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ABSTRACT

A new set of questions have entered the world of after-school/expanded learning opportunities programming. Until now the question asked about the non-school programming that serves school age children and youth has been primarily “how many.” But more and more school districts, funders, non-profit organizations, and the largest funder of them all, the federal government, have begun asking the question of “how” are these students being served by the programs of community organizations, institutions, and others who provide supplementary activities for students (Remer, 1996; Dryfoos, 1999; Little, Traub, & Horsch, 2002). This research is intended to address the issue of fit between these programs’ internal missions and goals and the subsequent objectives of the various players that participate in these arts education programs. Thus, the purpose of this research is to create an assessment tool focused on the points of alignment of missions, goals, and objectives that relate to collaboration and arts education standards among the participants in arts Extended Learning Opportunities (ELOs). The name of this assessment tool is PAGE ©, which stands for Participants’ Alignment of Goals Assessment. PAGE © is designed to assist the various stakeholders and participants in discerning if their organizations are good matches for arts ELOs based on similarities in their organizations’ missions, goals, and objective statements.
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A new set of questions have entered the world of after-school/expanded learning opportunities programming. Up until now the question asked about non-school programming that serves school age children and youth has been primarily “how many?” But more and more school districts, funders, nonprofit organizations, and the largest funder of them all, the federal government, have begun asking the question of how are these students being served by the programs of community organizations, institutions, and others who provide supplementary activities for students. (Remer, 1996; Dryfoos, 1999; Little, Traub, and Horsch, 2002). The questions being raised are along the lines of: How do these programs envision some kind of specific educative purpose, objectives, and goals for what they do with students? How do these programs plan and develop delivery systems for getting at the educative purpose, objectives, and goals? Are these programs’ educative purposes complementary to the curriculum goals of the host school and school district? Do these programs build in means of communicating with the faculty, staff, and administration of the school and school district in order to have a degree of correspondence to in-school learning?
This dissertation research is concerned with understanding these new questions as they relate to arts programming and in-school arts education. In particular, this research is interested in the fit of the separate internal missions, and the subsequent goals and objectives of the various players that participate in arts education projects and programs. This is a program theory assessment of before-, after-, and other out-of-school programs, or as they have most recently been called, Extended (Expanded) Learning Opportunities (ELOs). More specifically, the particular programming being examined is art education ELOs. Further refining this assessment of the program theories (or as some researchers refer to it, program philosophy [Conrad & Miller, 1987, pp. 19–42]) is the focus on effective arts learning.

**Critical Questions**

As mentioned earlier, questions are growing in this emergent field of ELOs as to the quality of the programming offered. ELOs, according to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act/No Child Left Behind (ESEA/NCLB) of 2001, are to be collaborative undertakings that reinforce and support the public school curriculum. The wording of this federal education law allows for the arts to be both an educational subject matter and an avenue of activity in funded ELOs. In addition, the National Endowment

---

1 *Extended Learning Opportunities* is the phrase currently used to cover educational programming that occurs with some type of connection to and some degree of relationship with regular public school environments. ELO programs may occur before or after school, on weekends, during holidays, or during the summer break period. This term has been most noticeably used by the current appropriation renewal of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), now referred to as No Child Left Behind (NCLB). ELOs have also been named *Expanded Learning Opportunities* by organizations such as SERVE. The Education Policy Studies Division of the National Governors Association refers to ELOs as *Extra Learning Opportunities*.  
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for the Arts (NEA) and national level nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) typically have statements directly or indirectly supporting such activities, and in some cases, offering funding.

The environment has become one where federal law requires educational “improvement.” In the meantime, schools need support and resources, cultural institutions need consistent and new audiences, and funders demand the maximum quantifiable use of their resources. In the search for improvement, support, audiences and maximized usage, three of these major institutional players; namely schools, cultural organizations, and funders; are increasing their interactions and networks. This comes primarily because of the operating setting demanded by the fourth player, namely the federal government in its current incarnation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), or “No Child Left Behind” (NCLB). But as these large categorical institutions begin to create partnerships, have they taken a good look at the individual internal goals and missions of the various players and partners to see what is the interface to collaboration and learning in the arts. Are they equally aware of the unique missions, visions, and goals of each other in terms of understanding how their intrinsic sets of goals and objectives will work to help, hinder, or in some cases, be void in the operationalization of the networks and programs that they create? The issue is not just what is the nature of the project, the program, the partnership. The issue is about an understanding of the fit (or not) of the missions, and accompanying objectives of the institutions involved in these joint ventures. The concern is about the characteristics and
resources of the entities involved. Do the missions of each partnering organization fit well enough to support a viable, sustainable, and effective collaboration in the execution of an arts education program?

In this study, the primary question as it relates to the arts and art education ELOs is:

Are the policies of the various policy agents supporting, encumbering, or silent on the two points of collaboration, and learning in the arts as they relate to art education ELOs? Critical questions coming out of this overarching concern are:

- Do the mission and policies of the various institutions, agencies, and actors engaged in ELOs address the issue of collaboration?
  - With whom is the collaboration occurring? (i.e. Non-school entities?, site school administration?, site school general teaching staff?, site school arts teachers?, others?).
  - How do these policies provide for regular or routine conversations, planning, and coordination between staff and managers of the ELO site program and the art education faculty?

- Do the missions or policies of the various institutions, agencies, and actors engaged in ELOs use some type of education standards, curriculum, goals, and/or methodologies?
  - To what degree, or in what way, is learning in the arts of the ELO linked to or harmonized with the art education standards and learning in the arts of the public school it has a relationship with?
How do these policies provide for, and to what degree, a clearly understood and agreed incorporation of art education standards, curriculum, goals, and methodologies suitable for ELO settings?

- Do the mission or policies of any of the institutions, agencies, and actors engaged in ELOs include any type of oversight procedure regarding these two points?

**Rationale and Need**

It is important for me to distinguish between the need to answer a question, and a mechanism for getting to an answer. The natural and first inclination is to dive directly into finding an answer. But what are the criteria by which to make this evaluation? What is my yardstick? The purpose of this study is not to do the evaluation, but rather to create the yardstick. Thus, the intent in doing this study is to create a criteria matrix based on the documents of the ELO contributor.

I have named the criteria matrix I am creating PAGE. PAGE © stands for **Participants’ Alignment of Goals Assessment**. PAGE is an instrument focused on the points of alignment of mission, goals, and objectives that relate to collaboration and learning in the arts among the participants in Arts ELOs. Rather than being the evaluation itself, PAGE is a set of criteria. A thorough “read” of the documents and advisory papers, interviews of key informants, and observations of Arts ELO sites as well as the statements of mission, goals and objectives, inform the creation of PAGE. The

---

2 The phrase and acronym, **Participants’ Alignment of Goals Assessment** (PAGE) is copyrighted as of Thursday, March 16, 2006 by Karen M Clark-Keys, Columbus/Cleveland Ohio.
creation of PAGE is designed to assist in supporting the various stakeholders and participants in discerning if their organizations are good matches for Arts ELOs based on similarities in their organizations’ missions, goals, and objective statements.

Based on these concerns, I submit that this research would be useful and informative for:

- local school district and site school administrations making choices of what organizations to partner with for arts ELO programs affecting their students,
- managers of local site ELOs that do use the arts, in making decisions about which kinds of partnerships are the best for them to apply their own goals and resources for maximum positive effect and benefit for the children they serve,
- national, state, and regional initiators, funders, policy advisors, advocates, and supporters of arts ELOs to ensure that the quality of programs are not compromised, and that the intended purpose of learning is achieved, and
- art education rank and file teachers, and district supervisors who wish to expand the continuation of art learning for their students beyond the regular classroom.

**Statements of Educational Philosophy / Discussion of Bias**

It would seem that the standard request for the researcher to state her or his bias would seem a rather clear-cut matter. For me, this has been anything but. If I think in terms of the typical lay definition of bias, it would imply giving some kind of list of what I am against, the things I don’t care for, disagree with, or seek to avoid. When I think in terms of a dictionary definition of the term, on the one hand I encounter expressions such as “inclination of temperament or outlook” but in the same definition, I encounter “sometimes unreasoned judgment.” (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. 2004). By
virtue of the volume of information a research projects encounters and generates, it would seem less likely, though not impossible, for the work to be “unreasoned”. But if what I am being asked to articulate is my “inclination of temperament or outlook” then I feel I can oblige. On yet another hand, writings on policy analysis and the research process all maintain that there should be an explanation of the selection process, a statement of why certain things were chosen and others were not.

My attempt to interpret these different definitions has been synthesized down to the following. Bias, for the sake of this research, is delineated along two tracks. The first is a statement of what are my beliefs and lens of perspective that I bring to this research. The second is an explanation of why I chose a particular methodology or method, or chose a particular set of documents to analyze, persons to interview, or sites to visit. Here in the introduction chapter, I will give an explanation of my personal lens as “bias” in this paper. Later in the methodology and methods chapter, selection choices, or selection bias, will be reiterated in greater detail.

Hammersley and Gomm (1997) reflect my understanding about bias as not being a clear-cut affair. They point out that because different perspectives coupled with different situations cause things to shift in their importance for the researcher, that bias can be ambiguous. As Hammersley and Gomm continue in their discussion on bias, they add the caution against an overreliance on notions of correctness or truth as put forth by foundationalist epistemology. This foundationalist position views bias as any commitments, assumptions, or presuppositions that the researcher holds. Bias is
removed, under the foundationalist view, by merely stripping away any of these presuppositions and commitments “pertaining to the field in which research is being carried out … until bedrock is reached.” (p. 9).

Hammersley and Gomm’s article argues for a definition of bias that is somewhere in the middle between the absolutes of foundationalism and what they refer to as radical alternative epistemological positions. This middle ground interpretation of bias includes several notions. One of these notions, according to Hammersley and Gomm’s argument, is that

…judgments about the appropriateness of methods and about the validity of conclusions must be recognized as fallible. Moreover, it is no longer simply a question of whether or not methodological rules have been followed. For the most part, such rules can be no more than guidelines, and considerable judgment is involved in applying them …

Hammersley, M., & Gomm, R. 1997, p. 9

The authors go on to state that rather than trying to avoid or remove systemic error that comes out of the presuppositions one holds about the field of study, that instead our presuppositions “…can only be matters about which we believe our knowledge to be sound but less than apodictic.” (p. 10). They go on to state that errors in procedures have more to do with logic, and how much the procedures deviate from common judgments and behaviors typical to a given field of study. In the end, Hammersley and Gomm’s definition of bias is, in part,

…systematic error that the researcher should have been able to recognize and minimize, as judged either by the researcher him or herself (in retrospect) or by others. This then allows us to distinguish between motivated and unmotivated bias, according to whether it stems from other goals than the pursuit of knowledge.

Hammersley, M, & Gomm, R. 1997, p. 11
Similarly, Kay Fielden gives an explanation that describes bias in qualitative research as both inevitable and desirable because it is an expression or manifestation of the researcher’s point of view. (2003). She states that as “the researcher becomes aware of the ‘cultural self’ there is an additional set of resources upon which to draw in interpreting qualitative research results.” (p. 128). Further, being reflexive and aware of one’s own subjectivity brings about this capacity for self-realization. Fielden enumerates three general sources of bias in the research process, the first being the aforementioned internal research bias. Next, she states that bias is introduced into the process because of interaction with “…researcher/s, research institution, funding body, client organization, and individual participants.” (2003, p. 1). Lastly, Fielden also notes that bias is generated in the process and consideration of the “…analysis, interpretation and reporting of research results for organizational information systems.”

Here in the introduction chapter, I will introduce by way of a brief list, those inclinations, outlooks and presuppositions that I personally bring to this process. This list of presuppositions or personal biases will be fleshed out in greater depth in the “Review of Literature” chapter of this dissertation. In the methodology chapter, I will discuss bias in terms of selection, validity and other matter related to methods and methodology. In the course of the “Description of the Study” chapter, the views and perspectives of the various participants and stakeholders will be described, thus giving some insight into these sets of bias.

As any researcher does, I bring to the research my own perspectives and presuppositions, and these have their roots in the personal. My interest in this topic stems from experiences as parent, visual arts teacher, researcher, and school district arts
supervisor and administrator in which I observed or was made aware of both good arts-based ELO programs, and others that were considered nothing more than a “warehousing” or “babysitting” of students. The following summary of my perspectives are given further detailed discussion in the review of literature chapter, but for now and in the vein of being an introduction, these comments serve as an overview of my biases.

Keeping the Learner First

Keeping the learner first and foremost in the process of research, analysis and evaluation are the cornerstone of keeping the integrity of the process. The question that must be kept uppermost is: How will this line of research benefit the learner? The creation of PAGE is the creation of a framework that can assist implementers and administrators of ELOs in creating frameworks and environments for learning. But PAGE is not being constructed to make life easier for this collection of ELO administrations. It is about grounding and giving clarity to what each of us has to bring to make learning possible for the real stakeholders, the students. The purpose is not to make our jobs easier, though that does make a lot of sense. The purpose is to discover what and how do these characteristics and traits inform and aid individual learners in accessing and applying knowledge.

Intrinsic Value of the Arts

I also hold that the intrinsic value of the arts and art education are not up for compromise. (Bumgarner Gee, 1999). In the back-and-forth process of aligning, making coherent, integrating and thematically linking between the arts and non-arts disciplines, the tendency is to lose sight of the intrinsic value of the arts themselves. In relation to my study, keeping the intrinsic worth of the arts as its own reason for study, is
at the center of my concern about ELOs making good on any claims of teaching or utilizing the arts. In real nitty-gritty language, I’m asking if arts ELOs are actually teaching about the arts, or are they operating as “cute” make-and-take time-fillers for children? Embedded within this position of defending the intrinsic worth of the arts is insistence that if ELOs make a tacit or explicit assertion to teach art, then students should learn the arts.

However, there is also the urge at the other extreme to see any integration of the arts with any other subject as some kind of betrayal. Charles Fowler in his 1996 book *Strong Arts, Strong Schools* states, “Intrinsic and extrinsic values do not have to clash. Both views can help substantiate the value of the arts in education.” (p. 37). I take the stance that to stand exclusively at either of the poles is counterproductive. The business we are in is education. Our function is to educate and to participate with the best of what we have for the full and inclusive education of all students. We have interests, passions and training in the arts and that is what we bring to the table for the purpose of educating students, (including adult ones in some occasions). I hold that we need to take the middle path, not by default but because we are clear. We need to be perfectly clear, even when we choose to integrate, that we are by, for, and about the teaching of the arts. 

I also believe that in defending the intrinsic worth of art education as its own worthy subject we may also be bringing to light possible lapses in our curriculum planning in general. In standing clear and firm in who we are and what we are about, we may be creating a manner or atmosphere of rigor that sometimes gets lost in education planning with or without the arts presence.
Curriculum Coherence

I have a bias about how education should be constructed. What I want for learners is a learning process that is consistent, coordinated, and based in a set of shared goals and objectives. And this includes arts education. Efforts should support and promote holistic, constructivist forms of instruction that requires coordination, or coherence.

Coherent curriculum, as described in the 1995 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, is a concept under which hang things such as outcome-based education, integrated, alignment, interdisciplinary, and authentic assessment. As I understand this description, coherent curriculum is a strategic stance, a view and plan of the larger goal, based on what Beane describes as a “widespread understanding of what the curriculum is about.” (p. 4). Based on coherent curriculum being a strategic viewpoint and framework, then the tactical means of achieving this strategic vision is coordinating the usage of such education modalities as integrated curriculum and lesson planning, curriculum and lesson alignment, interdisciplinary learning, and authentic assessment.

Coherence, at first glance, appears to be much the same as integrated curriculum, but there are differences. Nor should it be confused with alignment, which is really about how a content area or academic subject aligns teaching with state standards of that given subject. Coherence requires that “the programs, materials, and resources used in teaching must enhance and support one another without overwhelming the teachers or the students.” (Protherone, Shellard, Turner, 2003, p. 22). Protherone, Shellard and Turner as well as March and Peters (2002) and Gordon (2002) caution that we not
confuse and misuse a bombardment of programs, projects, initiatives, or “new
techniques” as being coherent. Adding yet another program or project, including arts
based ELOs, is not automatically coherent. My bias is to support a comprehensive
learning “package” that is not only tactically holistic and constructivist, but is so in a
strategic coherent framework. The development of PAGE is a tool to aid in the strategic
readiness and planning for placing arts ELOs into a coherent learning process.

Resources

Students should be given opportunities for high quality and meaningful learning
that includes the use of shared space and resources outside of the typical school
environment. Nowhere is it more professionally and painfully evident the paltry
equipment, supplies and materials afforded to public schools arts programs than it is in
my current position as a district level arts administrator. The lack of resources, based on
my experiences in the field, is a function of both a lack of funds and a lack of
comprehension or understanding by the majority of administrators that specialized
equipment and supplies are a vital necessity. This lack of understanding operates at all
levels of administrations including building level administrators, budget managers and
higher-level policy makers. By having a coordinated and collaborated strategy for
utilizing arts ELOs, there may be opportunities for students to work in real studios with
the proper (and safe) equipment that school districts cannot or will not provide to their
students.
Race and Class

The removal, or lack of support for and access to a thorough and complete education in the arts raises my concern and questions about internalized class- and race-based marginalization, and even externally justified discrimination based in these modes of inequity. Numerous authors have written on the class and race divide in the general sphere of art and culture.

Arthur Efland in his survey of the history of visual art education points out how class, status and race determinate if art education was provided and if so, in what form and to whom. (1990). He points out this pattern occurring in the nineteenth century, next in the child-centered school movement of the late 1920’s, and then particularly in what Efland refers to as “the suburbanization of art education” in the post WWII era. (p. 229). Larry Shiner (2001) traces the creation of the notion of “fine” art and the elevated status of crafts as an outgrowth of Kant and Schiller’s culturally engrained and privileged notions of racism and classism. Russell Ferguson in the book “Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Culture” brings up the irony of self-limiting class and race behavior when he says, “…while that myth is perpetuated by those whose interests it serves, it can also be internalized by those who are oppressed by it.” (1992, p. 9).

These texts will be reviewed in more depth in the literature review chapter. However, for the sake of this introduction the implications of class, race and marginalization concern me. Particularly as the arts and arts education are marginalized in public schools. The precarious position of the arts in the public schools may have as much to do with unexamined automatic institutionalized mechanism that deems working
class communities and children of color as poor candidates for the arts as it does with any economic dire straits. The implication is the richer and the whiter the school or school district the more likely the arts are infused, integrated and considered an integral part of the total education process. Conversely the implication is the poorer and the darker the school district, the more likely the arts and arts education are separate, seen as unnecessary and expendable with no real necessity for the education of young people. Taking this position, my bias is to employ arts ELOs as a supporting tactic to coherent education strategy that fully embraces arts education as an equal and core component of the learning process.

**Future Chapters**

The future chapters will cover literature review, methodology and methods, description of the study and the findings and conclusion. The literature review chapter will flesh out many items alluded to in this introduction as well as ground and frame the work in two primary categories: contextual backgrounding, and theoretical/conceptual positioning. The first category will be the place for describing some of the history of Arts ELOs. The second category will be the opportunity for me to flesh out in greater detail the literature that informs and summarizes the points of my personal bias or presuppositions.

The chapter covering methodology and methods will give greater details for the methodological rationale and choices, including selection bias, for my research. In the description of the study chapter, I will present the actual process of reviewing the documents, including advisories, best practices commentaries, and similar evaluations, from and of the selected organizations and institutions impacting arts ELOs. The
description of the study chapter will also be the place where the interviews will be
recounted and site visits will be described. Finally, the findings and conclusion chapter
will present the actual analysis of the described data and my conclusions based on these
findings.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review chapter is designed to address two primary categories: contextual backgrounding, and theoretical/conceptual positioning. The contextual backgrounding section will present literature that addresses what is the more recent background and context of ELOs, arts partnerships with schools, and arts ELOs. The theoretical/conceptual positioning portion of this chapter gives explanation of what concepts or notions I hold that guide my interest and approach to this research. As such, it gives additional clarification to my presuppositions, some of which was discussed in the introduction.

**Context and Background**

**Context and Background of ELOs**

*Federal Education Law*

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was enacted in 1965 as Public Law 89-10 as part of Lyndon B. Johnson’s Great Society initiatives. Typically the act is reauthorized about every five to six years. As part of the Great Society agenda, ESEA was seen as a means of redress to members of society that had been discriminated against or disadvantaged. At the time it was written, ESEA was intended to provide for
service and support of poor and disenfranchised schools and students. However, it did not provide in any direct or specific way for any kind of out-of-school time activities.

It was under the 1994 reauthorization of ESEA as the The Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 that general provisions began to be made for the broadening and coordination of a greater range of resources for the benefit of K–12 students, but it was not until later that the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21CCLC) was added to the law. In 1997, the original 21CCLC was authorized under Title X, Part I (20 U.S.C. 8241) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The original 21CCLC program was authorized to be administered directly by the U.S. Department of Education with only school districts being eligible to apply for funding under competitive grants.

The current version of federal education legislation, No Child Left Behind (NCLB) continues and expands Extended Learning Opportunities (ELOs) with K–12 students. The specific portion of federal legislation that gives basic policy guidelines and funding is currently Title IV of the present version education law. Under the newest authorization, application for funding is no longer limited to local school districts, but is open to a variety of organizations and institutions, including faith-based organizations. In addition, funding has moved from being directly administered at the federal level to now being administered by state departments of education.

According to the U.S. Department of Education Web site, the total appropriations for 21CCLC for 2006 are $981 million. (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). With grant awards ranging from $293,000 to $131,000,000, the average 21CCLC grant award is $17 million. The maximum number of years a given partnership can receive 21CCLC funds is three years. 21CCLC programs are focused on providing expanded academic
enrichment opportunities for students attending financially disadvantaged schools. The categories of activities specifically named and allowed under 21CCLC include art and music, along with tutoring and academic enrichment activities, recreation and Character Education.

In addition, there are other initiatives from the U.S. Department of Education under Drug-Free Schools, and Title I Compensatory Education. Fortune, Padgette, and Fickel (2005) suggest that a portion of $12.7 billion dollars allocated to Title I could be utilized for ELOs. They base this on “Title I provisions in NCLB specifically encourage the use of strategies such as extended day, extended year, and summer programs to increase learning time.” (p. 10). Fortune et al. also point out that Title I funds are to be used to “coordinate services and programs, (and) increase parental involvement.” There may even be means of using Title I dollars to pay for ELO staffing.

Safe and Drug-Free Schools under Title IV Part A of the current federal education act has an overall funding of approximately $431 million. While Safe and Drug-Free does require specific targeted interventions as part of any ELOs they might fund, there may be situations where arts activities and learning are used as part of such an ELO. If and when the arts are part of such a program, the arts partners that may choose to be part of such a process need to take a look at how their own internal aims and objects can be engaged in such a program in a way that keeps learning in and about the arts viable.

Other Federal Programs for ELOs

As significant as this type of federal funding is, this was not the first time the federal government has provided some sort of support for school-age child care. Seligson (1999, p. 135) states that there were previous supports given by the federal government at
the close of the 19th century and again during World War II. The limited support given in the late 1800’s was to deal with the socialization and assistance of the large influxes of immigrants. During World War II funding was needed to address what could referred to as latchkey kids with large numbers of women working outside the home while male workers were away fighting. Both of these two examples of federal support for child care were both short lived. Any other kinds of federal involvement in child care, particularly in the mid to late 20th century, was limited to health and safety issues, and primarily geared to infants and pre school-age daycare and child care regulations.

Returning to Halpern, we can see that there are currently other sources of government funding for Extended Learning Opportunities. (1999, pp. 89–90). In addition, Social Services and Community Development block grants provide some support for different kinds of ELOs. Padgette (2003) reports that there are over 100 federal sources for ELOs and similar types of programs. In the overall listing of these approximately 100 ELO funding sources, 11 of them have language that specifically allows for activities in the arts. Three of these are limited to Native American/Indian tribal communities. It is important to keep in mind that these are programs that specifically name the arts. The other 89 federal funding sources do not necessarily explicitly disallow arts activities.

Padgette’s report goes on to give information about the seven largest federal sources specifically designed to include support of ELOs. In 2003 three of the largest federal funding sources came from the Department of Education (USDOE). Besides 21CCLC, there are also Supplemental Services, and Grants to Local Educational Agencies, both as Title I options. According to Padgett, these USDOE funding sources
totaled an estimated $1.680 billion. The Department of Health and Human Services also has three major funding sources. They are the Child Care and Development Fund, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, and Social Services Block Grant. Their totals come to an estimated $2.166 billion. The U.S. Department of Agriculture is included in Padgette’s list of top seven funding sources. The Department of Agriculture has an estimated $270 million available through their Food and Nutrition program.

In 2005, Dionne Dobbins wrote two reports for The Finance Project about the use of federal funding for ELOs. The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) has provided funds since 1984 to encourage and develop community-based strategies through its Office of Justice Programs (OJP). OJP has been said to provide something in the range of $2 billion to states and localities during 2004, including for programs that can be ELOs. Dobbins suggests ten different grants under four offices within OJP that could tap into these dollars to fund ELOs.

In addition, Dobbins reports that the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) has funding that could be applied to ELO through its Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). SAMHSA has an overall budget of $3.4 billion, and of that approximately $2,236 billion is potentially available for ELOs.

Another example of noneducation funding for ELOs is the U.S. Department of Labor’s Workforce Investment Act. (The Finance Project, 2003). This 1998 act redesigned and consolidated workforce development in a way that youth services and academic and occupational learning would be supported. Local unemployment rates and
percentage of economically disadvantaged youth are factors that go into the formula for funding. These formula grants totaled $1.1 billion in 2002 and 994.5 million in 2003.

The information provided by these reports describes a universe of noneducation sources for ELO funding that could represent something in the range of $11,083 to 9,347 billion dollars. Potentially that could represent something in the order of $221 to 186 million per state from noneducation resources alone. When 21CCLC is added in, the funding stream that ELOs could tap into to could be as large as $12,064 to $10,328 billion. For states, this appears to be a potential of $240 to $206.5 million. To put these dollars into perspective, the state of Ohio has over 560 city and local school districts, coming out to a simple math average of about $42,000. The total funding and budget for the Cleveland (Ohio) Municipal School District alone, is between $350 and $420 million annually. (Ohio Department of Education, 2006).

Looking at these sources of funding, we need to remember that seldom do they exclude arts activities from their programs, but they are also not explicitly interested in the arts.

It has to be kept in mind that ELOs are being thought of as a mechanism to accomplish the purpose and mission of these funding sources. Some of these major governmental funders are seeking education improvement. Others are more concerned with safety and keeping kids off the street, with the subset of behavioral changes and character development. Others government programs are designed to improve employment skills. These various contexts will effect how an Arts ELO will have to frame and position itself if it chooses to be part of such a grant program.
City governments look for ways to improve their communities, and one of their concerns is to reduce juvenile delinquency by having school-age children safe and off the streets. What the activities are once these children are contained is typically of very limited concern to any mayors’ office. In my experience as an arts education administrator for large urban school district, is that the city government, the mayors’ office, will apply for funding for ELOs to achieve these goals. When they are created many will include some form of arts activities or enrichment. If my question is concerned with learning in and about the arts and the quality of that learning, then I will have to be conscious of the context or setting in which this arts learning will occur. If the Arts ELO is operating in a “get off the street” program context, what do the partners need to bring to the table, what resources and motivations of their own do they already have, that will work to insure that collaboration with school-day arts education and arts learning doesn’t get shortchanged.

State and local governments are also struggling with sustaining economic growth and jobs creation. When ELOs embed themselves under programs that have the purpose of jobs creation, there is some degree of limitation on how and in what way an Arts ELO can operate in this context. Those that wish to be partners in an Arts ELO funded or operating under a workforce development umbrella will have to consider their match to the format. If the Arts ELO is operating in a “get them jobs” program environment, what do we need to come to the table with that supports job creation and workforce development, and particularly in the arts?
Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs)

School-age childcare and after-school care has also been provided for by a variety of agencies, organizations not directly a part of schools. In the broadest sense, these before-school, after-school, weekend, holiday and summertime interventions have been in place for a long time in the form of institutions like the Boys and Girls Clubs, the YMCA and YWCA, community centers and settlement houses. (Halpern, pp. 83–84). Olatokunbo Fashola’s 1998 study, Review of Extended-Day and After-School Programs and Their Effectiveness, reviewed 26 organizations that provided such programming. The organizations included Big Brothers Big Sisters, Fifth Dimension, Hands-on Science Outreach, LA’s BEST, New York City Beacons, and Police Activities League.

Some of the recent nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that have played a role in either funding or support and advocacy have been The Open Society Institute with its school and community-based programs in New York City. (Seligson, pp. 136–137). The Dewitt Wallace–Readers Digest Fund has funded the MOST (Making the Most of Out-of-School Time) programs in Boston, Seattle, and Chicago. The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation has been not only a powerful force in advocating for the very creation of 21CCLC, but provides about $55 million annually for technical assistance, evaluation, and training for 21CCLC sites.

There is an industry that has developed around ELOs with a host of advocacy and service organizations. (Halpern, p. 89). At the national level alone there are a multitude of such organizations. The American Youth Policy Forum (AYPF) describes itself as a professional development organization. It has after-school/out-of-school time among its program areas. (2006). AYPF maintains a database of research briefs, and AYPF
publications on ELOs for older students, a category of students that are less supported. The Promising Practices in Afterschool (2006) was initially funded by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation and has as its focus directors of ELOs. Probably one of the largest and most familiar of the ELO service organizations is the advocacy organization Afterschool Alliance (ASA). (2006). ASA was also given its initial start-up by the Mott Foundation along with the USDOE, J.C. Penney Company, and the Open Society Institute’s own ELO service organization, The After-School Corporation (TASC). TASC is a major ELO service organization in its own right despite being primarily by and for New York City schools. TASC not only provides the services of training and technical assistance, but is also a grant provider. As a last example that I will give at the national level, founded in 1987, the National AfterSchool Association (NASA) was originally the National School-Age Care Alliance. NASA is a membership association for after school childcare professionals.

Many of the ELO NGOs find their own unique operating niche, but my research shows few that are specifically and solely about learning in the arts. As seen in so many cases, something about the arts might be revealed in the content of any publication, brief, program, or project description but none are specifically about the arts as its own discrete topic. It would appear that there is a great deal of activity in this branch of education, but in my view, there is little consistently speaking by and for the arts education view.

I think it is also important to make note that the goals held by both the government and for NGOs in providing some kind of school-age childcare and support, even going back to the 19th century, has primarily been about supervision, safety and socialization. This is not much different from the current concerns of keeping kids safe
and off the streets, and to possibly impact their behavioral and socialization habits. This is important to my research because knowing the origins and goals of the funding source describes the environment that any ELO has to operate in.

Universities and Higher Education

Universities, colleges, and research institutes associated with them have long been a part of the ELO movement. Their roles have included research and advisory centers, actual ELO partnerships and sites, and teacher development laboratories. Probably the most notable examples of universities engaged in ELOs are Harvard’s Project Zero (2006) and its Family Research Project, and Wellesley College’s National Institute on Out-of-School Time contained in its Center for Research on Women. Wellesley’s National Institute on Out-of-School Time (National Institute on Out-of-School Time, 2006) describes itself as providing “research, education and training, consultation, and field-building.” Among their most recent efforts is the development and advocacy for credentialing of ELO frontline staff workers. Their efforts are not specifically geared towards training in arts education.

Harvard’s Project Zero currently has 13 research projects. Two of these are explicitly about learning in and about the arts. They are the Qualities of Quality in Arts Education, and the Studio Thinking Project. These two projects focus on both the teaching practices and strategies as well as the learning process generated in the visual arts. Other research projects under Project Zero look at critical

---

3 The Qualities of Quality is a project to synthesize the critical elements of high quality arts teaching and learning and to identify effective strategies. Phase I of III of the Studio Thinking Project identified visual art teachers’ pedagogical intentions as eight categories of learning and three classroom structures as strategies for achieving those intentions. Phase II is intended to generate an assessment instrument of the Studio Habits of Mind in the visual arts.
thinking, habits of mind, logic and assumptions in students and how to foster such thinking in a positive manner. The connection this research can make to ELOs is in the area of discerning a variety of measuring criteria that can be included in the PAGE matrix. For example one could ask: Of the eight categories of learning identified in the Studio Thinking Project, which might already be part of the internal mission, or a goal or objective of a given ELO partner?

Harvard’s second internal institute is directly linked to and about ELOs. The Family Research Project (HFRP) is focused on complementary learning, which they describe as:

We believe that for children and youth to be successful, there must be an array of learning supports around them. These supports, which must reach beyond school, should be linked and work toward consistent learning and developmental outcomes for children from birth through adolescence. Examples of non-school learning supports include early childhood programs, families, after school programs, libraries, and other community-based institutions.

Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP), 2006

A substantial portion of what HFRP provides is a centralized database of research from a variety of sources and institutions that are investigating various forms of complementary learning, including ELOs.

In addition to universities and colleges being research focused, an advisory in 1999 from the USDOE offers the suggestion that universities and colleges can both supply staff teachers for ELOs from their preservice pool, but by doing so also begin to recruit middle and high school students to become future teachers. (U.S. Department of Education, 1999). Working with ELOs is seen as having three benefits. The first is a site for teaching laboratories for preservice teachers. This environment is seen as particularly
needful in developing classroom management skills, acutely in working with students of classes and ethnicities different from the student teacher. This could be a possibility for arts education preservice teachers as well. It may also be that the greater flexibility and latitude available in ELOs might give preservice arts teachers opportunities to test deeper exploration of the various components of arts learning that might not be afforded in many public school buildings.

The second opportunity listed by the USDOE is seen as a way of engaging middle and high school students as mentors and tutors to younger students. Several studies and reports on ELOs point out that retaining older students is a much more difficult challenge. (Anderson-Butcher, 2003; Artists for Humanity, 2006; Baldwin, Price, Fellerath, Jucovy, Kotloff, Raley, Walker, 2002; Harvard Family Research Project) One suggested means of retaining these students is to engage them as mentors and tutors. (Birmingham, Pechman, Russell, and Mielke, 2005; Conk, 2000; National School-Age Care Alliance, 2000). Retaining students for a time long enough to have meaningful impact and improvement on their academic, behavioral, or skills is a daunting challenge for an ELO, including arts ELOs.

The third opportunity for university involvement is that of developing and encouraging high school and middle school students to consider a career in education. The DOE report suggests, “(s) tarting future teacher clubs for middle and high school students.” (U.S. Department of Education. 1999, p. 2). This would seem to imply that these kinds of opportunities would also be prime opportunities for engaging young people in considering a career in arts education. Daniel (1982), Efland (1990), DiMaggio and Ostrower (1992), Halpern and Wolf (2005) have writings that speak to the history,
statistics, and impact of marginal participation and education in the arts for the socioeconomically disadvantaged and ethnic minorities. The low levels of participation in the arts by ethnically marginalized and economically, socially and educationally disenfranchised members of our society limits and narrows the development of a potential pool of future workers at all levels in any occupation in the arts.

Arts ELOs

Arts Partnerships in Schools

The majority of arts learning experiences that occur with public schools are in-school activities. A number of providers of in-school arts engagements also provide out-of-school-time arts learning experiences. In my role as an administrator for Arts Education for the Cleveland Municipal School District (CMSD), a substantial number of our external/third-party providers have both in-school and ELO programming. Among our partners are institutions and organizations such as Playhouse Square, the Western Reserve Historical Society, the Passport Project, and our biggest partner, Young Audiences of Northeast Ohio (YANeO). Connections and collaborations with school staff and administration occurs more because of prior relationships generated because of in-school engagements. In both cases, direct conversation and collaboration with any arts teachers are much more circumstantial.

A read of the documents reveals that the majority of research studies, evaluations, and descriptions of guidelines are geared to in-school arts partnerships, and of these overwhelmingly they are focused on supporting the non-arts teacher/classroom to implement learning through the arts, but seldom intentionally about the arts. The primary factor forcing this approach to in-school arts partnerships is federal mandates and funding
under the current federal education law. (U.S. Public Law, 107-110, 2002). Title I Part A Subpart 1–Basic Program Requirements under NCLB, makes it specific that adequate yearly progress (AYP) is determined by mandatory testing in reading and math in grades three through eight\(^4\). States may choose on their own to administer tests in other subjects such as science and social studies, but because the focus in K–12 public school education is on literacy and math, funding is directly tied to this agenda at every level. If any project, any program is to be part of in-school day learning, it must be couched in supporting learning in reading and math.

*Arts Out-of-School Learning*

There are places where art learning; learning by, for and about art; occurs outside of the school day. These sites are typically based in organizations and institutions that are themselves exclusive to the arts. The first such that comes to mind are art museums and music organizations of some type. In most communities that have a visual arts museum, an orchestra or opera company, and in some cases, a historical society, these institutions also become a potential resource for independent learning in the arts.

At the national level, the American Association of Museums has a standing committee to address the practice and issues of museum education. That committee, the Standing Professional Committee on Education (EdCom), states that it “… advances the purpose of museums as places of lifelong learning, … and excellence in the practice of museum education…” (Standing Professional Committee on Education, 2006). EdCom states that it will accomplish its mission by “providing networking opportunities for those
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\(^4\) At present, science is scheduled to become a federal required test subject beginning in the 2007-2008 school year. There are no planned provisions at the federal level for social studies, and its components of history and economics, to be included as a requirement for federal evaluation of schools and for federal funding support.
engaged in fostering the educational purposes of museums … serving as a clearinghouse for information related to learning in museums.” As laudable as these goals and mission are, it has to be kept in mind that that they are for the benefit of and from the perspective of museums, not schools. This is as it should be. However, it is important to be aware of the agenda of each partnering organization in forming an arts ELO.

According to EdCom’s brief history of education in their institutions, connecting with education was not a high priority for most museums until the 1980s. The document Museums for a New Century: A Report of the Commission on Museums for a New Century, (Bloom and Powell, 1984), enumerated seven different concerns for museum practice including the need for museums to move past their usual solitary and detached relationship with their communities and begin to embrace their role as sites of lifelong learning. In addition, the report said the “lack of a ‘philosophical framework’ for museum learning theory and a conflict of values within museums.” is an impediment to museums to articulate and operationalize education as part of their role and mission. (Standing Professional Committee on Education).

Looking at a local example, University Circle Inc. (UCI) in Cleveland, Ohio, serves as the umbrella organization managing the collective growth and development, service and advocacy of 40 member institutions and 38 associate member institutions. Among these 78 institutions, one is a university, four are specialized arts teaching and conservatory training institutions, and two are first-tier, world-class arts presenting institutions, the Cleveland Orchestra and the Cleveland Museum of Art. While each member institution is free to establish its own programming, UCI does provide coordination and cataloguing of the member institutions’ educational programming. One
of UCI’s strongest roles is in coordinating and promoting the various offerings of the member institutions to K–12 schools in the metropolitan area, with a major emphasis on the Cleveland Municipal School District. In looking at the history self-reported by UCI, we see that an issue for major institutions is their relationships, or lack of, with the communities they exist in.

In July 1966, riots occurred in the nearby Hough neighborhood that reinforced mounting neighborhood distrust that the Circle was closed off to the surrounding neighborhoods. … In 1970, UCDF was reorganized as University Circle Incorporated (UCI) with an added emphasis on strengthening the relationship between University Circle and its surrounding neighborhoods. In its outreach to the broader community, UCI began working closely with neighborhood organizations to build housing and provide access to broader community resources. UCI's Community Education Program was created in 1973 to bring the assets of the Circle to with Cleveland schoolchildren, a collaboration that thrives today with four significant UCI programs serving thousands of Cleveland Municipal School District children yearly from pre-school to high school.

History of University Circle, 2006, http://www.universitycircle.org/content/history.asp

These racial and socioeconomic tensions of the 1960’s forced member institutions of UCI to rethink their engagement with the larger Cleveland community well before the publication of the EdCom document. What EdCom and UCI both say about themselves is that they operate with a particular worldview and agenda of their own that has only recently begun to incorporate interacting with the educational needs of the larger communities around them.
In my view this is an important example of why knowing the vision, mission, goals, and objectives of a partner is important to understanding the degree of fit with an Arts ELO. One the one hand, museums and similar institutions may appear to be a natural fit, but what are their own internal goals? There are subtle nuances that may require some deeper thought than the obvious.

In a different vein there are also stand-alone arts learning centers not connected to major presenting institutions like a museum or orchestra. A substantial number of these community arts learning centers and settlement houses are represented by the service organization, The National Guild of Community Schools of the Arts (NGCSA). NGCSA references its beginnings as originating from the famous Hull House in Chicago founded by Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Starr in 1892. (National Guild of Community Schools of the Arts, 2006). What initially began as a sort of loose collection of settlement houses became more formalized in 1937 to become the National Guild of Community Music Schools. Between 1954 and 1967 the organization received funding from both the Rockefeller Foundation and the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). It was not until 1974 that the organization took on its present name in order to “…reflect the growth of multi-disciplinary arts programs at its schools…” NGCSA has two national initiatives that play a part either with K–12 arts or with ELOs.

The first is the NGCSA’s Partners in Excellence (PIE) research and evaluation initiative that is focused on understanding needs and best practices for partnerships with K–12 public school arts. With support in 2005 from MetLife Foundation, the PIE research was operationalized into Partners in Arts Education (PAE). The purpose of PIE is self-described to be “a national initiative which was developed to identify and study
best practices in K–12 arts education partnerships and foster their replication. The project has evolved out of a continuum of inquiry by the National Guild about effective arts education collaborations.” (National Guild of Community Schools of the Arts, 2001, p. 5). PAE partnerships are almost exclusively about in-school partnerships rather than ELOs.

The second NGCSA initiative is Creative Communities, which is a joint project with the NEA and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development that is intended to service children and youth in public housing. This initiative is focused on and based in or around public housing, rather than specifically with public schools. One such Creative Communities fund recipients is Cleveland Public Theater (CPT) of Cleveland Ohio.

CPT has run its own after-school and summer ELO since the spring of 2000, called Brick City Theater (BCT). (C. Seibert, personal communication, December 19, 2006). CPT’s own theatrical production focus and philosophy is to present socially and politically alternative views with an emphasis on original, emerging and historically unique plays, playwrights, and stage adoptions that give voice for writers and directors, and voice to audiences that are not always part of the mainstream cannon. Based on this kind of inclusive and open perspective, it was a very natural extension for CPT and its founder, James Levin, to create BCT.

BCT is operated in two public housing sites in the city of Cleveland. BCT serves typically 7- to 14-year-olds but frequently will accommodate children as young as five. Generally, between 17 and 22 students will be in attendance on a normal day. Numbers tend to take a dramatic upturn when a final performance is close at hand. This program is exclusively by, for, and about learning in the arts, allowing theater to be a broad and
inclusive avenue for exploring a variety of visual, musical, and dramatic art forms. BCT, however, does not collaborate with the staff or administration of the schools that their students might come from.5

NGCSA and its two initiatives, have the strongest parallels to my development of a measurement instrument to be applied to the internal mission, goal, and objectives of partners in an Arts ELO that connects to arts learning in the K–12 environment. It is noteworthy that NGCSA is about the business of learning in the arts. NGCSA and its various initiatives make it a strong and foremost priority to guide students in development and mastery of arts skills. This is different from many other potential categories of ELO partners that frequently include the arts merely as a supplement or enrichment in a program with a different purpose.

There are also for-profit enterprises that do provide out-of-school, or arts ELOs. Two examples are the commercial franchise arts program, AbraKadoodle and KidzArt. Mary C. Rogers founded AbraKadoodle, a partner of Binney and Smith Crayola. (AbraKadoodle, 2005). The corporate information packet explains that Abrakadoodle is designed to work with “…host educational institutions, such as schools (private and public)…” This franchise is geared to work with children no older than 12 years of age, or grade 7. The brochure/press pack goes on to say that the franchise provides process as

5 By contrast, many of their teaching artists are frequently engaged in the CMSD in-school long-term residence program, ICARE - Initiative for Culture and Arts in Education. These teaching arts are themselves well versed in CMSD's standards for all of the arts as well as expectations and standards for general classroom instruction.
opposed to product art activities as a means of developing and maturing students’ skills, imaginative process, and creative abilities. An observation of an AbraKadoodle site is described in a future chapter.

KidzArt is partnered with one of Binney and Smith’s rival, Sanford Prismacolor. (KidzArt, 2005). KidzArt also lists itself as affiliated with the National AfterSchool Association, an organization previously mentioned as a NGO. KidzArt has franchise program options to work with a broader range of clients or arts students that covers the entire K–12 spectrum. KidzArt makes a direct statement that school administrators should consider using their program for extended after-school programming. Both franchises make statements that each of their programs “meets or exceeds the National Standards for Arts Education.” Neither franchises indicate any kind of goal or objective of working with the school or schools district’s own arts education curriculum or arts teachers.

These background and context descriptions set the stage for understanding what my position or biases are regarding arts ELOs. Several things appear to be lacking in writings on the subject. One is a description of arts ELOs themselves. There is much written about ELOs in general. To be sure many of these ELOs do allow for the arts to be part of their total offerings, but few are programs that are specifically by, for and about the arts. The arts are used as a vehicle to achieve some other goal.

When arts partnerships are written about, it is overwhelmingly about arts during the school day, not ELOs. Here too, the majority of these during-the-day partnerships are about learning through the arts, not about mastering and developing knowledge and skills in the arts themselves. My focus is on arts partnership, arts learning, objectives and
standards, and a relationship with the arts education that is (or should be) occurring in the school, or at the very least, in the school district. While opportunities may present themselves for there to be something called art present in ELOs, my concern is to have something that partners can measure themselves against that will increase the probability for real arts learning to occur. My belief is that arts ELOs can be a beneficial thing but there are certain notions or concepts that I believe have to be part of the awareness embedded in the arts ELO process.

**Theoretical/Conceptual Positioning**

The basis for my interest and my concern in this research flows out of a set of beliefs that I hold regarding arts education. The following explores those I feel are most relevant for this discussion.

**Learning in the Arts**

As obvious as this might seem, learning in the arts is frequently lost in the majority of partnerships with schools. Considering the aforementioned pressures to focus on reading and math, particularly during in-school time, it is rather understandable why the habits of thinking have carried over into the ELO setting. Further amplifying such pressures are the requirements of so many federal ELO programs and funding streams that specify that in order for ELOs to receive dollars, they must support school-day learning. The place of the arts in the majority of these ELOs is ambiguous. Arts education must negotiate for itself that there be a clear and precise place for the arts in ELOs.
My position is that the arts are worthy of full and respectful teaching and learning in their own right. Whether from the theoretical, social political left or right, art educators do struggle to have the arts taught for its own intrinsic good. Despite the how of arts teaching ranging from high arts/fine arts western cannons, through DBAE, to socio-political change agency, and Visual Culture, the issue still comes down to there being any learning in, about and for the arts. The focus of my work is to provide an instrument that can increase the probability that teaching and learning in the arts will occur. What is needed is an explanation of what makes up learning in the arts.

Eliot Eisner (1997) holds that when the arts are taught, they address three levels of learning. He refers to them as arts-based outcomes, arts-related outcomes, and ancillary outcomes. (p. 13). Translating Eisner’s arts-based outcomes into my own terminology, I would refer to his first tier as foundational learning. Foundational knowledge is concerned with the content, the facts of the subject, and the learning of techniques of performance and production. The learning of content includes learning the variety of tools and instruments, methods and techniques of an art form; learning the formal features and descriptors or vocabulary of an art discipline; and the history, basic facts and dates relevant to a given arts discipline. These are not small or unimportant things to gain knowledge and to become skilled at. These are the first building blocks for learning in the arts. My concern is to support arts learning that occurs in arts ELOs that either introduces, parallels, or deepens and broadens foundational learning that should be occurring in the K–12 school. The matrix to be generated by this study seeks to reveal if
the vision, mission, goals and/or objectives of the partnering organizations are already aware of, seek to address, or have resources that will support foundational learning in the arts.

In addition, I categorize learning in the arts to be comprised of advanced learning. I borrow from and merge elements of Eisner’s second and third tier into what I refer to as advanced learning. My advanced learning category of learning in the arts includes Eisner’s tier two arts-related outcomes that are concerned with perception, comprehension, and the aesthetic encounter. (p. 13). Advanced learning also includes some of what Eisner describes in his third-tier or ancillary outcomes. Eisner gives two subcategories in his third tier. The one that I use is his “transfer of skills employed in the perception, creation and comprehension of the arts to non-arts tasks.” (p. 14). While Eisner sees ancillary skills, and particularly the transfer skills, as learning through the arts and somehow not really part of learning in the arts, I view it as a larger paradigm of learning that transcends any one discipline or subject.

Advanced learning is operating at the levels of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation, the higher orders of thinking as enumerated in Bloom’s Taxonomy. (Bloom, 1956). Bloom also includes affective domains in his hierarchy. In considering the affective dimensions of learning, Abraham Maslow’s hierarchy of needs also comes to mind. (Maslow, 1998/1968). The top of Maslow’s hierarchy of need is the point of self-actualization. There are several behaviors or attitudes that are present in a self-actualized individual that have a bearing on learning in the arts. Maslow states that a self-actualized person has the ability to approach life’s challenges as problems to be solved rather than overwhelming fate. One attitude that is closely linked to the arts is the capacity to see
things with newness and wonder, or freshness of appreciation. So very key to the creative process itself is the capacity to be oneself by being spontaneous. Spontaneity has a close relationship to the capacity of being able to resist enculturation, to be one’s own person, to be unique, rather than easily influenced. Being self-actualized in these various ways, according to Maslow, allows one to be creative, inventive and original, a very obvious capacity that learning in the arts seeks and nurtures.

While the arts might have a more pronounced affinity or pathway of getting to this transcendent knowledge level than many other subjects as they are currently taught, qualitative judgments, perception and comprehension are universal goals of learning. As I look at the documents, consider the interviews and observation; I am looking for those points of measurement that can indicate foundational and advanced learning in the arts.

Equity

I see equity and equal access as a key issue in arts education in general. I hold that in those places where school district and family financial limitations prevent in-school learning in the arts, community arts education and arts ELOs may be the only access many students will ever receive. *Inner city, urban,* and *at-risk* are terms that typically describe not just our children, but also the school systems that most of them attend. Many of these high-need school districts do not receive adequate resources to support education in general, and the arts in particular. Students in our crowded, short-staffed and shortchanged districts, including many poor rural districts, all too commonly never receive any instruction in the arts in their K–12 experience, or at least not a consistent and sequential quality education in the arts. This deprives our students of their learning if they have an interest, if they have talent, to develop some level of
sophistication and literacy in the arts, if it can even be an igniting force in their having an improved attitude and outlook on learning in general, or if the arts could be a potential career path.

Cynthia Brown makes the point that the idea of students learning above and beyond the school is taken for granted as being equally available to all students.

But children in poverty too often lack the structured and well-supervised chances to develop these competencies fully throughout their childhood and youth. They do not have opportunities to take private music lessons, play in orchestras and bands, go to basketball camp, or study ballet. They rarely have CD-ROM computers in their homes or parents educationally prepared to oversee their homework. To make matters worse, children in poor communities frequently and unfairly attend inadequate schools that use watered-down or inappropriate curricula and are staffed by less-prepared teachers working in a disorganized manner.

Brown, 1999, p. 141

Debra Holloway and Beth Krensky (2001) also wrote on the disparity in arts education:

Meaningful arts education in U.S. schools has been pushed to the margins of curricula, especially in poorer, urban school districts. In the majority of schools, the arts are considered frills or the province of a talented few, expendable from limited budgets and academic programs feeling the pressure of high-stakes accountability policies. Denying youth artistic instruction and resources has been a regular practice in U.S. schools for more than a decade. … The consequences of cuts and gaps in arts curricula in urban schools are a progressive degeneration of challenging arts instruction to students who can least afford opportunities in the private sector or after school, and a reduction in these students’ capacity to compete with more affluent students on standardized tests of all kinds, including SATs and ACTs.

This is very meaningful in light of the arguments and research making the case for corollary relationships between sustained arts learning and scores on standardized achievement tests. (Darby and Catterall, 1994; Deasy, 2002; Efland, 2002; Eisner, 2002; Jensen, 2001). The meaning being that if at-risk, high-needs students in poverty school
districts are already lacking academic, social, affective, and personal achievement, then removing the arts may well be an act of discrimination that removes a key component that by the correct applications of its own learning process, could move our children to a better possibility of achieving. If school districts cannot for financial reasons, or will not because of some kind of intractable ignorance, then at the very least, arts ELOs may be able to fill in the gaps, but only if deliberately constructed to be a quality learning process in the arts. For this reason, I am interested in knowing the motivations and agendas of the partners that choose to participate in arts ELOs. Those organizations and institutions whose missions express an awareness of and a commitment to addressing issues of equity and access to the arts and learning in the arts across racial and socioeconomic lines could potentially be excellent matches for an arts ELO.

Theories of Learning Styles

Earlier in this chapter, I spoke about the potential for well-thought-out arts ELOs being laboratories for preservice teachers, arts and non-arts alike. This seems most fitting as more and more mainstream media outlets have begun to highlight the need for a change in direction for how education is formulated and constructed in this country. The front cover of the December 18, 2006 issue of *Time* magazine is titled “How to Build a Student for the 21st Century.” In this lead article Claudia Wallis and Sonja Steptoe (2006) refer to the newly released New Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce (NCSAW) report *Tough Choices or Tough Times* with its findings and recommendations for totally rethinking how education is constructed and thought of from the ground up. What is being understood is that the philosophies, structures, pedagogies, means and methodologies, and financing of the nation’s schools is rooted in a late 19th-
early 20\textsuperscript{th}-century reality that to a great measure no longer exists. Continuing to use such an approach no longer works. This article points out that organizing learning around discrete subjects with no overall coherence or organizing connections is not only ineffective but is highly inefficient.

The arts, creativity, design, innovative skills, seeing patterns, discerning, and “sensitivity to foreign cultures,” along with emotional intelligence and “the ability to work in teams” are peppered throughout the \textit{Times} article. These are spoken of directly as the necessary skills needed not only for the workforce, but also as general preparation for living and understanding life in the global world we live in. My belief is until the larger national, regional, and local education bureaucracies change at the root and structure—if ever—that education outside and away from the classroom may be the most immediately accessible, possible, and attainable avenue for both engaging students in a new education paradigm, as well as being the laboratories for training. And well-conceived arts ELOs are excellent opportunities for being such a laboratory and learning environment.

The New Commission is not alone in making this assessment. One very noteworthy voice for utilizing project-based approaches of good teaching in the arts is the National Governors Association (NGA). (2003) The most recent past chair of the NGA, Governor Mike Huckabee’ (R) of Arkansas, has been a strong promoter of understanding how to capitalize on not only the advanced learning skills and attributes of the arts, but how to understand the arts as an exemplar of organizing subjects and curriculum into a more meaningful, relevant and coherent process. Under Gov. Huckabee’s tenure, position papers, governors’ symposiums, and meetings were utilized to put this notion of
the arts as a model for a coherent curriculum. The closing plenary for the 2005-2006 term of the NGA, held August 7, 2006 in Charleston S.C. had as its keynote speaker Sir. Ken Robinson⁶. Robinson’s speech was focused on the need for creativity and innovation as the needed skill for the developing workforce, a topic that is his specialty. Robinson was articulate and specific in bringing to the forefront the need for arts education as the model for problem-solving, project-based, thematically-organized way for restructuring education in order to meet these needs.

Another source for thinking of arts education pedagogy and the arts studio education process as a model for education as a whole has been New Horizons for Learning. Close to 10 years before the NCSAW report, New Horizons issued a report of their own that held similar notions.

We in America have known for some time that the old models of schooling are not adequate and that school reform is necessary to meet the demands of this new age. The only skills from the (Department Of Labor) list developed in the schools of much of the last hundred years have been, with the exception of “speaking,” those in category one: “Basic Skills” … However, when one thinks of educational reform, schools for the arts do not immediately leap to the minds of the American public; … However, I want to suggest that such schools do offer a model that does work for many students, educating them both as artists and as citizens, and that this model may, in some form, work for more students then one might think, not only the “talented.”

Perrin, 1997

An example of this new way of organizing education exists in Queensland Australia. There, schools are already functioning with such a new model, one that allows the arts to be more authentically integrated than what is currently the practice in the U.S.

⁶ The video of Sir Ken Robinson’s speech at the plenary is accessible online at http://www.nga.org/portal/site/nga/menuitem.6c9a8a9ebc6a07eee28aca95010101a0/?vgnextoid=365dab5b42f5e010VgnVCM1000001a010101aRCRD at the NGA’s Web site audio Video Gallery as part of the 2006 Annual Meeting Audio and Video Files.
The name of this curriculum reform is the New Basics. (Department of Education, Training and the Arts, 2006). New Basics of Queensland has totally rearranged the curriculum structure around major conceptual goals for education that makes discrete subjects secondary and answerable to these larger themes. The goal and purpose of education is not to learn math or reading. The goal and purpose is to learn how to live and function in the world, the world of today. Rather than making small, compartmentalized adaptations and revisions in how to change teaching methodology and calling it reform, New Basics is a rare example of education reform because it changes the very foundational approach to the why of learning, resulting in a total change in the very structure of how teaching is organized. With this kind of real education reform, marginalized subject areas, such as the arts, have a far greater chance of being maximized as equal and legitimate contributors to the larger learner process.

Much of this bears a close resemblance to ideas about constructivist learning, BIG IDEAS, and Visual Culture. (Jacobs, 1989; Bruner, 1966; Stewart & Walker, 2006; National Arts Education Consortium 2003; Freedman, 2003; Freedman & Stuhr, 2004). Constructivism holds that knowledge, and particularly understanding and developing concepts, is constructed through a process of investigation and exploration. The learning experience is about learning through active dialog, exploration, interaction and collaboration. Learning is not organized around content but rather concepts.

In thinking about concepts and themes, the notion of BIG IDEAS that evolved out of the Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge (TETAC), was not only refined by Stewart and Walker, but was couched specifically in terms of arts learning. Rather than have learning in the arts be about simply following a set of instructions to
make a predetermined product, teaching with BIG IDEAS generates exploration and even questioning on the part of the student. BIG IDEAS asks questions about cultural and social issues such as identity, power, gender, relationships, and community. By asking students to decipher themselves and their art making through the lens of such conceptual themes as these, students are also exercising and developing many of the traits that are part of Maslow’s self-actualization.

Visual culture is closely aligned and related to constructivism and BIG IDEAS in that it is about giving students skills in deciphering, analyzing, understanding, and reprocessing personal and social identity, affiliation and place, and power and allegiance in the complex multilayered complexities of today’s society. Understanding the layers, the nuances, and being able to adapt to them in this globalized milieu, is a requirement for life and living, not just a theoretical fine point.

Returning to New Basics, these driving themes are referred to as organisers, of which there are four. Queensland Government Department of Education explains their reasons for moving to organizers and away from discrete subjects as “futures-oriented categories for organising curriculum. Essentially they are a way of managing the enormous increase in information resulting from globalisation and the rapid rate of change in the economic, social and cultural dimensions of our existence”.

The four organizers are: life pathways and social futures; multiliteracies and communications media; active citizenship; and environments and technologies. Each of these in turn has three to four subcategories of ideas to construct learning around. The New Basics Web site explains the rational for creating such a model as an “…explicit orientation towards researching, understanding, and coming to grips with the new
economic, cultural and social conditions. These four clusters of practice are deemed to be essential for lifelong learning by the individual, for social cohesion, and for economic wellbeing…”

Project modes of learning called Rich Tasks, are crafted to engage students with one of the organizers at an age-appropriate level. The discrete subjects such as math, language arts, social studies, and the arts, are all then brought to bear as tools to investigate these organizers and their subsets. The connections to constructivist learning, BIG IDEAS, and visual culture are operationalized in real time and space. With this kind of arrangement, inclusion of the arts is firmly grounded as intrinsic to day-to-day learning.

In considering the possibilities of arts ELOs as laboratories and demonstration sites for something on the order of New Basics, it would be a tremendous strong point if as many partners as possible articulated a view of education and arts education similar to this.

Identifying, Utilizing, Maximizing Resources

School districts around the country, suburban and urban, all struggle with space allocations for any subject area, but having a room to work in, much less one that is appropriately outfitted and designed for the particular arts discipline, is especially difficult. The National Arts Education Association, the professional organization for the nation’s visual arts teachers, has reported any number of studies that talk about teachers teaching “art-on-a-cart”. My experience as an administrator (I was very fortunate as a visual arts teacher) has been witness to appalling situations when it comes to equipment, materials, supplies, and room assignments. Safety can be impaired due to not having a
dance space with a sprung floor to reduce chances of twisted and sprained ankles.

Various media and techniques cannot be taught because of room size, lack of equipment, and no budget for materials. Schools cannot have marching bands because there is no field for them to practice on. The reality is most schools, and especially impoverished school districts, are woefully short of the appropriate resources for arts education. When opportunities do present themselves for districts to develop resources, all too frequently administrations are either shortsighted in imagining that design needs to follow function. Compounding the situation, state-level regulations hamstrung whatever meager efforts districts may make to design school buildings appropriately. In the end, another barrier has been created that prevents students from having a reasonable but full range of arts experiences, and in some cases, prevents them from having any experience at all. Just as arts ELOs might be a means of access to arts learning, so too might arts ELO partnerships be an avenue for students to expand their participation in various practices that they cannot have in their school buildings.

Wolf champions the idea of collaborations at the institutional level that would allow for students to have access to studio and rehearsal spaces, and specialized equipment that in and of themselves schools cannot offer to place in each and every school. (Wolf, 2000). The related potential loss of resources might also be in the form of assets of nonschool arts learning providers such as specialized supplies, equipment, technically up-to-date facilities, and access not normally available to students during the typical school day/year. In the end, the loss could be both in terms of a model of teaching and learning, as well as also the loss of equipment, space, and supplies. In capitalizing on the resources that are available at community and professional arts locations, access and
equity, as well as direct learning in the arts can at the very least be provided for those students that participate in arts ELOs. In doing so, these spaces can become demonstration spaces and exemplars for those decision makers in education as they consider the kinds of environments and circumstances they need to have in place if they are committed to quality arts education in schools. Based on this consideration, the goals and objectives of arts ELO providers can be analyzed to determine if there are resources and the willingness to share them on the part of the partners.

I have enumerated four lenses or presuppositions that guide my approach to this study. They are learning in, by, for, and about the arts in both a foundational and an advanced learning level; equity; learning theories and art education as a model; and maximizing resources. These beliefs are not the same as methodological bias that I will cover as part of the next chapter.
CHAPTER 3

TYPE OF STUDY, METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the type of study that this dissertation is, the overarching methodologies that frame the research process, and state the research methods employed to collect or create and then analyze the data. As has been stated in the introduction, the analysis of a set of facts to determine their relationship to one another in this research requires that the units of observation be both reliable and valid to the unit of analysis. What is being analyzed, or unit of analysis, are the mission, goal, and objectives statements of arts ELO partners. The goal of this study is to create an instrument, a measuring device, to be applied to the unit of analysis. To determine what are suitable components or markers of this instrument, what is being observed, or the units of observation, I observe similar evaluations that are valid and relevant to arts education standards and collaboration with schools. Operationally, what is being observed are the social artifacts, the documents that conceptually have valid connection to arts ELOs. To make the analysis of, to unearth the traits/criteria for the analysis of mission statements, purposes, goals, and objectives of ELO partnering organizations, it is necessary to learn what are the most commonly held and prevalent characteristics of effective ELOs. The source for this observation is a range of research, advisories, best
practices, and summary reports. While the mission statements, goals, and objectives of organizations are the unit of analysis, the actual units of observation are these reporting documents.

PAGE ©⁷ is an acronym for Participants’ Alignment of Goals Assesssment ©. PAGE is an instrument that specifies the most frequently needed points of alignment of mission, goals, objectives, resources, and concerns among the participants in arts ELOs. Before anything can be judged or graded, a set of criteria has to first be established. PAGE is a matrix of criteria that can indicate the degree of alignment of each participant’s own mission, goals, and objectives to one another and to the arts ELOs’ mission, goals, and objectives. If we can think of a comparison to education practices, PAGE is a form of formative assessment rather than a summative assessment. It is important to distinguish between units of observation and units of analysis. What will eventually be analyzed are the mission, purpose, goals, and objective statements of arts ELO partners. To determine what are the characteristics and traits to look for, it is necessary to observe a variety of documents such as (units of observation) research, summaries, best practices advisories, and other measuring instruments of effective ELOs, in-school arts partnerships, and arts ELOs. A thorough “read” of the documents and printed statements of mission, goals, and objectives, as well as interviews of key informants and observations of arts ELO sites also inform the development or list of

---

⁷ The phrase and acronym, Participants’ Alignment of Goals Assesssment (PAGE ©) is copyrighted as of Thursday, March 16, 2006 by Karen M Clark-Keys, Columbus/Cleveland Ohio.
criteria that will make up the PAGE matrix. This chapter is a description of the methodologies and methods of the data collection and selection process that leads to the end product.

**Type of Study**

Qualitative Study

This is a qualitative study. Qualitative study has been often defined as research study that focuses on comparing and understanding text and symbols rather than counting the quantities of things. (Stake, 1994, Creswell, 2003). It is narrative-based, using various forms of content, discourse, and text analysis of diverse forms of communication in order to understand individuals and/or groups and their actions. By analyzing the narratives in and around arts ELOs, my study seeks to understand the actions—past, current, and potential—that support ways and means of creating and sustaining arts ELOs that collaborate with in-school arts education standards.

In their definition of *case study*, Denzin and Lincoln (1994, p. 2) note that there are several different structures or systems of observation. They list visual texts, personal experience, introspection, interviews, and observations as well as case study. Creswell references Denzin and Lincoln’s definition of qualitative research but then focuses his definition on the social and human investigation traditions and protocols. For Creswell, “(t)he researcher builds a complex, holistic picture, analyzes words, reports detailed views of informants, and conducts the study in a natural setting.” (2003, p. 15). My study will use many of these same techniques in examining arts ELOs as a case study in order to gain a “holistic picture” of the characteristics and markers of a collaborative standards-based arts ELO construct.
Denzin and Lincoln point out the various traditions and perspectives that fall under the umbrella of qualitative research. Among these, they include constructivism with its connections to ethnography and interpretive case studies; ethnic perspectives which include Afrocentric and emancipatory theories; and cultural studies with focus on social texts’ “subjectivities.” (1994, p. 13). Creswell lists various paradigm traditions by showing the origins of ethnography as coming from anthropology, grounded theory coming from sociology, and case study as coming from political science and urban studies (1998, p. 65). Creswell notes that of all five of the traditions in qualitative research design that he covers, sociology is at least one of the root or “parent” disciplines for each of them. Lund’s 2005 comparison of qualitative to quantitative approaches is a reminder or reconnection of the research methods as frequently coming from the same disciplines and traditions in the social sciences. In making his case that “… the differences between quantitative and qualitative research in psychology and education are often greatly exaggerated.” (p. 1), Lund sees both as “… methodological variants within the same paradigm … grounded on similar perspectives with respect to ontological and epistemological questions about reality and knowledge construction.” Lund is clear to explain that he is concerned with establishing validity in the “critical realism” (p. 2) research of the social and human disciplines. Even in looking at mixed methods of research, qualitative research is firmly connected to the study of human engagements, including education and social systems. This seems to hold true for all three (Lund, Creswell, and Denzin and Lincoln). For that reason, the overall definition of qualitative research from each of these sources support the use of qualitative research for education,
to which this study is connected. As this study is also concerned with policy, the connections with the traditions of political science and sociology are also obvious links.

Initially confined and marginalized to anthropology and sociology, qualitative study began to gain prominence in the 1970s. (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, Taylor and Bogdan, 1998). At the time of their writing in 1994, Denzin and Lincoln characterized qualitative study as having five major stages. The five stages they identify are 1) the traditional period that began in the early 20th Century; 2) the Modernist Phase that spans the post-war era until the very early 1970s; 3) Blurred Genres emerged between the 1970s and extended to the early to mid-’80s; 4) a period Denzin and Lincoln refer to as a “Crisis of Represention” that began about the mid-’80s; and 5) finally the unnamed present period that can be marked at approximatly the time of Denzin and Lincoln’s 1994 edition of the Handbook of Qualitative Research. The characteristics of these various phases move from a “scientific objective”, even colonialistic approach, to those that are more postmodern and allow for multiple views. It was at the point between the second “Modernist Phase” and the “Blurred Genres” phase that qualitative study gained major acceptance and broadened usage. (pp. 9–11). The time marking the transition between these two phases is the early 1970s.

On the modernist side of this divide, qualitative researchers were struggling with how to retain some modicum of the ethnographic naturalistic storytelling while also attempting to use scientific postivism and postpositivism for a greater degree of rigor. However, on the other side of this early 1970s divide, the harsh realities of the failure of the scientific experimental model generated what Jennifer Greene (1994, p. 534) calls “taking off the white lab coat.” Scientific positivist models did not allow for the realities
and necessities of the social context in which a program occurs. For education and government programs, this was a major stumbling block. Greene references Ernest House in a quote that encapsulates the inappropriateness of experimental science models because “… it focuses on the truth aspect of validity to the exclusion of the credibility and normative aspects” … (p. 251 of E. House quoted by J. Greene on p. 534 of Denzin and Lincoln.) As a result of this ferment out of failure, new interpretive models of qualitative research were developed.

Among the contributors to the call for a change in how research is conducted in the social sciences, Joseph Wholey, as the lead investigator and managing editor of the Urban Institute team of Wholey, Scanlon, Duffy, Fukumoto, and Vogt (1970), created program theory evaluation (PTE) to address the nonexistent or poor-quality evaluations of United States federal programs and their concurrent policies, while Parlett and Hamilton (1972) of Great Britain developed illuminative evaluation (IE) to address the needs of education. Both methodologies assert that any study of the social sciences, including education, must give a thorough view to the circumstances and context of the case being studied. In doing so, both methodologies expect and anticipate an ethnographic method of analysis, which will be visited later in David Altheide’s ethnographic content analysis method. Because this study of arts ELOs involves both federal programming and education, Wholey and Parlett and Hamilton are the primary sources for methodologies that influence the construction of my work.
Case Study

Of the different kinds of qualitative modes of inquiry, this is a case study-based qualitative study. A case is an enclosed or circumscribed set of activities and events that make up one total unit. (Babbie, 2001; Creswell, 1998; Stake, 1997 and 1994; Stokrocki, 1997). Stake describes a case as follows:

In the social sciences and human services, it has working parts, it probably is purposive, even having a self. It is an integrated system. The parts do not have to be working well, the purposes may be irrational, but it is a system.

Stake, 1994, p. 236

The reason cases are typically studied is most likely to understand how to make the irrational rational, to understand why the parts are or are not working or, as in my study, to know how well a system is integrated.

Stake makes the distinction that “(c)ase study is not a methodological choice.” (1994, p. 236). Rather, case study is a description or characterization of the kind of phenomenon under investigation. Yet another way of saying it is to clarify that a case study is more a statement about what kind of thing is being studied rather than a statement about the methodological lens being applied to the study.

Stake goes on to enumerate three types of case studies. They are the “intrinsic case study”, ‘instrumental case study”, and “collective case study”. (1994, p. 237). Of the three, what Stake calls an “instrumental case study” begins to explain the type of case study I am examining. Stake describes an instrumental case study as closely scrutinizing the context of a particular phenomenon in order to gain insight, or to build or refine theory. The particular case itself is secondary. In my study, what is being sought for
understanding are the various factors and considerations that can or should be in place for arts ELOs to be an effective collaboration with the school day arts standards and teaching. The particular arts ELO site or collection of participants is secondary.

Qualitative Program Evaluation and Methodology

In Jennifer Greene’s description (1994) of qualitative program evaluation, she makes the distinction that program evaluation using qualitative methodologies operates in a different manner from most modes of social inquiry. Qualitative program evaluation is bound in the setting of political decision-making and politics. It focuses on the goals and strategies of a given program, but couched in the environment of competing stakeholders. Qualitative program evaluators must constantly negotiate in and among these dynamics in order to “produc(e) useful information” (p. 533). It is this emphasis on the “useful” that underlies Greene’s statement that

Evaluators in this genre pragmatically select their methods to match the practical problem at hand, rather than as dictated by some abstract set of philosophical tenets.

Part of the interpretive turn in social science, these approaches share a common grounding in a basically interpretive philosophy pluralism … and a case study methodology orientation … Part of the responsive tradition, … these approaches seek to enhance contextualized program understanding … as well as forge direct channels to program improvement.

Greene, 1994, p. 533

Wholey (1970) and Parlett and Hamilton (1972) address the need for rigorous evaluation but one that is interpretive and responsive. This study follows in the same mode by using the methodologies and methods that aid in arriving at useful information that illuminates the characteristics of an arts ELO.
While Greene and those she references seem to downplay methodologies to some degree, it should not be over- or misstated as a total dismissal of the need for methodologies to be part of the framework of how a researcher goes about his or her job. In that regard, there are two methodologies that will be the foundation for my research. They are program theory evaluation as put forth by Joseph S. Wholey (1970) that I have reconfigured as program theory assessment (PTA) and illuminative evaluation created by Malcolm Parlett and David Hamilton (1972). Wholey was among the first in the 1970s to be involved in the creation of new evaluation guidelines for federal programs. Parlett and Hamilton in 1972 were dealing directly and literally with education and the need for a responsive and interpretive evaluation methodology that allows for the illumination of the instructional system and learning milieu.

Before evaluation of any program can be made, the philosophies, concepts, values, and theories of all involved stakeholders must be examined to determine what are the mutual foundational expectations. In summarizing the work of Wholey and the Urban Institute, Rossi, Freeman and Lipsey had this to say:

They found it often difficult, sometimes impossible, to undertake evaluations of public programs and began to analyze the obstacles. This led to the view that a qualitative assessment of whether minimal preconditions for evaluation were met should precede most evaluation efforts. Wholey and his colleagues termed the process *evaluability assessment*. … Evaluators conducting evaluability assessments operate much like program ethnographers. They seek to describe and understand the program through interviews and observations that will reveal its “social reality” as viewed by program personnel and other significant stakeholders.

Rossi, Freeman, and Lipsey, 1999, p. 157
The purpose of this research is to uncover, or reveal the program theory (or philosophy) that is foundational to the application and implementation outcomes of art education ELOs. More specifically, the purpose of this research is to determine if and how the policies of the various entities work together to collaboratively produce content and procedures based in, or connected to some type of art education criteria or standards. Rossi et al. (1999) describe Wholey’s work as addressing the need of first understanding the context and background of a program or project. Then a much more accurate evaluation can be planned and undertaken.

Rossi et al.’s (1999) comments about “preconditions” point towards at least two methodologies and one data collection method that I find useful for my study. The methodologies are Program Theory Evaluation (PTE) based on the work of Wholey, and Illuminative Evaluation articulated by Parlett and Hamilton. The method, or technique for decoding, is ethnographic content analysis, articulated by Altheide. (1987) The operationalization of all three of these requires that there first be an examination of the background and general environment, in other words, the preconditions. Rossi et al. speak of understanding the “social reality”, which is a common theme in Wholey’s public policy/government program methodology, and particularly in the multipartisan world of education as described by Parlett and Hamilton. And finally, Rossi et al. speak of taking the lens of the ethnographer as the technique, or method, to decode and discern what is happening in a program, which is what Altheide is describing with his ethnographic content analysis method.
The work of Joseph S. Wholey and the Urban Institute’s program theory evaluation was developed to meet the growing awareness in U. S. Federal government of a need for rigorous evaluation but one that takes context and circumstances into consideration. Parlett and Hamilton’s illuminative evaluation methodology calls for understanding the context of the “instructional system” and the “learning milieu” (p. 10, 1972) in education innovation. I am utilizing major concepts from both methodologies because, from the perspectives of education, public programs, and policies, they have relevance for social interactions and systems, a shared focus on understanding context, and capacities for the process of comparing the written to the acted.

Program Theory Evaluation

Program Theory Assessment (PTA)

Program theory evaluation has its origins with Joseph Wholey and the Urban Institute in the 1970s (Wholey, Scanlon, Duffy, Fukumoto, and Vogt, 1970). In the preface to the Urban Institute’s report, Federal Evaluation Policy, lead evaluator and editor Joseph S. Wholey is very explicit that at the time of their writing, federal social programs and their related policies were not being analyzed, or were very inappropriately and ineffectively analyzed. Public policy evaluation was in its infancy. Wholey’s work, as we will later see with Parlett and Hamilton, embodies the questions and struggles of the aforementioned bridge period of the 1970s in that he is calling for rigor in the conduct of evaluation. He is also making it clear that the means of doing so must allow for a range of appropriate evaluation methods. (p. 16, p. 21). As quoted from Greene earlier, he and his team are calling for “taking off the white lab coat.”
One of the stages of Wholey’s (1970) program theory evaluation includes examining the polices of a given program to determine the implicit or tacit program theory guiding the program. Among Wholey’s characteristics of what is needed in the evaluation, he lists “… the definition of program objectives, the development of measures of progress toward these objectives…” (p. 19) and “… definition and measurement of appropriate environmental, input, process and output variables …” (p. 25).

Rogers, Petrosino, Huebner, and Hacsi (2000), and Davidson (2000) make it more precise that program theory evaluation (PTE) is a policy evaluation methodology that must include two processes. The first process or stage is the uncovering and understanding of the “minimal preconditions.” This calls for the creation of a model or matrix of what is or should be happening based on an assessment of the values and purposes of the significant stakeholders as they pertain to a particular program. The second required stage of a program theory evaluation is to apply this model to the measuring or evaluating of the program under review.

The purpose of this dissertation research is to generate a matrix PAGE© of these minimal preconditions as they relate to art education ELO programming. As the actual measuring or evaluating of a program is not the aim of this stage of research, I must make a distinction between program theory evaluation (PTE) and my own terminology, program theory assessment or PTA. PTA seeks to avoid implying or making the false claim of doing the work of making a judgment, giving a verdict or mark of hierarchical value on some specific program or project. Wholey, and Parlett and Hamilton have

---

8 PAGE ©, an acronym for Participants’ Alignment of Goals Assessment ©, is an instrument or matrix of criteria that can indicate the degree of alignment of each participant’s own mission, goals and objectives to one another and to the arts Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) mission, goals and objectives.
stated in various ways that there is often more of a need to first know what are the characteristics of what is being evaluated than there is to rush to judgment. This more precise variant of PTA is part of the process, the how of getting to the end product of this research, or PAGE.

**Illuminative Evaluation**

Just as Stake sees instrumental case study as a reflexive and illuminative means of generating or refining theory as a result of deconstructing an observed experience, so too does Parlett and Hamilton’s illuminative evaluation (1972) use what they refer to as the “social-anthropological paradigm … to take account of the wider contexts in which educational programmes function.” (p. 10).

Parlett and Hamilton point out that where the traditional “science-based” evaluator would merely seek the objectives in the system and ask if they have been met, the illuminative evaluator would be equally concerned with how the instructional system is adopted. What are the various transformations and modifications the instructional system makes on its way to implementation? Due to these transformations, the objectives of a program or project can begin to change in priority, depth or breadth, or engagement or commitment. Parlett and Hamilton make it clear that the evaluation process must understand the background and changing circumstances just as much as it must do the actual evaluating.

Illuminative evaluation is the methodology developed by Malcolm Parlett and David Hamilton (1972) and presented in an occasional paper to the Centre for Research in the Educational Sciences at the University of Edinburgh. Parlett and Hamilton are very concerned with how evaluations are conducted in the field of education. Much like
Wholey’s criticism, they challenged the overreliance on what they refer to as “the classical or agricultural botany paradigm” (p. 7) as the attitude and techniques to be applied to any of the social sciences and particularly to the field of education. Parlett and Hamilton argue for, at least at the time of the early 1970s, a completely new and different approach to education research that allows for a deeper understanding of the context in which human activities occur. This is very much the same challenge that Wholey (1970) and his team from the Urban Institute were raising two years earlier in discussing federal government program evaluations.

Parlett and Hamilton point out several considerations that parallel my own questions about the degree of alignment among program participants. One concern is the need to understand what are the various considerations to an educational program or process before it begins. Parlett and Hamilton also speak of being attentive to how and why a program might change once it goes into operation. This presents itself in my research as wanting to know if there is a mechanism for flexibility and adaptation built into this network of site providers, funders, and oversight connected to the arts ELO program itself. The authors continue by pointing out the difficulties with basing education research on so-called scientific or quantitative methods because such methods do not allow room for the subjective, the anecdotal or the unusual. Parlett and Hamilton argue that an overreliance on “objective truth” is “…insensitive to local perturbations…” and “…fails to articulate with the varied concerns and questions of participants, sponsors and other interested parties.” (p. 9) In my view, this speaks to having a sensitivity to the degree of flexibility and fluidity that exists in the real world life cycles of a program.
Parlett and Hamilton describe their illuminative evaluation methodology as a “general research strategy” (p. 13) that allows the researcher to function more like an ethnographer or anthropologist. In taking this ethnographic approach, Parlett and Hamilton suggest that the researcher examine what they refer to as the “instructional system” and the “learning milieu” (p. 10). Parlett and Hamilton give a sampling of documents that can inform the examination of the instructional system. These include “educational catalogues, prospectuses and reports … formalized plans and statements” (p. 10). These represent key examples of the main source of where the research for my own study will be focused. What can be gleaned from these and similar documents are the goals, objectives, and desired outcomes of the project at hand. However, while Parlett and Hamilton take the objective or scientific evaluator to task for using these elements as one-dimensional facts against which a program can be rigidly measured, I would rather use these same elements as starting points for asking the collection of participants if everyone is on the same page.

The techniques, or methods, that Parlett and Hamilton suggest as a means of organizing an illuminative evaluation include observation, interviews, questionnaire and test data, as well as documentary and background information. For my purposes, the document is the starting point. There are two categories of documents that will need to be examined. The first are other examples of measurements or evaluations of ELOs and arts programming that enumerate various concepts of standards-based arts education collaboration. The second are documents that represent the stated policies, and sometimes procedures of the various participants involved in implementing arts ELOs. Interviews are crucial in my study as they provide the background and clarification that
the authors refer to. The interviews have been conducted as semiformal questionnaire interviews meeting the guidelines of The Ohio State University’s (OSU) Office of Responsible Research Practices (ORRP) Institutional Review Boards (IRB). Interviews were conducted with key informants connected to a variety of arts ELO partnerships. An observation was conducted of an arts ELO in Northeast Ohio to see how the missions of a given ELO might be operationalized in a live situation.

**Methods**

Summarizing what I have put forward so far, studies of the human and social environment—which includes public policy, government programs, and education—has demanded a means of conducting research that is predominately qualitative rather than quantitative. The majority of situations studied fall into the category of a case or case study. While having a general commonality under the social sciences and sociology, the various disciplines have basic philosophies, principles, and conceptual frameworks that make up the more specific methodologies coming out of each discipline. Wholey’s program theory evaluation, and Parlett and Hamilton’s illuminative evaluation are research methodologies that come out of and address both public policy and education.

**Selection and Selection Bias**

Having moved through an overview of these components, we now come to the specific methods of exactly how the data was collected and then analyzed for this study. The specific method for examining the actual documents is ethnographic content analysis as understood from the view of David Altheide (1987). I present a brief description of this method that explains why I chose it for my own research. As was stated earlier, the starting place was the collection and initial examination of proposals, and program
descriptions of arts ELOs, as well as mission, goals, and objective statements, from a variety of national and local governmental and NGO funders, advocates, and providers. At this point a discussion of selection bias is included.

As mentioned in the introduction chapter, I define the units of analysis and units of observation. (Babbie, 2001; Krathwohl, 1988). Arts-based Extended Learning Opportunities is the case under study. The goal is the creation of a criteria matrix, Participants’ Alignment of Goals AssEssment (PAGE), created for arts ELOs. The thing that has to be analyzed, or the unit of analysis, is the mission, goal, and objective statements of arts ELO participants. However, in this situation, to learn what are the potential indicators or markers that can be used in this measuring instrument, I must look at other similar and related sources. I must observe what are the measuring criteria that have been applied in other relevant situations. These become my units of observation. Babbie (2001, p. 95, p. 306) makes the point that in most studies the unit of analysis is usually also the unit of observation, but that there are situations where it is necessary to study some component part or example in order to make the generalization to the unit being analyzed.

There has to be clarity and precision in determining what is the unit of analysis as this determines sampling validity. (Babbie, 2001). Typically not all conceivable content can be observed, so choices have to be made about the sampling strategy. The unit of analysis establishes the universe to be sampled from. As I am studying the social artifacts of arts ELOs, my universe for selection becomes ELOs in general, arts ELOs, and other arts partnerships with schools. In particular, the “relevant sensible universe” for sampling is the documents from these three “planets” that orbit around
implementation that supports collaboration of standards-based arts education in ELOs. (Rossi et al., 1999, p. 257). The document choices were based on those that could be reliably attributed to those entities that have the greatest relevance and validity to the case. In explaining my assumptions and choices for sampling, I am stating my sampling bias.

Validity must address what was most relevant to the general field of education and then the more specific arena of arts education. At the national level, documents that expressed the intent of both federal and NGO programs were chosen based on their widespread application and influence on the field of ELOs. Included among these are those national programs and organizations that fund or advocate specifically for the arts. As the frameworks of these large national organizations typically are the benchmarks for the bulk of ELOs’ sources for coding words, concepts, and themes.

Almost all funding source documents have as part of their guidelines stipulations regarding what kinds of services or procedures are required. Other documents are advisory documents that address best practices, standards and benchmarks, and the construction of a learning framework. Typically, a good number of resources for ELOs have their origins at the national level, whether from the federal government or from some major foundations or NGOs. For that reason, my selection bias starts first with federal programs and national level NGOs.

State and local level organizations are where these large national program and standards initiatives are actually implemented. The selection bias at this level was strictly a practical one. As the lone researcher with no funding support, it was easiest to examine
what was close at hand. What was helpful was being located in a state capital. This gave me access to both state and local agencies. The same requirements of relevance and validity to the unit of analysis still had to apply.

**Ethnographic Content Analysis**

Because documents are the primary source of data, an analysis method was needed that would be able to view documents as a site of ethnographic fieldwork. For that reason, I utilize ethnographic content analysis as a means of understanding human interactions and reactions with text. David Altheide’s ethnographic content analysis method (1987) is specifically applied to both the text and the “reader”, or in his case, viewer. While Altheide’s method is about the social and cultural transactions of media and TV, what is relevant to my work is his focus on document analysis as fieldwork through an ethnographic lens with constant comparisons that reveal emergent patterns and themes.

Ethnographic content analysis (ECA) refers to an integrated method, procedure, and technique for locating, identifying, retrieving, and analyzing documents for their relevance, significance, and meaning (Altheide 1987; Altheide 1996). The emphasis is on discovery and description, including search for contexts, underlying meanings, patterns, and processes…

Altheide, D. L. (n.d.)

Altheide (1987, 1996) suggests that the documents selected should be understood in terms of their own function and framework. In that regard, the selection process I have used is based on an organization’s function as either a funding source or authority of best practices. The selection also required relevance to the arena of education and the
discipline of arts education in particular, with emphasis on ELO settings. As these documents are examined, categories, issues, or themes emerge for coding. These various words, topics, or subjects can then be tracked for comparison and patterns.

The starting point for my ethnographic content analysis is the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) that contains the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21CCLC). The current set of reauthorizations of the ESEA is known under the current administration as No Child Left Behind (NCLB). While there are private supports for ELOs, the majority of ELOs are guided and funded by 21CCLC. As 21CCLC is part of the ESEA/NCLB, it is relevant to K–12 education in general. Even for those ELO programs and projects that are not funded directly by the federal Department of Education, NCLB and 21CCLC are the guidelines and expectations that tend to be the benchmarks against which all others programs are designed. Thus ESEA/NCLB and 21CCLC make up the bulk of both the funding function and the framing of criteria.

In addition to the federal Department of Education’s 21CCLC, there are other national entities that function primarily as funding sources. The Finance Project lists 116 different federal funding sources that can be applied to ELOs. (Padgette, 2003, p. 2, p. 33). Of these 116, the top seven federal funding sources represent a roughly estimated $3.6 billion to ELOs. These include various grants from the U. S. Department of Education, and Department of Health and Human Services. The Department of Labor (DOL) through its Workforce Investment Act (WIA) and the numerous grants under the Department of Justice (DOJ) are additional source of ELO funding. (Dobbins, 2005b;
However, while not necessarily excluding the arts, of these 116 potential sources for ELO funding, only 11 specifically mentions the arts, with three of these being designated for Indian or Tribal affairs.

The federal sources are primarily functioning as funding sources with varying degrees of stipulation and guidance about how an ELO should be run. However, also at the national level, there are a variety of private foundations and advocacy organizations supporting ELOs. These groups may offer some limited dollars, but their primary function is to provide guidance in how to operate ELOs. Most of these national NGOs are not arts, or arts education-focused. Nonetheless, the degree of such NGOs’ influence and help to create the larger arena within which arts ELOs must operate, is tremendous.

Two of the largest and most influential are the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, and its created advocacy group, the Afterschool Alliance (AsA). The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation is a major nongovernmental organization (NGO) that actively and vigorously supports and advocates for Extended Learning Opportunities. (Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, 2006). Mott was a major impetuous and crucial force in the very creation of the federal 21CCLC. The Afterschool Alliance was created by major national institutions supporting ELOs, including not only Mott, but also DOE, George Soros’ Open Society Institute, and other foundations and corporations. This arrangement has created a three-compartment approach to administering 21CCLC. DOE, through 21CCLC, provides funds and gives the basic policies and procedures. The Mott Foundation primarily handles training, and evaluation. AsA handles advocacy, building local constituencies, and acts as an information clearinghouse. My selection bias was based on these NGOs’ having such a far-reaching influence on the general field of ELOs.
For that reason, I will apply ethnographic content analysis to these three organizations as the primary starting point for the coding of keywords, phrases, and themes about ELOs in general.

Moving from the general to the more specific, I refine my selection process at the national level by focusing on those funders, advocates, and evaluators that deal with the arts. These national level organizations function far less as funding support, but rather represent the function of criteria, standards, and benchmarks by way of advocacy or advisory role for the arts. These include organizations such as the National Arts Education Association (NAEA), National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), Americans for the Arts, the Annenberg Institute, and the National Guild of Community Schools of the Arts. The Arts Education Partnership (AEP) that evolved out of the research and policy issues of the federal Goals 2000, and the Kennedy Center Alliance’s service organization, the Arts Education Network (KCAAEN) also function as advisory organizations.

For the most part, few of these organizations directly fund or operate ELOs even in the arts. The National Guild of Community Schools of the Arts is the most notable exception. However, all of these organizations play a major role in establishing standards, curriculum frameworks, research, and recommendations on best practices for arts education in general, and occasionally for ELO settings. Ethnographic content analysis is conducted of the documents, including the mission statements, goals, and objectives of these organizations as part of the beginning coding process.

Other sources for documents occur at the regional, state, and local level. At the state level, I was able to examine the documents of general education, arts, and arts education sources. They were the Ohio Department of Education (ODE), Ohio Alliance
for Arts Education (OAAE), and the Ohio Arts Council (OAC). The choices of which organizations’ documents to analyze were based on the same criteria of validity and relevance applied to national funders and advisories.

At the local level, I was able to examine the documents of the direct implementers of a variety of programs. The organizations included in this group are The Columbus Museum of Art, Short Stop Youth Center, and the Greater Columbus Arts Council. The public school that was included was the Arts IMPACT Middle School (AIMS) of the Columbus Public School District. The one observation site outside of Columbus was Abrakadoodle in Cleveland. The bulk of the interviews and all of the site observations occurred at the local level. One observation site, Abrakadoodle, was a bit of an anomaly in that the observation was of a local site but the organization is part of a larger national franchise system of arts ELOs. It was the only commercial outlet that I observed, and is one of the two commercial, for profit programs that I am aware of in the “universe” of arts ELOs.

It is not possible to read everything from every organization or group having a role with ELOs. The selection of organizations was based on those that have had the largest and most powerful influence on ELOs in general, and on arts ELOs in particular. The selection bias also took into consideration the reputation and historical significance of groups as a criterion for their selection for review. Thanks to the Internet, e-mail, and telephones, getting copies of mission statements and the like was rather straightforward. This means that at the document analysis phase, location was not a major determinant.
Interviews

There was a selection bias or limitation of the organizations, groups, foundations, and institutions to research at the state and local levels. As a self-financed study with highly limited resources, the selection of which state and local ELO programs and supporting agencies had to be based on what could be managed in terms of time and distance. For that reason, the state and local level organizations have been located in Columbus Ohio, with one site visit in Cleveland. This limitation has more of an impact on the interview and site observation process then it does on the document analysis portion of this research.

Having given a first read to the majority of these documents, a semistructured interview instrument was created to seek refinement and clarification of key points in the documents. This interview instrument was approved by The Ohio State University’s Office of Responsible Research Practices Institutional Review Boards (IRB). A copy of it appears as Appendix D. Interviews were conducted with primarily middle level administrators of state and local organizations and institutions to gain their understanding and conceptualization of how they understood the written mission and goals, and how that compared to what happens in real time and space. The majority of these interviews occurred between 2002 and 2003 in Columbus, Ohio. Here too, an explanation of the selection bias must be stated.

Site Visit

The arts are frequently a side item that happens as supplementary activity in most ELOs. Few ELOs are specifically and deliberately constructed around the arts and arts education. However, in both Columbus and Cleveland it was possible to locate ELOs
that were arts ELOs, and two site visits were conducted. The first was in Columbus Ohio at the Short Stop Youth Center. The second was in Cleveland Ohio with an Abrakadoodle location. Much like the selection biases applicable to the interview process, the site visits were constrained by time and location but did have to fit the criteria of being an arts-focused ELO. Site observations of arts ELOs were conducted in both Columbus Ohio and Cleveland Ohio between 2002 and 2006. The observations focused on site managers and facilitators rather than of children or other members of the public. This was a condition covered by IRB.

**Coding and Computer-Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis (C-AQDA) Software**

The resulting data from the interviews and site observations, and the actual documents were coded using computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software. There are several reasons for my choosing computer-assisted qualitative data analysis (C-AQDA) software. The first is the capacity of this category of software to mine data with a thoroughness and speed that is much more precise and accurate than what an individual researcher can accomplish. Additionally, at the time of this writing, C-AQDA programs have gone through so many upgrades and new “generations” that along with the basic mining functions, such programs can begin to indicate and map connections and relationships that may not be immediately obvious to the lone researcher. C-AQDA is discussed as a technique or means to support research methods by Krippendorff (1980), Rosengren (1981), Nagel (1992), Fielding and Lee (1992), Finlay (1994), and Popping (2000). Ozkan (2004) gives a specific example of using NVivo in researching the school classroom setting. Renata Tesch in the Fielding and Lee anthology *Using Computers in Qualitative Research*, (1992) defines and describes the analysis needs of a variety of
approaches to qualitative research, including Altheide’s ethnographic content analysis. In listing the shared analysis activities of these research methods, she makes the case for the use of the C-AQDA. Tesch points to speed, accuracy, and thoroughness as aids that “…can actually result in considerable investigative advantages.” (p. 25, Tesch in Fielding and Lee, 1992).

The particular C-AQDA program that I used is N-Vivo version 2.0 released by QSR International in November of 2002. At the time that I initially began this research study, while also completing a brief in-servicing course on N-Vivo’s sister program Q-NUD*IST, N-Vivo version 2.0 had just been released and was the most up-to-date and recommended C-AQDA software version that I had familiarity with. N-VIVO 2.0 allows for the searching, coding, organizing, and linking of data as well as generating models and graphic representations that can, for example, visually show the relationships and issues in the research. (Richards, 2002).

There is a major caveat to understanding C-AQDA and that is being clear that this is software, a tool, an instrument that aids in the coding process, not a methodology. The word analysis is a bit misleading and cannot be taken to mean that the software is actually able to do the analysis for the researcher. MacMillan and Koenig (2004) warn against confusing C-AQDA with a research method. Ozkan’s aforementioned study of constructivist classroom learning environments supports the use of C-AQDA software in general, and NVivo in particular. However, she too makes the clear distinction about C-AQDA software by saying:
…it can be said that the NVivo package provided a tremendous help in the data analysis process and some facilities of the software helped increase rigor in terms of data management but it did not guarantee the validity of the study.

Ozkan, 2004, p. 594

It is with this understanding of utilizing the C-AQDA software NVivo that I applied this as a tool to expedite and gain precision in the coding process. This process led to the actual analysis that will be described in the following chapter.
PAGE is an instrument focused on the points of alignment of missions, goals, and objectives that relate to collaboration and arts education standards among the participants in arts ELOs. Rather than being the evaluation itself, PAGE is a set of criteria. The indicators of what is needed in an arts ELO in this study, have as the overarching concern learning in the arts. By learning in the arts, the program’s educative purposes should be complementary to the curriculum goals of K–12 arts education. In addition, the arts ELO program would need to build in means of communicating with the faculty, staff, and administration of the school and school district in order to have a degree of correspondence to in-school learning.

A variety of arts education informants provide an initial array of potential measures of what should qualify as arts programs. Snyder (2000) in her brief Vision of a Model Arts-Infused School lists major conditions for an arts-infused school. Among these are the need for a strong mission statement and philosophical foundation built through scholarship and consensus. Snyder also emphasizes the need for a curriculum organized around higher order thinking, experiential learning and an open-ended process that allows for teaching and learning both in the arts and through the arts. A major arts
education initiative that provided the nexus for potential key conditions to be aware of in the coding process is the TETAC (Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge) Project. Among TETAC’s goals was better understanding the roles of a variety of non-school arts stakeholders, including community arts organizations and institutions. (The National Arts Education Consortium, 2003). TETAC outlined and made a major effort to underline the need for substantive and rigorous learning in the arts themselves. The concern was for learning in the arts that included knowing theories of art (aesthetics), responding to art (art criticism), and knowing the context of art (art history). By placing such strong academic elements of arts learning in the same framework that included connection-making with external partners, TETAC’s findings helped to inform the criteria analysis in the coding of the data.

Arts Beyond the School Day from KCAAEN suggested an equally rich source of potential criteria. Arts Beyond is an advisory specifically about arts ELOS’s. (Kennedy Center Alliance for Arts Education Network, 2000). In their listing of essential elements deemed necessary for arts ELOs, the categories addressing school leadership, community partner collaborations, and planning more refined strategies point to considerations that may have to be addressed by these organizations internally as they contemplate creating a new endeavor.

The questions are to be asked of the organizing partners, not of the program itself. The mission statements are being examined to explain the various partners’ own motivations and resources that will work to insure collaboration with school-day arts education. Considering that arts activities and learning can occur in different
programmatic contexts, the mission and goal statements would need to address the partners’ commitment to keeping learning in the arts as the clear and central focus while working within the parameters of a given program’s purpose.

The goal of this research is to create an instrument that can be used to measure a set of documents that inform the creation of a social experience. The items to be analyzed and measured, or the unit of analysis, are the vision, mission, goals, and objectives of the partners in arts ELOs. In order to create this measurement instrument, the qualities, indicators, characteristics, the marking points, are actually coming from other closely related documents that are part of the universe that arts ELOs occupy. These closely related documents are those that come from the general overall field of ELOs, arts partnerships of various kinds, and arts education partnerships specifically. These closely related documents became the units of observation.

Beginning in 2001, I began looking at and collecting a variety of documents that are part of this constellation of arts ELOs. The first set of documents was a set of mission statements from a variety of arts ELOs in the central and northeastern Ohio area. In reading these mission and goal statements, several things were apparent. One is that mission and goal statements are not all constructed the same. It is because of the variety of ways that mission and goal statements are written that I wish to define, for the purpose of this document, what are vision, mission, goals, and objectives.

Vision is a statement about how a group views the ideal in the environment that they inhabit. A vision statement is future-oriented, values-based, and inspirational. Vision is a description of how any person or group would like to see their environment ideally function. An example of a vision statement is from the National School Board
Association (NSBA) that states “The NSBA believes in the involvement of responsible adults in the community as positive role models and mentors for children.” (National School Boards Association, 2006). Most simply put, the vision statement asks what is the ideal world you would like to see?

Based on the vision, an individual or a group makes a choice about what it is that they can contribute to make that vision a reality. The simple question then becomes: What is your contribution toward making that ideal world a reality? The mission statement should state who the organization is, what that organization does, and why. Following the example from above, the NSBA mission statement is “The National School Boards Association is a not-for-profit Federation of state associations of school boards across the United States. Our mission is to foster excellence and equity in public education through school board leadership.” The central theme in the above example vision statement is education but depending on the group, the mission or focus of action could be from the perspective of business, from law and governance, from education institutions, or a variety of other functions. The mission, or what the groups’ contribution to the vision might be, could be advocacy or direct practice.

Once the mission is established, typically three to four goals are then presented. The goals are main areas or activities that the group envisions it can achieve. A goal is the finish line in a race; it is the endpoint. But it is not the stages and steps necessary to get there. The goals are the specific primary tasks or functions that a group feels it can take on to achieve its mission. In turn, the objectives flow out of each specific goal and are the strategies or actions needed to achieve them.
The reason for giving an explanation of these points is to be clear on what I am looking for and where. Frequently groups merge their vision, mission and/or goals into one another. In other situations, an organization’s vision, mission and goal statements may be switched among one another. Quite frequently the goals or objectives are not stated or at least not readily available. Knowing what a vision, mission, goal, or objective is supposed to look like gives essential clues as to how to decipher what organizations have to say about themselves.

As an example, the Ohio Arts Council’s 2006 to 2009 strategic plan very clearly articulates their vision, and based on that vision define what they say is their mission to contribute to that larger vision. The stated mission of the Ohio Arts Council is “The Ohio Arts Council is a state agency that funds and supports quality arts experiences to strengthen Ohio communities culturally, educationally and economically.” (Ohio Arts Council, 2006). The strategic plan does use the expression of goals, but does not use the wording objectives. Instead the terms strategies and actions are used. These are given with performance targets, and short-term outcomes. This thorough and well-organized set of statements makes it clear as to what the Ohio Arts Council is prepared to do in a range of different ventures.

In contrast, the Greater Columbus Arts Council’s mission statement is written such that their goals, objectives, and functions are merged into one. One has to decipher what are the goals that flow out of the mission, or functional strategies instrumental to accomplishing the goals.
The Greater Columbus Arts Council (GCAC), a not-for-profit organization, encourages and supports cultural development in the Greater Columbus area. In this capacity, GCAC provides technical services to artists and arts organizations, acts as the community’s voice on arts advocacy issues, and serves as the official agency for the City of Columbus grants for the arts. GCAC administers the Columbus Arts Festival, the Business Arts Partnership program, and the Community Arts Education program, which consists of Artists-in-Schools and Children of the Future, a public safety project targeted to youth ages 5–14.

Greater Columbus Arts Council, 2006

Another observation is that mission statements are typically left rather vague in order to allow greater latitude for change and movement. One example is the mission statement of the Cleveland Municipal School District (CMSD) that reads “(t)he primary goal of the Cleveland Municipal School District is to become a premier school district in the United States of America”. (Cleveland Municipal School District, 2006) While this implies a lot, it also says nothing that is specific. While making it more difficult to pinpoint what an organization is about, it can nevertheless allow for opportunities.

Mission statements can also change. Referring back to the CMSD mission given above, prior to a new administration taking over the CMSD in July of 2006, the mission statement had been “Each student in the Cleveland Municipal School District will be successful in a rigorous instructional program, and our teachers, principals and administrative staff will be valued, will hold themselves responsible and accountable, and will be rewarded for their professionalism.” (Clark-Keys, personal communication, August 18, 2003).

It was because of these ambiguities that what at first glance appeared to be a mere yes/no question, made it necessary to find another way of getting at the description of what arts ELOs look like. I had to move from the unit of analysis to units of observation.
This became a collection of reports, advisories, regulatory, meta-analysis, compendiums and research reports, interviews, and site visits. In addition, I reviewed mission statements of a variety of arts ELO partnering institutions that range from school districts through museums to local arts and culture organizations. The description will begin with the research documents.

**Description**

**Documents**

The search for relevant documents began with a search of writings on arts education in the ERIC files of the U. S. Department of Education (DOE). Initial searches turned up little in the way of arts education as it related to ELOs so I expanded the search to ELOs in general. Most information I located referred to 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21CCLC). Previous coursework and writings of my own had made me aware of several major foundations and research groups that were doing work around ELOs. Some of these included the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the David and Lucille Packard Foundation, the Annenberg Foundation, the Rand Corporation, and the Open Society Foundation. The Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP) and Southeastern College Art Conference (SECAC) provided documents or leads to where other documents could be found. Of particular note, HFRP has a database holding over 100 evaluations of ELOs. More detailed reading revealed a few that were arts-focused.

Among the research groups, the various regional education research laboratories became rich resources. These centers included Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL), the Southeast Regional Education Research Laboratory (SERVE), and WestEd. The resulting literature from this search produced a combination
of empirical research studies (studies attempting to identify and measure characteristics of quality in after-school programs and program outcomes) and reports produced by professional organizations or by expert panels.

The majority of documents found were focused on general ELOs, meaning those ELOs that did not have a specific focus on the arts. To locate information specifically on arts-based ELOs, my first efforts were to use Ohio Link Education Abstracts and JSTOR archival search engine to locate any writings in arts education publications and journals. Of the few articles located using keyword searches, none were directly relevant. I then turned to service organizations such as the Ohio Alliance for Arts Education (OAAE), its parent organization, the Kennedy Center Alliance for Arts Education (KCAAE), and the National Guild of Community Schools of the Arts (NGCSA). NGCSA has done its own research study of arts partnerships, some of which included arts ELOs. Overall, finding anything about arts ELOs was a matter of gleaning through what was available about ELOs in general. All in all, I was able to locate 35 documents\(^9\) that had some relevance to ELOs.

The documents were sorted into categories. The categories that emerged were: 1) Studies which include various types of evaluations, ethnographies or surveys; 2) Advisories which were recommendations, and guideline for best practices in ELOs; 3) Opinion and Position Papers meaning a paper that argued for a particular position, or provided strategies for moving policy forward; 4) Pre-research which included RFP’s, guiding principals for research, and conceptual frameworks; and 5) Descriptions which could be annual reports, self-descriptions, lists, and databases.

\(^9\) Two documents were from Abrakadoodle of Cleveland. These were counted as one
Of the 35 documents, there were twelve studies, eight advisories, five opinion and position papers, four pre-research, and seven descriptions. Most of the studies were national in scope, but referenced specific local implementation sites. Nine of the documents were about the arts with four being specifically about arts ELOs.

It was next necessary to sort the documents, whether research, advisories, opinion or others, as either general ELOs or arts ELOs. In examining the general ELOs, it was important to keep in mind that when the arts were mentioned, mostly the arts are only being used as a general activity, not as a specific focus of the program. Conversely, when examining evaluations about arts partnerships, it had to be kept in mind the difference between in-school and out-of-school partnerships. Of those writings on the arts, the majority are focused on in-school partnerships.

Two sources in particular stand out. HFRP is significant because of the large number of evaluations that they have compiled in their database. The other is the advisory document, Arts Beyond the School Day from KCAAEN (2000). HFRP specifically maintains a database of evaluations of ELOs. HFRP has 124 total ELO evaluations listed. The HFRP database mentioned several of the other separately-listed evaluations. The opening page of the database gives a short one- to three-sentence overview of each ELO evaluation in their list. There are web links to a more in-depth profile and contact information to the program or evaluator sites including URL addresses. The importance for my work was that this was a ready and useful central source for locating relevant and related work.
Further reading of all the HFRP evaluations showed that the ELOs followed the typical pattern of including some kind of arts activities, arts and crafts, cultural enrichment and the like, as supplemental activities for participating students. But as this study is about gaining an understanding of ELOs that are specifically arts-focused, it is important to note that four of the 124 have some degree of direct focus on the arts, but as a means of gaining mastery in other subjects, most notably English/language arts (E/LA). Out of the entire 124 HFRP listed evaluations of ELOs only two others, both by program title and brief description, indicate that they are specifically by, for, and about learning in the arts.

Arts Beyond the School Day from KCAAEN is a document that is arts-focused and arts-based, and it is an advisory specifically about after-school programming. (Kennedy Center Alliance for Arts Education Network, 2000). The KCAAEN work is immensely important in addressing the issue of quality in arts ELOs. It does make the statement that the organization acknowledges and supports the role of arts teachers/specialists. Particularly relevant and useful is their list of essential elements. There is however, a subtle but significant nuance that I feel needs to be at least questioned.

The Arts Beyond the School Day introduction gives three reasons for developing their protocol for after-school arts programming. Two of the three reasons, however, cloud the issue of the arts as the primary focus. One reason for participation given is the excitement over the possibility of revenue streams from a variety of funding sources. My concern is that funding sources come with stipulations, some of which will allow for a tremendous amount of latitude, but others will limit and constrain program focus and
activities in directions that relegate the arts to secondary, or even tertiary, positions. The second of KCAAEN’s reasons for investigating ELOs that does not engender a lot of confidence states “it becomes necessary to define the relationship between these programs and the arts curriculum in the schools during these days of emphasis on standards and assessments.” (p. 3). Later in listing who should use this resource, the KCAAEN document refers to educators and curriculum but does not specify the arts. The overwhelming habits and historical patterns is that statements such as these have been long internalized and institutionalized to be operationalized as being about nonarts educators and nonarts curriculum.

To be sure, subsequent statements in the KCAAEN do mention the arts curriculum. Nonetheless, this does point, in my view, to the need and the difficulty of being balanced in the legitimate concerns of general, all-around good education, but to be clearly and consistently driving home the requirements for learning in the arts, for the arts, about the arts, not solely through the arts. The implications in this introduction are to chase any and every dollar to serve the needs of other subjects. To be sure and to be fair, KCAAEN does make a very strong and articulate case for the value of both in-school and out-of-school arts education. However, the fact that this introduction from such a major arts institution raises this kind of concern, is an example of the need to ask questions of the vision, mission, goals, and objectives of any set of partners that create arts ELOs. The good intentions just might be there, but it may be necessary to dig deeper to clarify if all parties are “on the same page.”
Mission Statements

There were a variety of arts partnerships that were sources of mission statements. As has been said before, mission statements are not all constructed the same, and frequently commingle vision, mission, and goals into one statement. Objectives, called by some strategies, if given at all, are frequently used interchangeably with goals. For this reason, it was necessary to conduct interviews with personnel of some of the organizations that generated the mission statements to better understand what was stated and to learn what was left unsaid.

Mission statements can reveal if some categories of partners are more prone to hold a particular view or are more connected to the arts than another. The missions that I collected were of partners to either ELOs, or somehow partnered with a public school system in central or northeastern Ohio. While not a direct partner or actual facilitator, the strategic plan and mission of the Ohio Arts Council (OAC) was significant in that it is not only a source of some funding, but more importantly, provides leadership and codes of practice for arts activities throughout the state. For that reason, OAC has considerable influence on local arts organizations in Ohio.

Other mission statements were from the Columbus Museum of Art, the Columbus Public School System, the Greater Columbus Arts Council, Short Stop Youth Center (a entity within the Directions for Youth and Family.), Cap City Kids and Children of the Future (two programs of the Greater Columbus Arts Council), the Cleveland Municipal
School District (CMSD), Initiative for Cultural Arts Education (ICARE), and Abrakadoodle of Cleveland\textsuperscript{10}. All of these were part of arts partnerships either during or after school.

**Interviews**

There were also five interviews conducted of individuals that had direct involvement with various ELOs in central and northeastern Ohio. These interviewees were chosen from the organizations that mission statements were collected from. As the mission statements were often unclear, and access to vision, goals, and objectives statements were often difficult to come by, speaking with a representative of the organization helped to clarify a great deal. Interviews were conducted according to protocols approved by the Ohio State University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The interviews were semistructured in order to allow for a degree of latitude that would allow information to organically emerge. A copy of the sample questions is in Appendix D.

**Observations**

Research included both formal and informal observations. The formal observation was of a commercial, for-profit arts-based ELO, Abrakadoodle. As my research is not focused on doing any actual evaluation, field observations were less of a concern. The document sources are the field to be observed. However, because of the uniqueness of a for-profit entity involved in arts ELOs, combined with a lack of information about this kind of enterprise, I conducted an observation in order to understand better this phenomenon. There was some conversation with the local owner and director of this commercial program.

\textsuperscript{10} A list of the specific mission statements of each of these entities can be found in Appendix C.
The informal observations come out of my daily work life of the last three and half years as an arts administrator of the Cleveland Municipal School District (CMSD, or the District). One my multiple functions in the Department of Arts Education is to be directly and intimately involved with two major in-school partnerships, ICARE and the newly created Arts Is Education\textsuperscript{11}. The others roles that provide informal observation are Visual Arts Supervisor and Professional Development Administrator. Both of these require that I frequently act as representative and liaison between CMSD and third-party external arts and culture organizations in the Cleveland metropolitan area. My work has been deeply involved with working with local arts and culture organizations and institutions of various sizes and longevity, as they have all sought ways of being engaged with CMSD. This has included working with a major arts institution to develop curriculum for the development of a new arts-focused small learning high school community being brought on board. My work also includes the preparation of the strategic plan for arts education within the District including direction for the department. This plan has to fit and be subsumed under the larger CMSD strategic plan being formulated by the current new administration, while also marshalling and articulating the coordination of relationships with external third-party arts and culture institutions in the

\textsuperscript{11} The Initiative for Cultural Arts in Education (ICARE) is a program that supports long-term arts-focused educational partnerships between the Cleveland Municipal School District (CMSD) and the Northeast Ohio cultural community. ICARE seeks to improve student achievement in both the arts and academic subjects. Art is Education is a K–12 initiative in collaboration with the Cleveland Municipal School District that employs the arts to teach literacy. The Cleveland Integrated Arts Collaborative Art is Education envisions a public school system where every student will receive the highest quality education that includes continual immersion in a comprehensive, arts-infused curriculum.
area. This work, which is principally about in-school activities, puts me in a position to observe what is the thinking of our third party, external partners, and how it is acted upon by them, a good number of whom do operate ELOs.

**Findings**

By looking at these various sources of data, the description can now turn to the patterns that emerged, the findings. To be sure, many points emerged from the coding, but they are not all necessarily relevant to this study. For example, coding related to technology concerns are less pressing for this discussion than codes that are connected to collaboration and relationship building. Further, the fact that some items might appear more frequently in the coding process than others does not always mean they are more important. This is not a quantitative study, but a qualitative one. A key example is that the bulk of documents, research and resulting coding, tallies up to be about Pre-K to sixth grade ELOs. While the mentioning of Pre-K to sixth is more frequent, what I found more significant, but less mentioned was the marginal support for middle school and high school students. The reason this was more significant is that many of the more noteworthy arts-centered, arts-focused ELOs were designed for middle and high school age students. For that reason, the emerging patterns that I feel qualitatively are more relevant for my study are the following: 1) funding sources’ impact; 2) the predominance of relationship building; 3) predominance of focus on supporting in-school learning; 4) retention of students; 5) lack of support for middle school and high school students; and 6) nonacademic outcomes for students.
Emerging Patterns: Funding Sources Impact

The most noticeable pattern was the impact of funding sources on program. This is important because the regulations and requirements of the funding sources determine what will be the primary programming goal of an ELO. As detailed in the literature review, funding may come from multiple federal departments such as Agriculture, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, and Labor, as well as Education. The nature of each department’s function will dictate the required focus of the ELOs they will support. This, in turn, impacts the ease of fit for an arts ELO.

Funding from these various sources generates a set of patterns. Typically the intention of each funding source fell into one of four categories. The resulting categories are 1) Safe-and-Off-the-Streets; 2) Personal Socialization; 3) Society and Community; 4) Employment and Workforce Readiness, and 5) Schooling, Grades, and Test Scores.

Funded Program Categories: Safe and Off the Street

Safe-And-Off-The-Streets programs are concerned with placing children and youth in a safe environment. The Department of Justice is the largest funder of this type of programming, with an approximate budget stream of $2 billion. Another major federal funder of this kind of program is the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) through its Child Care and Development Fund, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, and Social Services Block Grant. Not all, but a good number of HHS programs are also constructed as safe-and-off-the-street programs. These Department of Justice and Health and Human Services funding stream represents approximately $4.166 billion. In addition, the Department of Education has its own safe and off the streets program. It is Title IV Part A: Safe and Drug Free Schools under current federal education
authorization, with a budget in the range of $431 million. This DOE program does have a requirement to address test scores and grades, but it does to some degree straddle both categories.

Interestingly, Safe-And-Off-The-Streets programs offer some of the greatest latitude for arts-based, arts-focused programs for the simple reason that there is far less concern or regulatory requirements for any particular kind of content activities, as long as students are safe and off the street. Partners that are developing their local arts-based ELOs may find that they have fewer restrictions constricting their out-of-school-time efforts working under this category of financial support. As part of the interview of a community arts council administrator, it was interesting to note that even an arts organization might want to retain a relationship with a safe-and-off-the-street funding stream because they see it as a real need. As the administrator stated,

The public safety issue is a real issue. There is a real need. Simply for a safe place for children to be during after-school hours in the neighborhoods where we have the program. So, there is no strong reason to abandon public safety as an AmeriCorp category that we fall into because I think we do directly address that issue.

Community Arts Council Administrator, 2003

On the other hand, because there is little concern with the actual content in safe-and-off-the-street programs, there is less oversight or accountability for the quality of program activities. Arts ELO partners need to take into consideration that if they are operating in a safe-and-off-the-street program context that part of their consideration is to ask themselves what internal accountability standards and practices do they have to insure that they provide a more meaningful and rich arts learning experiences for students than what may be normally present in safe-and-off-the-street programs.
Funded Programs Categories: Personal Socialization and Improvement

Personal socialization programs are very similar, and often overlap or are one and the same with society and community programs. The difference of purpose in the personal socialization programs is to focus on the individual for individual change, while society and community programs have a greater focus on getting students to think about, understand and act upon their roles, rights and responsibilities in society, and their various communities (i.e. familial, neighborhood, association, local, regional, etc.). For example, Teen REACH in Illinois, a program listed under the HFRP database, has as its focus to “expand the range of choices and opportunities that enable, empower, and encourage youth to achieve positive growth and development, improve expectations and capacities for future success, and avoid or reduce negative risk-taking behavior.” (University of Illinois, 2004).

This Illinois program also illustrates that funding for personal socialization programs occurs more frequently at the state and local level then at the national level. The data coding revealed that funding for personal socialization that does come from the national level tends to be predominantly from NGOs. National NGOs whose mission is primarily concerned with personal socialization and individual behavior change are groups like Boys and Girls Club, the 4H, and Big Brothers/Big Sisters. For national-level government fund sources, personal socialization may be a goal, but not the primary mission. DOJ programs’ primary mission is safe and off the street, with the high-priority goal of personal socialization. DOE programs’ primary mission is education improvement, with personal socialization as a lower-priority goal.
Considering the writings (Catterall, 2002; Efland, 2002; Eisner, 2002; Jensen, 2001; Perkins, 1994; Rabkin and Redmond, 2004) that support the impact of arts education on affective skill development and interpersonal relationships and maturation, programs such as this should be a natural fit for arts ELOs. Partners must take into consideration whether the regulations attached to such programs place personal socialization at the level of mission or goal, and at what level of priority. In addition, arts ELO partners that are operating in a personal socialization program environment need to ask of themselves what they bring to the table that provides arts learning in a way that supports that program’s purpose.

*Funded Programs Categories: Society and Community*

Very similar, and closely related to personal socialization, are programs that have either as their mission or as a high-priority goal aiding students in becoming conscious of and engaging constructively with society, the civic, the communal, and community. These are the society and community programs. Frequently, these kinds of programs are service-learning programs. Looking to the data and coding, some examples are Creative Communities, a national youth development and community building program developed by the National Guild of Community Schools of the Arts (NGCSA), and Mural My Neighborhood, a mural arts program for youth offered by the City of Cleveland’s Division of Recreation, Bureau of Cultural Arts. The NGCSA funded locally in Cleveland, is a program operated by the Cleveland Public Theater (CPT) that runs its own after-school and summer ELO, called Brick City Theater (BCT) (C. Seibert, personal communication, December 19, 2006). Utilizing CPT’s philosophical position and theatrical focus on socially and politically alternative views, presented through
historic and emerging unique productions, BCT students research issues impacting their public housing communities in order to write and mount plays that address the realities of their lived experience.

Mural My Neighborhood is a second Cleveland program that pairs 12- to 17-year-old students with professional mural artists to research the history and heritage, and the issues of a given community, meet with community and political leaders in neighborhoods earmarked for murals, and then plan and execute a mural. (C. Luciani, 2005, personal communication). The program recruits students from the city of Cleveland through a nomination process with CMSD visual arts teachers. Mural My Neighborhood, operated by a division of the city’s parks and recreation department, has the specific charge of strengthening neighborhoods.

The good news is the emerging new approach to arts education, *visual culture*, lends itself greatly to this and the previous category of funded programs. Ballengee-Morris and Stuhr (2001) draw parallels between visual culture and multiculturalism as educational paradigms that create a space and a means of engaging the learner in examining history, culture, identity, and connections to place as direct connection to the personal. Freedman (2003) explains four forms of curriculum plans in visual culture. (p. 115). They are sequential, interactive, event experiences, and interdisciplinary. Of the four, interactive curriculum and event experiences seem to have key components that parallel society and community focused ELOs. Personal socialization focused ELOs are also environments that could support such arts learning. The visual culture interactive curriculum options that Freedman describes are structured to be “tuned to students’ experience outside of school.” Event experiences according to Freedman, is a curriculum
that is generated around key and out of the ordinary events that are tied to “ongoing learning.” Walker (2006) discusses visual culture as a way of organizing learning around major conceptual themes such as “identity, environment, community, violence, race, and gender.” (p. 191). In talking about how to rethink learning in art, Tom Anderson (as cited in Walker, 2006) makes a very clear picture of teaching and learning that addresses both the personal and the civic.

And in addressing the personal as well as the social, art educator Tom Anderson advocates a comprehensive approach for art learning, one that interweaves “the intrinsic, personal, and psychological aspects of artmaking as well as those that are social, community-based, extrinsic, and instrumentalist…”

Walker, 2006, p. 191

Chanda and Daniel (2000) anchor their analysis of meaningful art making as grounded in and requiring re-cognizing, or thinking in a deeper way, about connections between the past and present. They demonstrate their analysis by a description of their engagement with a community-based arts project in Columbus, Ohio called the Kwanzaa Playground. The Kwanzaa Playground was a grassroots project initiated by a member of the community to address the needs of children, bringing together a variety of residents, artists, and political and social personalities and institutions, including public schools and students. While professional artists constructed the art objects in the playground, there were student participation and contributions to the Kwanzaa Playground as well. These were both in-school and out-of-school art making, making this a more loosely structured arts ELO, nonetheless but one that was very clearly attentive to society and community. The work of the Kwanzaa Playground is community-based artwork. It was also an “event experience” that generated a new way of thinking, or re-cognizing through the art
process, for a variety of learners, in a safe space beyond the typical school setting. The visual culture and symbolisms of the African Diaspora was deeply investigated and embedded in the conceptualization and creations of the Kwanzaa Playground. Translating and transforming from the past to a relevant present is a component of both visual culture and of many society and community funded ELOs.

These examples and descriptions of components of visual culture are part and parcel of both the personal socialization ELO, and the society and community ELO. Such arts ELOs, as was mentioned before, are potentially good laboratories for arts education in general, and visual culture in particular. This connection of arts ELOs and visual culture parallels the new basic restructuring of education around crucial and life-based conceptual themes. Indeed, I would argue that with the vagaries of public school K–12 teaching in the arts, arts ELOs may, at the present, be a better opportunity to engage in the kind of in-depth, experience-based, and multi-layered learning that visual culture calls for than what the resources, bureaucratic circumstances, and deeply-entrenched habits of teaching currently allow in public schools. Indeed, for most veteran arts teachers trained in different previous arts pedagogical and theoretical perspectives and methods, visual culture is nonexistent. Whether or not arts ELO partners are aware of visual culture approaches to arts education is not altogether clear. By more deeply investigating their individual internal thinking, arts ELO partner institutions and organizations may learn that they are utilizing some of the concepts of visual culture already, and thus can more deliberately bring it to bear in the partnership.
Funded Programs Categories: Employment and Workforce Readiness

The data revealed another funding focus for arts ELOs that share many of the goals and objectives of the previously mentioned personal socialization, and society and community types of programs. Funding focused on employment and workforce readiness typically assists middle and high school age students in expanding their understanding about the world of work and how to prepare for it. Several examples were collected in the data. One collection of employment and workforce-focused ELOs are described by Clawson and Coolbaugh (2001) in their evaluation of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention’s (OJJDP) YouthARTS Development Project. YouthARTS was operated in three different cities as a collaboration of local and national arts organizations along with OJJDP. The goals varied to some degree from location to location, but on the whole they all had as their major or uppermost goals learning and mastery of skills in the arts and employment in the arts.

A particularly outstanding employment and workforce readiness arts ELO is Artists for Humanity (AFH) of Boston. AFH’s mission statement is:

Artists For Humanity’s (AFH’s) mission is to provide underserved city youth with the keys to self-sufficiency through paid employment in the arts. AFH began in 1991 with what was then an ambitious and unconventional idea—young people can provide, through their creativity, tangible services to the commercial world. This concept is now recognized as social entrepreneurship and is a proven model for youth development. Training and employing urban teens is a solution to economic disenfranchisement and has a resounding effect on communities. AFH employs Boston teens in paid apprenticeship in the arts, including painting, sculpture, photography, graphic design, silkscreen, and murals.

Artists for Humanity Overview Organizational Profile, (n.d.).
Arts ELOs that hold the mission of exposing students to career opportunities in the arts are filling a greatly needed niche of education. This is particularly true in terms of underserved and underrepresented communities in the career and entrepreneurial field of the arts. The underserved and underrepresented are typically the socioeconomically disenfranchised segments of marginalized ethnic and racial groups. In providing this type of support to students, employment and workforce readiness arts ELOs are putting into action the recommendations of Vesta A. H. Daniel to “identify and create occupations and services in art which serve diverse populations on a nonexclusionary basis.” (1982, p. 174). While arts partnerships, in school and out, make almost exclusive their focus on some type of intervention or remediation for marginalized ethnic and racial segments of the society, seldom is this effort focused on giving students knowledge about arts occupations, including arts education and administration. Daniel makes the point that it is the responsibility of the teaching artists, and arts institutions to make students aware of not only the career possibilities but to provide the understanding of the cultural tools, standards, and demands necessary to be successful in the arts and culture environment. Career and workforce readiness, while often over looked, is as much a part of standards in the arts as knowing the elements and principals of a given discipline. Those institutions, groups, and organizations that wish to develop rich and substantive arts ELOs need to look to their own mission and goal statements to see whether this need is addressed or not.
Funded Programs Categories: Schooling, Grades, and Test Scores

The funding, and resulting purpose, that most typically come to mind when discussing ELOs are those connected to improving grades and test scores. This kind of ELO has a very precise and specific focus. That focus is most notably on improving performance in subjects that are part of mandatory testing, typically reading and math. In this context, there is far less room for the arts to be the mission or a goal. The data suggests that typically the arts will be an objective that exists to support some other goal. The coding indicated that these grade, test score, homework types of ELOs are much more likely to view the arts solely as an occasional activity for entertainment or “enrichment.” In these kinds of situations, potential partners to arts ELOs must ask themselves if they are comfortable with their own missions and goals serving as a tertiary activity. At the very least, they would need to ask themselves how to maximize such a restrictive setting. As to learning in and about the arts, partners of an arts ELO operating in a grades and test scores environment would need to understand their own purpose in maintaining a commitment to keeping learning in the arts at the forefront rather than as an instrument for other subjects. In doing so, the motivations and agendas of the partners would need to also address collaboration with school-day arts education and school arts teachers.

Emerging Patterns: Relationship Building

The most consistent pattern to emerge from the coding, regardless of funding source, age group served, or purpose of any ELO, was the crucial need for relationship building. Without exception, interviews and documents both reinforced the need to
develop and maintain a variety of relationships. Relationship building had different purposes, different locations in the life cycle of a program, and were made with different constituents.

One purpose was that of needs assessment and development. Needs assessment and development should be thoroughly done so that the offerings of an ELO can be, among other things, a viable match between schools and their educational objectives. In considering an arts ELO, any needs assessment needs to be include the scope and sequence of standards based arts education that is occurring in schools. Based on the needs of students and arts education, arts ELO partners will have to not only assess what are the needs but also how to establish and maintain a relationship with in-school arts education. Example statements such as “(s)ite visits revealed some outreach to personnel at the local feeder schools, with some connections being built with teachers, counselors, and principals” does not communicate a clear and definite commitment to engage school arts teachers. (Anderson-Butcher, Midle, Fallara, Hansford, Uchida, Grotevant, S., et al., 2003). Partnering institutions will have to examine their own practices and policies for working with arts teachers.

The data revealed that relationships were also created or needed to support the sharing of resources, be those resources personnel or space and equipment. Having access to stages, dance floors, studios with running water, proper ventilation and light, and storage of works in progress, instruments, equipment and the like is perpetually an ongoing problem in school settings. Partners to arts ELO have to take into consideration if they are in a position to share such resources, and by doing so how would that further their own mission and goals.
The coding of the relationship characteristics also revealed the need for understanding, clarifying, and establishing roles and responsibilities. This is particularly marked when ELOs are working closely with host school sites, as well as school districts. The interviews and the documents both made it clear that guidelines and boundaries had to be well understood by all parties, as this could become the most contentious point for disruption. By attending to the missions and goals of each organization at outset, roles and responsibilities can be aligned with the missions of the institutions.

Building relationships also was revealed to require attention to both when relationships are built and how to sustain them over time. Examples from the data pointed out that relationship building was crucial in the initial program development. Sustaining a variety of relationships had to be done over time with attention to keeping a variety of constituents and players aware of the progress of the program. In order to gain the cooperation and buy-in to execute various activities, recruit students, and even develop audience attendance, school site principals, teachers, and staff need to kept aware of schedules, special events, and any special needs and arrangements. In order to continue to have the support of organizations and institutions, periodic and judiciously timed communications need to be maintained over time. When to initiate relationship building and how to time ongoing sustaining communications, has to be considered on an ongoing basis.

The relationships most frequently mentioned were those with families and relationships with actual schools. Relationships with families were frequently mentioned not only because of the crucial need for parent participation, but also because of how very difficult gaining that relationship is. Most evaluations and descriptions of the ELOs
revealed that communications with families and parents were limited to very brief conversations when parents picked up their children at the end of the day. If special events or performances were part of an ELO’s agenda, parents would be involved then, but as an audience with little opportunity for one-on-one conversation. Building in means of deepening parent and family relationship may be a challenge that partnering groups may have already built into their own mission. If not, they might need to examine their missions to see if they have sufficient latitude to participate in that way.

The relationship with site schools often swung on the amount and the type of interaction with school principals. Principals often tightly control access to space, even to teachers. In their defense, and as at least one evaluation pointed out, principals are often constrained themselves by union agreements that limit what can be asked of teachers, support staff, and custodial staff. Most arts activities require considerable space, storage, and specialized equipment, so it may be problematic for arts ELOs to function in public school buildings. It appears that in having relationships with schools, there is data to suggest that partners are concerned with principals, space and resources. However, the frequent reference in the data to relationships with schools and their personnel follow the historical pattern of not being specific about relationship building with arts teachers. As this is a key point of PAGE, it was important to review the mission and goal statements of partnering organizations to get a sense of the how they include arts teachers and what their motivations for this may be.
Emerging Patterns: Extension to In-School Learning

As is to be expected, the task of supplementing school-day learning is a major and dominant theme in almost all ELOs. Even in looking at the employment and workforce-readiness arts ELOs, their goals do include supporting improvement of learning in the nonarts academic subjects. The majority of evaluations, opinion papers, and position papers include non-arts academic outcomes as a definer of quality. The study of 21CCLC programs conducted by Moore, Dynarski, Mullens, James-Burdumy, and Rosenberg (2000, p. 8) include the statement that “(i)n the context of the 21st Century program, however, there is a clear expectation that the program should improve measures of in-school performance…” As most ELOs are connected to schools, even if the funding source is not from DOE, this will be a strong concern and consideration for all ELOs. ELOs that are specifically funded by education-specific sources are especially focused on high-stakes testing particularly in math and reading. This leaves less room for latitude for the arts.

Ironically, being overly concerned with school subjects and testing could work against sustaining student participation in ELOs. It was during the interview of several local administrators of ELO programs that the challenge of balancing supporting academic learning against letting kids have fun was brought up. As one interviewee pointed out, “these kids don’t have to come if they don’t want to.” Another, a museum administrator, made the point that “we do apply a sequential educative framework but for the most part while we are very committed to kids learning we feel that it’s so important that they have fun too.” Additionally the evaluations of ELOs have also frequently made the point that ELOs had to be very careful not to mimic school-day learning
environments. Learning in the arts tends not to generate the same degree of resistance in students as does learning in other subjects. Nonetheless, even arts ELOs have to be mindful of providing programming that is engaging, even entertaining, while also being educative.

An additional concern regarding impacts on in-school arts education, is the perennial concern about external, third-party arts, teaching artists, or artists-in-residence programs as a direct threat to daily, in-school instruction provided by certified K-12 arts teachers. The documents, mission statements as well as personal observations revealed a consistent, clear and empathic insistence on the part of external partners that in-school arts education by certified teachers must remain in place and under the jurisdiction of public schools.

**Emerging Patterns: Retention of Students**

Retaining students is a major issue. ELOs are voluntary, even when students have to be registered and families pay a fee. Students are not captive audiences as they are in public school classrooms. They are truly clients, so programs have to be far more mindful of those dynamics. Among the factors that go into helping to retain students, the coding revealed student choice, learning that is less structured, and learning that is far more experiential.

The need for allowing students both choice and opportunity that is not overly structured is described by a public school dance teacher who works at an arts magnet middle school in central Ohio. This middle school has a very close ELO relationship
with a community arts center located a very short walk distance from it. In talking about how arts learning, even classroom arts instruction, should be structured, the public school dance teacher volunteered this insight.

Sometimes it’s nice to see the kids not have to think about one collaboration or the other. And sometimes … they wouldn’t want to be taking time on this! … I’ve been in other situations in arts impact schools, not this school, where the kids will sometimes say, do we have to analyze it again? Or do we have to take it apart again, or do we have to find a way that it fits here? And sometimes, and I think I’m learning, because this is a middle school kind of developmental population in terms of early adolescence, that sometimes they don’t want to overanalyze, and they don’t want to find the connection, and they don’t want to make sense of it in the way they might have two years earlier. But they just want to physically do it. And that’s just; and that’s the end-all-be-all for it. So as far as, if a student is taking African Caribbean technique, or after school, and does it connect, or do we deliberately connect it with their study of African American history … to today, yeah, it would be great, but it’s not that necessary.

Middle school dance teacher, interviewed 2003

The Kennedy Center Alliance for Arts Education Network’s (2000) evaluation of arts ELOs also makes the case that allowing student choice and making learning less structured is an advantage. The Massachusetts After-School Research Study (MARS) that was another part of my data set stated, “Programs that focused on academic improvement were less likely to have a relaxed, flexible pace.” (Miller, 2005, p. 7).

Having an environment that is attractive to students is crucial to keeping students in the programs, but a balance has to be found between too much and too little structure.

Another advisory in the observed documents stated that among their practices, ELOs “…must be interesting to participants and doable at participants’ current level of skill or knowledge but intentionally and incrementally challenging to help them grow.” (Raley,
Grossman, and Walker, 2005, p. 24). Being attentive to this kind of balance can a daunting challenge, but for the sake of recruitment and retention, must be part of the thinking of arts ELO planners.

Learning that is highly experiential is strongly suggested by the observed documents and observations. Several advantages are apparent when this approach is used. In-school arts partnership learning experiences were fairly universal manifestations of constructivist, situated, thematic, or project-based learning processes. The managing organizations and their teaching artists I observed in the CMSD system were frequently also providers of ELOs. As both personal observations for this study, and because of official needs on behalf of my school district, I had occasions to interact and observe some after-school programs as well. Much of what was seen in the ELO setting followed the general protocol of experiential, project-based learning. In both settings, this mode of teaching and learning generated enthusiastic learning for students, and a high level of enthusiasm for continuation of learning about the subject or similar learning experiences. While students during the school day are a captive audience, the same kind of observation was made in ELO settings run by the same organizations and teaching artists. In the after-school setting, this kind of enthusiasm played a major role in retaining students.

Experience-based, project-based, and other constructivist teaching and learning methods are part and parcel of visual culture and community-based arts education. In the process of using experience-based teaching and learning approaches, students have more opportunities to move to advanced-level arts learning, which in turn stimulates both cognitive higher-order thinking, and affective self-actualization.
Policymakers need to shift their thinking from creating the program to expanding the set of options available in a community. As children become older, they begin to search for a wider range of experiences. This expansion in their worlds is developmentally appropriate, but it means that the participation rates of older youth in any particular program—be it ESS or something else—will likely be relatively low. They are most likely to benefit if they, and their parents, are able to put together a mosaic of positive experiences—broadening the range of activities, widening their geographic horizons, and increasing their network of adults and peers.


Determining what the experiences will be, the concepts and themes to address, and how to get students to open themselves up to such an experience will require arts ELO providers to consider if they bring to the table a capacity to allow students to the source and resource for developing programming.

Emerging Patterns: Middle and High School Students

The observations I have made, what was revealed in interviews and the various documents, was that the bulk of ELOs focus on K–5/6 age students. Middle and high school age students are far less engaged in ELOs. Older students have greater independence combined with greater responsibilities—such as caring for younger siblings, or even working—than elementary students. Elementary students are more likely to be accepting of whatever offerings are made available to them in ELOs, while older students are potentially more critical of how and where they spend their time. This will require arts ELO providers to consider whether or not they wish to serve this underserved segment of learners.

While smaller numbers of middle to high school age students are served, interestingly many of the arts ELO that offered the most intriguing programming (as described by the data) were community-based, service-oriented, career preparatory,
experiential and serving middle to high school age students. The Artists for Humanity program of Boston is one example with its emphasis on entrepreneur development, opportunity for direct sales and services by youth, and skill building in business planning and career preparation in the arts. Interviews, review of the documents, and observation revealed an extremely rich and fluid reciprocal relationship between Short Stop in Columbus and one local arts magnet middle school. What is clear is that as students get older, arts ELO providers have to move past the delivery of services and product way of constructing their curriculums and move to a more interactive and developmental way of constructing curriculum.

**Emerging Patterns: Non-Academic Outcomes**

One of the struggles of in-school arts education is the battle of whether or not learning in the arts should contribute to overall student learning, particularly better grades and test scores. Eisner (2002) and others have pointed out that our greater strength and our more provable outcomes are those connected to nontest, nongrade outcomes. Considering the recent position papers and advisories from the National Governors Association and a list of the various skills needed for work in the 21st Century information age economy produced by the Department of Labor, the arts, and by extension arts ELOs could prove to be an avenue for addressing these outcomes desired by so many ELOs and ELO best practices advisories.

Concluding evaluations about the 21CCLC programs reveal that a concern for nonacademic outcomes is close second to the heavily emphasized academic improvements outcomes.
Activities Focused on Developing Students’ Assets. Social, cultural, and recreational activities that present students with opportunities to explore interests, express talents, develop ownership, work in teams, and handle conflict are key to developing the social skills, confidence, and protective factors necessary to meet the challenges that many students encounter at home, with peers, and in the classroom. These types of activities also serve to promote students’ duration and engagement in the after-school program.

(Moore, M., et al., 2000)

Even the commercial arts ELO venture, Abrakadoodle, emphasizes in their mission statement that they seek to develop social and emotional skills. This was strongly reinforced during the informal interview of the local franchise owner of Abrakadoodle in Cleveland. As this was such a strong pattern or finding that emerged from the documents, interviews, and observations, it presents itself as a consideration for inclusion in the instrument PAGE that can be applied to mission and goal statements of arts ELOs.
The findings given in the previous chapter point to the criteria that makes up the Participants’ Alignment of Goals Assessment (PAGE) matrix. The characteristics, considerations, or criteria in PAGE are applied to the analysis of the purpose, mission, goals, and objectives of groups, organizations, and institutions that jointly operate arts ELOs. The PAGE matrix is layered, as certain characteristics are prerequisites to others.

It is important that I emphasize in no uncertain terms that no ELO, arts or otherwise, will complete or accommodate every indicator of all the layers of the PAGE matrix. It would be impossible. However, it is necessary for partners in an arts ELO to look at how they fit with and accommodate as many aspects of the matrix as possible. The goal is to keep arts ELOs clear and focused on collaboration with school-day arts education, school arts teachers, and arts standards.

The most powerful of these considerations is funding in that the funding source carries with it requirements and expectations for a particular kind of programming focus. The first layer of the matrix reflects the finding that there are varying degrees of control
and restrictions on programming, where restrictions are referring to how much leeway is allowed for direct instruction in the arts that is substantive, sequential, and in some way paralleling school-day arts education and standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer 1</th>
<th>Funder’s Function/Programming Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>More Restrictive</strong></td>
<td><strong>Less Restrictive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schooling, Grades, and Test Scores</td>
<td>Employment and Workforce Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Society and Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Socialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safe-and-Off-the-Streets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 1: Funder’s function/programming requirements.

Layer one of PAGE would ask partnering organizations to reconceptualize their own internal missions and objectives in relationship to the programming requirements of a given ELO. The facilitating or managing organizations that come into an ELO must be as clear as possible as to what their mission is for an arts ELO compared to the requirements, regulations, and possible restrictions. If the partnering organization truly wishes to have an arts education program that is substantive, sequential, and connected to in-school arts education, then they may find it more difficult to operate in an environment oriented towards schooling, grades, and test scores.

Conversely, as the findings indicated, the majority of ELOs are focused on in-school learning. However, this in-school learning is typically not arts learning. Organizations and institutions may have wording in their own missions, goals, and
objectives that reference supporting school-day education, but there needs to be some degree of articulation as to what that means for arts education. The scale for an ELO partner’s own internal missions, goals, and objectives can be charted as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Specific Non-Arts In-School Learning</th>
<th>No Statement Regarding In-School Learning</th>
<th>Supporting In-School Learning in General</th>
<th>Supporting In-School Arts Learning Specifically</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting In-School Learning in General</td>
<td>Supporting In-School Arts Learning Specifically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2: Partnering organizations’ internal statement(s).

The third layer of the PAGE matrix deals with partnering organizations’ capacity for building and sustaining relationships. Relationships make up a matrix within a matrix. Relationship has to take into consideration the temporal, the conceptual, and the logistical, as well as consider the needs of the constituents. Temporal, conceptual, and logistical relationships generate a kind of y axis in the relationship minimatrix. Temporal considerations connected to relationships are about when and for how long in the life of an ELO partnership and programming relationships are created. Certain relationships need to be in place before the start of the ELO in order to evaluate needs, generate buy-in, and develop the program. Other temporal components continue over time such as advisory and oversight committees, and resource partners. Yet other temporal relationships are more episodic, such as evaluation and research that may be engaged
with an ELO for a set period. In looking at the time element in relationships, partnering organizations need to consider their own commitments and responsibilities to better determine when and for how long they can be involved in an arts ELO.

Conceptual relationships are those that deal with what is being programmed, why, and how. Consideration of what kind of arts-focused ELO will be created, if a specific art discipline or media is to be the sole form taught, or determining which arts education standards will receive the partnership’s primary attention are examples of conceptual issues to be addressed by partners. An example might be the determination by the partners that theirs will be a dance and music arts ELO with the intent of engaging students in learning the history of a dance, particularly as a reflection of the students’ ethno-racial heritage. Another example of conceptual relationship building is the process of determining how to connect with the school arts teachers at a partnering school to either support a specific project that is directly linked and extended from the school day, or to learn the general scope and sequence of planned units and lessons for the coming year at a given school so that partners can take that into consideration in their own planning. This later example begins to blur the boundary between conceptual and logistical.

Logistical relationships are really relationships dealing with capacity. Logistics relationships are those that deal with who will be responsible for what, the sequence of preparations, in-services or activities, or the means and method of delivery of resources. One example of logistical relationships is the coordination between Cleveland Municipal School District’s (CMSD) 3rd and 5th grade classrooms, the Department of Arts Education, and an external theatrical partner, to schedule teachers for in-servicing,
delivery of teacher resource guides and sample lessons, arrangements with CMSD transportation department for delivery of students to the annual theatre programming at Playhouse Square, and timing of pre- and post-event instruction related to the theatrical performance. Some of the actors and agents in the implementation of this process are the same ones involved from year to year. Others are not. Some individuals, departments, or institutions are very deeply involved in the logistics of implementation, others less so. In some cases, the policies and procedures of one organization expressly forbids providing transportation, but another partner may have transportation as a major goal or objective. Arts ELO partners have to ask themselves if they have the capacity, prior experience, or the internal purpose to be part of the logistical relationship portion of this third layer. Partnerships have to develop a clear understanding as to location of responsibility for these kinds of considerations about logistics and capacity, resolving any potential conflicts with a partner’s internal structure and focus.

The last relationship component is constituents. This is the most crucial of them all. Constituents are the x axis in this picture of relationships. The data reveals a considerable number of constituents, some that are directly relevant to this research’s concern of collaborations and standards with in-school arts education, and some that are not.

While many of the constituents revealed by the data do not have an immediate impact on the collaboration and arts standards concern, they are noteworthy in other regards. Constituents are not only the organizations and institutions of the partnership, but also the individuals and informally-structured communities and collections of people that have an interest in the implementation and outcomes of an ELO. The constituents
are student clients, the students’ parents, community and neighborhood members, political entities, civic and social groups, and other culture and arts organizations that are not participants in the ELO. Parents have an obvious vested interest by virtue of their children attending the arts ELO. Nonparticipating culture and arts organizations may be potential indirect resources or beneficiaries, including learning from the arts ELO process for their own benefit even if they never participate in a direct manner. Political entities are often highly interested in anything that brings improvement to the community for which they have responsibility. In those arts ELOs that are focused on community service; communities, neighborhoods, civic and social groups, and political entities are frequently direct beneficiaries as well. As was demonstrated by the arts ELO of Artists for Humanity (AFH) in Boston, business can be potential resources to support arts ELOs and also recipients of benefits of arts ELOs. In the case of AFH, the arts ELO was originally conceived and is maintained as a legitimate business venture and design incubator, furnishing services and end products to local businesses. While these constituents have valid relationships and relevancy to the implementation and success of ELOs in the broader scheme of things, they are not points of focus for this study.

The next chart exemplifies bringing all of these elements together into a relationship-building matrix within a matrix. With the temporal, conceptual, and logistical serving as the y axis, the x axis of the constituents listed are those most relevant to the concerns of this study.
Chart 3: Relationships.

Arts ELO partners have to look at their own missions to see if they have the policies, practices, and the expertise to support the relationship-building process with a willingness to listen to and accept as equal partners a range of constituents. Partners will need to consider how they can fulfill this set of concerns along with their roles and responsibilities over time.

In the end, PAGE is an instrument that combines three layers in an analysis of the range of stated purposes, missions, goals, objectives, and policies and procedures of the partnering members of an arts ELO. Similar analysis instruments can be developed, or even added to PAGE to cover additional issues of concern for arts ELOs, for example, sustainability. A few of these will be suggested in the closing implications section of this chapter. However, it must be kept in mind that the purpose of this research is to examine the capacities for collaboration and partnering between school-day arts instruction and
arts ELOs. The creation of this instrument provides a valuable instrument for arts ELOs to understand how their own missions and goals can be positive contributors to the meaningful and successful learning of the student client. The matrix as presented in its entirety is shown as the following.

![THE PAGE © MATRIX](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer 1</th>
<th>Funder’s Function/Programming Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Restrictive</td>
<td>Less Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schooling, Grades, and Test Scores</td>
<td>Employment and Workforce Readiness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer 2</th>
<th>Partnering Organizations’ Internal Statement(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Specific Non-Arts In-School Learning</td>
<td>No Statement Regarding In-School Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer 3</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constituents</td>
<td>Temporal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administration and Support Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-Level Arts Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 4: The PAGE © matrix.
Offering a very brief example of how PAGE can be applied, we can take into consideration the example of Abrakadoodle. It must be again reiterated that by no means should there be an unyielding expectation that every characteristic of every level of the matrix must be checked off in the affirmative. Circumstances vary, and human discernment must always be applied when trying to understand if a given organization or set of organizations will have a good fit with the schools and their arts curriculum.

Abrakadoodle at the first layer is primarily a “safe-and-off-the-streets” program. Ideally, this should be an opportunity allowing for a great deal of latitude in how an organization should operate. The choice for how the organization, Abrakadoodle, chooses to operationalize this opportunity begins to be discerned at layer 2. According to Abrakadoodle’s mission statements and other related documents, they are operating as supporting both arts learning and general learning. So far, this implies that there may be a successful match.

It is at layer 3 that we can see the missing links. Abrakadoodle’s mission statements and related documents have only the vaguest statements regarding conversations with listed constituents regarding concepts and shared values and logistical needs. School personnel that are mentioned are principals and general classroom teachers. While there is reference to arts standards in a generalized way, Abrakadoodle’s documents have little if anything to say regarding interfacing with certified arts teachers and/or district level arts administrators. With so many components of the third layer left unaddressed, it becomes apparent that much work remains to be done between this particular potential partner, the general school administration, and school based arts education curriculum and standards.
Further Implications

Applying PAGE to Arts ELO Partnerships

PAGE is the instrument, but the instrument remains to be tested in the field. Future research can utilize PAGE in the development of future arts ELOs. PAGE should ideally be applied at the beginning development stages of any new partnerships being considered. For existing partnerships, PAGE can be applied to determine how to strengthen the learning process that is already underway. For those programs that have a specific duration, PAGE can be part of the final summative evaluation of the program.

While it has been said elsewhere that the majority of funding regulations speak of the requirement of collaborations between ELOs and the school curriculum, the arts become lost in that process. PAGE is a means of including arts education in the regulated protocols and procedures. Far more importantly, PAGE supports substantive, meaningful learning.

Suggestions for Arts ELOs From the Data

In that vein, the data suggested particular areas where arts education partners may wish to focus their attention. These areas of potential future focus include retention of students, additional support for middle school and high school students, and nonacademic outcomes for students.

The data suggests that while the bulk of ELOs are focused on K–6 students, there is a major need for serving middle school to high school age students. The data also suggests that this demographic of student clients are also the most difficult to retain. These students are truly clients as they are mobile and able to “vote with their feet” if a program is not meeting their needs. The developmental high-stress phase of middle
adolescence in many ways has the greatest need for guidance and support in what are nonacademic outcomes. For high school students, nonacademic outcomes move from social and personal behavioral to career, future aspirations, and life-readiness realities. For that reason, I hold that the area of middle and high school are both a need and a promising area for arts ELOs to expand their efforts.

PAGE can be applied as it stands and expanded to support that process. In all cases where the concern is effective learning in, about, and for the arts, PAGE can be a valuable tool to guide partners to stronger implementation that supports and parallels in-school arts education.

Suggestions for Arts Education

Modrick (1998) has suggested that arts education, teachers, research, and academics alike, need to move beyond advocacy to grappling with actual policy issues. As mentioned earlier in this document, and as borne out by the data suggesting ELO funding sources, supporting organizations, and growing involvement by arts organizations, research and recommendations need to be forthcoming from professional and academic arts education and their allied associations. There are opportunities that arts educators can maximize to further quality learning in the arts. There are opportunities for developing relationships for studio space that is properly outfitted for the various arts, additional pre-service teacher training, improved identification and servicing of students both gifted and talented, and opportunities for improved career preparation in the arts.
At present, however, it is not clear if our professional organizations and research outlets are particularly aware of the growing ELO arena. Rather than repeating many of the artist-in-residence-in-schools battles of the not so distant past, now is a keen opportunity to participate in writing the rules of engagement. The phenomenon is new enough that we art educators can have a meaningful role. But that requires that we must be attentive to policy analysis and development, and take the initiative to negotiate and lobby at a variety of political, social and community levels. Arts ELOs can be a tremendous opportunity, or alternatively they can be another burden stifling rigorous arts education. We have to be attentive to that difference and we have to become capable of balancing advocacy and policy.
APPENDIX A

UNITS OF OBSERVATION DOCUMENTS


Both educational and economic forces appear to be increasing the demand for programs for before- and after-school programs. On the educational side, efforts to raise academic achievement have increased the push for after-school programs to provide more opportunities for instruction and academic enrichment. And as more women enter the workforce, their children need a safe place to go when school is out. The relationship between after-school programs and student outcomes has been a subject of a number of research studies exploring whether such programs improve grades, school attendance, and standardized test scores. The picture that emerges from the studies is mixed, with some outcomes being positive and others being unchanged or negative. Some studies have both positive and negative findings. Studies of the effects of after-school programs on other outcomes, such as drug and alcohol use, behavior problems, and self-esteem, also yield mixed findings.


This article provides a profile of after-school programs for low-income children, focusing on supply and demand, program emphases, and program sponsors and support organizations. It also discusses the major challenges facing the field in the areas of facilities, staffing, and financing. Details and examples are drawn from the ongoing evaluation of a specific after-school program initiative called MOST (Making the Most of Out-of-School Time), which seeks to strengthen after-school programs in Boston, Chicago, and Seattle.

The Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) has been working under a contract with the U.S. Department of Education to identify high-quality afterschool programs that have strong academic content links to in-school academic work, and thereby boost student achievement. This work has focused on programs in reading, mathematics, science, the arts, technology, and homework help/tutoring.


More recent developments include a new emphasis on the importance of providing quality after-school options for families as well as an increase in interest within the funding sector to support these programs. This environment presents an unparalleled opportunity for the arts education community to maximize the ways in which the arts can contribute to building quality programs. In order to assist those who wish to develop or expand arts programs, the Kennedy Center formed a Task Force of arts and education professionals to develop recommended guidelines for quality after-school programs in the arts.


The Nation’s Report Card, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), is the only nationally representative and continuing assessment of what America’s students know and can do in various subjects. NAEP is a congressionally mandated project of the National Center for Education Statistics, the U.S. Department of Education. The Commissioner of Education Statistics is responsible, by law, for carrying out the NAEP project through competitive awards to qualified organizations. The National Assessment Governing Board approved the Arts Education Assessment Framework for the 1997 National Assessment of Educational Progress on March 5, 1994.


Concludes that the presence of arts magnet schools in three school districts in North America was crucial in the development and maintenance of outstanding arts programs in these areas. General features of magnet schools selected from the three districts; Characteristics of arts magnet schools; Impact of arts magnets on students.
Meaningful arts education in U.S. schools has been pushed to the margins of curricula, especially in poorer, urban school districts. The consequences of cuts and gaps in arts curricula in urban schools are a progressive degeneration of challenging arts instruction to students who can least afford opportunities in the private sector or after school and a reduction in these students’ capacity to compete with more affluent students on standardized tests of all kinds, including SATs and ACTs.

Artists For Humanity’s (AFH’s) mission is to provide underserved city youth with the keys to self-sufficiency through paid employment in the arts. AFH began in 1991 with what was then an ambitious and unconventional idea – young people can provide, through their creativity, tangible services to the commercial world. This concept is now recognized as social entrepreneurship and is a proven model for youth development. Training and employing urban teens is a solution to economic disenfranchisement and has a resounding effect on communities. AFH employs Boston teens in paid apprenticeship in the arts, including painting, sculpture, photography, graphic design, silk screen, and murals.

In the 1980s and early 1990s, the focus of these programs was on delinquency prevention to discourage such behaviors as substance use or gang involvement. From the late 1990s to the present, BGCA has prioritized the integration of career preparation activities, academic support and technology into its Clubs. To better understand the potential benefits of these programs, more than 20 evaluations have been commissioned over the past 20 years. Although yielding promising findings, the vast majority of these studies have been limited to documenting only the specific outcomes the programs were designed to influence (e.g., increased academic achievement, reduced levels of drug abuse, etc.), rather than considering that these programs are part of the larger fabric of the Clubs’ opportunities for leadership, decision-making and positive peer and adult-youth relationships—experiences likely to affect broader outcomes for youth.

The purpose of this paper is to highlight the experiences of several citywide afterschool initiatives with particular focus on the activities and strategies that contributed to building operational and sustainable citywide delivery of out-of-school time programs. The eight citywide initiatives that are profiled were chosen because they represent diverse approaches to organizing a citywide afterschool initiative.


Cap City Kids’ (CCK) mission is to: (1) provide a safe, caring, and enriching environment for children during nonschool hours; (2) provide places where children can increase their academic, interpersonal, and social skills; (3) involve families in planning and participating in activities; and (4) foster positive connections between family, school, and community.

Designing a Sustainable Standards-Based Assessment System. Don Burger. Midcontinent Regional Educational Laboratory, Inc. 1998.

However, designing and implementing a sustainable standards-based system that consistently yields high student achievement involves more than setting and measuring academic goals. The process of changing to a "standards" frame of reference goes much deeper. Changing to a standards-based system provides an opportunity to re-examine the organizational elements (Cordell & Waters, 1993) of a school system: fundamental purpose, principles, policies, processes, practices, programs and procedures. Standards present an opportunity to examine or clarify these organizational elements as they are viewed by all the groups within the school community—teachers, school administrators, other district staff members, parents and other community members. Establishing clarity on the organizational elements—e.g., purpose, principles, and policies—may do more to help schools and their communities re-establish trust in public education than many of the current reform efforts which tinker with how schools work—or don't work.


Abstract: I suggest some reasons why education has proved so resistant to reform. That the educational system is a system is, in some respects, more significant to this question than the fact that it deals with education; that it is a system militates against certain sorts of reforms being successfully adopted. I will also argue that policymakers' efforts to reform education are made more difficult because of lack of clarity of purpose. Though all
agree that "excellence" is the goal to be pursued, there is little attention to
the meaning of excellence, nor how we would recognize it if we saw it.
Often, "excellence" is used synonymously with "competitiveness." I
explore the limits of policy, and suggest that these limits are inescapable.
Recognition of these limits may allow us to attend to those policy areas
where success may be more likely.

Expanding knowledge about the implementation of quality after-school
programs and identifying program effects on students’ school performance
and social, emotional, and cognitive development are the key missions of
the national evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers
Program. Sustained public interest in structured after-school
programming for students has heightened the need for a comprehensive
national evaluation that can inform policy makers and practitioners. The
C.S. Mott Foundation and ED are partners in contracting with
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. to carry out the national evaluation of
21st Century programs. This concept paper sets forth the assumptions and
key relationships underlying the evaluation.

What does a community school look like? “Community school” is an
inclusive term, encompassing a growing number of school-community
initiatives that feature both common themes and differing approaches. The
names of the initiatives suggest some of the varying attributes: Caring
Communities, Beacons, Bridges to Success, University-Assisted Schools,
Healthy Start, Communities in Schools, School of the 21st Century, and
many others. Some are broad in scope, promoting widespread replication
or adaptation, while others are single entities. Programs are being initiated
at the national level (e.g., Children’s Aid Society, School of the 21st
Century), state level (e.g., New Jersey School-Based Youth Program),
local level (e.g., Polk Bros. Foundation Full Services Schools Initiative in
Chicago) and in individual schools (Molly Stark Community School,
Bennington, Vermont). Community schools also vary in their goals: Some
specifically aim to improve academic achievement while others focus
primarily on health and behavioral outcomes or enhanced family
functioning.

Extra Learning Opportunities (ELOs) provide school-aged children with recreational, academic, and development opportunities supplementing education provided in a typical school day. ELOs serve multiple purposes, consist of varied activities for youth, occur in various locations, and have many labels. The diversity of the after-school field presents a key challenge for state leaders: how to coordinate activities occurring statewide and embed ELOs into overall education reform. The state role in ELOs is increasing dramatically. The transfer of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) program from the federal government to states offers an opportunity for states to promote a cohesive ELO agenda.


When after-school programs began gaining popularity in the early 1990s, researchers, policymakers and funders had high and broad aspirations for these activities as a way to improve young people’s academic performance, strengthen their social skills and keep them safe while reducing risk-taking behaviors and providing child care. Political pressure for these programs to produce academic outcomes became particularly acute in the late ’90s, especially for school-based programs. Recent evaluations suggest that strong after-school programs might help participants academically, socially and behaviorally, but not all programs produce these benefits, and in those that do, the benefits are often modest (Dynarski et al. 2003; Dynarski et al. 2004; Grossman et al. 2002; Huang et al. 2000; TASC 2003; Walker and Arbreton 2004).


Although numerous ways exist to connect young people to the issues that affect their lives, this article argues that the arts provide a powerful way for young people to explore, engage in, and affect social issues. It shows how art making is able to create a free space in which young people can envision different possibilities for themselves and their community. This article is based on an ethnographic study of a collaborative effort between a public middle school and a community-based arts organization that involved the research, design, and groundwork for a youth-created Peace Park—a public art and playground space. The Peace Park project took place in an ethnically and economically diverse community on the outskirts of a major metropolitan area in the Rocky Mountains. The project was initiated in response to an absence of arts programming for underserved youth in the community, a history of racial conflict between
young people, and a need for a communal gathering space. This article examines the influence of issue-oriented community-based arts education on the development of social responsibility and democratic participation in young people.


This issue brief provides examples of arts-based education as a money-and time-saving option for states looking to build skills, increase academic success, heighten standardized test scores, and lower the incidence of crime among general and at-risk populations. It offers examples drawn from states that are utilizing the arts in education and after-school programs, and it provides policy recommendations for states looking to initiate or strengthen arts education programs that improve productivity and foster workforce development.

**Impact of the LA’s BEST After School Enrichment Program on Subsequent Student Achievement and Performance.** Denise Huang, Barry Gribbons, Kyung Sung Kim, Charlotte Lee, Eva L. Baker. UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation (CSE) and Graduate School of Education & Information Studies. June 2000.

This report summarizes the evaluation of the LA’s BEST program. A comprehensive intervention, LA’s BEST, was developed in the Los Angeles area by a community-based initiative. In operation for more than 12 years and overseen by the Mayor of Los Angeles, the Superintendent of the Los Angeles Unified School District, a Board of Directors and an Advisory Board, LA’s BEST holds the following goals for K–5 students: • A safe environment • Enhanced opportunities through the integration of an educational support structure • Educational enrichment activities to supplement and deepen the regular program • Recreational activities • Interpersonal skills and self-esteem development.

**Los Angeles County Wide Arts in Focus Arts Education Survey.** Commissioned by the Arts Education Task Force of Arts for LA. Prepared by Museums Without Walls, Los Angeles; Kendis Marcotte, Tschopik Schneider. 2005.


RAND was asked by Stone Soup Child Care Programs to assess the adherence of its California programs to a set of research-based best practices for after-school care. Toward this end, RAND comprehensively reviewed the literature on after-school programs and derived a set of 18 practices associated with quality of care. We then developed a protocol to
measure the extent to which the Stone Soup programs were following these practices, and we applied this protocol to ten randomly selected school campuses with Stone Soup after-school programs.

Mixed Results: Lessons Learned from a Case Study of Interagency Collaboration: Special Report #10. Margaret C. Dunkle, Stephanie A. Surles; with a commentary by Jeanne D. Jehl. The Policy Exchange—The Institute for Educational Leadership. 1998. This evaluation is a case study of mixed results. It documents how difficult it can be to administer separate, seemingly complementary federal programs in a value-added way that makes sense to customers and uses taxpayer money wisely. This close-up looks at the incentives and, perhaps more importantly, disincentives in the small pilot program studied offers critical lessons for more ambitious efforts to use public funds more effectively.

Multiple Choices After School: Findings from the Extended-Service Schools Initiative. Jean Baldwin Grossman, Marilyn L. Price, Veronica Fellerath, Linda Z. Jucovy, Lauren J. Kotloff, Rebecca Raley, Karen E. Walker. June 2002. After-school programs can play an important positive role in the academic and personal development of young people, especially in an era when many parents work full time. Launched in 1997, the Extended-Service Schools (ESS) Initiative helped establish after-school programs in 17 communities across the country, each of which adapted one of four program models to local circumstances and needs. In this report, Public/Private Ventures and MDRC present the findings from their joint evaluation of the initiative, focusing on ESS programs in six cities where intensive data collection was conducted. Among the themes examined in the report are the programs' implementation, quality, and cost and their effects on students' after-school participation and attitudes toward school.

National School-Age Care Alliance: NSACA—Standards at a Glance. National AfterSchool Association (NAA). Salt Lake City, UT. 2003. The National AfterSchool Association, formerly the National School-Age Care Alliance (NSACA), was founded in 1987. A professional association with a membership component membership includes practitioners, policy makers, and administrators representing public, private, and community-based sectors of after-school and out-of-school time programs.

National Study of Before- and After-School Programs Analysis and Highlights. U.S. Department of Education; Elementary and Secondary Evaluation. 1993. The National Study of Before- and After-School Programs is the first nationally representative study to document the characteristics of formal before- and after-school programs, which have grown in response to the increased need for high-quality, affordable day care. It examines the prevalence, structure, and features of formal programs that provide
enrichment, academic instruction, recreation, and supervised care for children between the ages of 5 and 13 both before and after school, as well as during vacations and holidays.


The Opening Minds Through the Arts (OMA) program is an Arts in Education Model of innovative arts-infused programming. It is a sequential curriculum-based approach to arts in education, incorporating the art disciplines of music, dance, and drama. OMA is a collaborative effort among five community partners: Tucson Unified School District (TUSD), Tucson Arts Connections, the Tucson Symphony Orchestra, the University of Arizona School of Music and Dance, and the Arizona Opera Company. The overarching goal of OMA is to help students who are at academic risk to succeed by actively supporting and positively engaging them in core learning experiences that integrate the arts.

**Out-of-School Time Evaluation Database by Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP)**


Our database of out-of-school time evaluation profiles provides information, in an accessible way, about evaluation work of both large and small out-of-school time programs and initiatives. Each profile contains an overview of the out-of-school time program or initiative that was evaluated, as well as detailed information about each evaluation report produced about that program. Electronic links to actual evaluation reports, where available, are also provided, as are contacts for program directors and evaluators. The profiles are searchable on several key criteria in each of these broad categories. The search mechanism allows users to refine their scan of the profiles to specific program and evaluation characteristics and findings information. New profiles are added and existing profiles are updated quarterly.

**Partners in Excellence Conference: Panel Summaries and Report of Proceedings.**


Founded in 1937, the National Guild is the service organization for a diverse, nationwide constituency of nearly 600 nonprofit, community-based institutions that offer access to sequential arts instruction for people of all ages mostly after school and on weekends. Within this overall constituency 300 schools, operating in 44 states, are members of the Guild. The central mission of these schools is to provide high quality arts instruction in the visual, literary and performing arts to all persons, regardless of age, race, religion, aptitude or ability to pay. Partners in Excellence is a national initiative which was developed to identify and study best practices in K–12 arts education partnerships and foster their
replication. The project has evolved out of a continuum of inquiry by the National Guild about effective arts education collaborations, beginning with the formation of a special task force in 1990.

Pathways to Success for Youth: What Counts in After-School: Massachusetts After-School Research Study (MARS). Intercultural Center for Research in Education (INCRE); National Institute on Out-of School Time (NIOST); Wellesley Centers for Women • Wellesley College. Arlington, MA. November 2005

The study focuses on afterschool programs serving elementary and middle school youth from ten communities across the state, including urban, suburban, and rural areas. It is the largest study of its kind in Massachusetts.


At Abrakadoodle we focus on Process Art—Art that places emphasis upon the learning taking place rather than the outcome or finished product. Children learn that there is no right or wrong way to create art, but that what they learn in the process is most important. Each lesson is carefully designed to ignite the imagination and foster creativity while developing fine motor, language, art appreciation, cognition and other skill areas. Children are also introduced to art materials, artists, art vocabulary and techniques through engaging and fun art activities.

Remarkable Art Education • www.abrakadoodle.com: About Abrakadoodle®

Abrakadoodle provides the highest quality, educationally rich, imaginative art education programs to children ages 20 months to 12 years old. Classes are provided through a network of educational directors and teachers at host educational sites, such as schools (private and public), park programs, community centers, day care centers and other locations. Abrakadoodle offers a complete school curriculum beginning at the preschool level that can be incorporated into the school’s curricula offerings or offered as extracurricular activity. Educator Mary Rogers, M.A.Ed., who also cofounded Computertots, and Lori Schue, author of 11 books Artworks for Kids, developed Abrakadoodle’s innovative art curricula that include lessons about everything from painting to 3-D art to food design. Abrakadoodle has partnered with Binney and Smith’s Crayola® to jointly bring creative learning to children everywhere. Abrakadoodle Enrichment Curriculum is designed to supplement the child’s educational programs, as an extra-curricular activity. It includes hundreds of lessons that are taught by Abrakadoodle teachers. The lessons introduce techniques, ignite the imagination and provide opportunities for exploration of a variety of media and materials.

This study examined high-performing after-school projects funded by The After-School Corporation (TASC), to determine what characteristics, if any, these projects shared. Evaluators reanalyzed student performance data collected during the multi-year evaluation of the TASC initiative to identify projects where the TASC after-school program was especially likely to have contributed to improvements in students’ academic achievement.


The IEL Policy Exchange held a February 1998 seminar, Achieving a Common Purpose in Early Childhood, that began by laying out broad strategies to improve social policies. This publication is designed to share this powerful learning experience with a broader audience. … outlines seven broad strategies she believes are essential to moving to the next stage — sustaining and “scaling up” from small successes.


The National Arts Education Consortium’s main mission was to create school environments that ensured rigorous intellectual development in the arts for all students. Through the TETAC project, the Consortium worked to integrate comprehensive approaches to arts education with other elements of whole-school reform to demonstrate the value of the arts as part of the core curriculum and to quantify student achievement in the arts.


Regardless of when a program meets and what focus it has, there are certain ingredients that are generally evident in programs that are deemed successful by parents, staff, young people, and others who have a stake in the program. Research and field testing done by the National Institute on Out-of-School Time (NIOST) and the National School-Age Care Alliance (NSACA)* have resulted in the “NSACA Standards for Quality School-Age Care,” a set of national standards that form the foundation for a self-assessment and accreditation system that recognizes high-quality
programs. The Standards are used by programs across the country to assess the current state of their program, set goals for program improvement, and/or pursue accreditation through NSACA.
## APPENDIX B

### LIST OF EVALUATIONS OF ELOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX C

MISSION STATEMENTS

The Ohio Arts Council
727 E. Main Street, Columbus OH 43205-1796
Vision: Serving People and Strengthening Communities through the Arts
Mission Statement
The Ohio Arts Council is a state agency that funds and supports quality arts experiences to strengthen Ohio communities culturally, educationally and economically.

Greater Columbus Arts Council
Columbus, OH
Mission Statement
The Greater Columbus Arts Council (GCAC), a not-for-profit organization, encourages and supports cultural development in the Greater Columbus area. In this capacity, GCAC provides technical services to artists and arts organizations, acts as the community's voice on arts advocacy issues, and serves as the official agency for the City of Columbus grants for the arts. GCAC administers the Columbus Arts Festival, the Business Arts Partnership program, and the Community Arts Education program, which consists of Artists-in-Schools and Children of the Future, a public safety project targeted to youth ages 5–14.

Short Stop Youth Center
A division of Directions for Youth and Families
Columbus, OH 43201
School year hours: 2:30 pm to 8:00 pm
Summer hours: 8:30 am to 3:00 pm
Mission Statement
The Short Stop youth Center is a community-based prevention program that creates opportunity for young people ages 7–19 to enhance their personal growth and development. Youth learn the importance of abstinence from drugs and tobacco, violence, and delinquent behavior.

Columbus Museum of Art
Cap City Kids
**Columbus Public Schools**  
Columbus, OH  
**Mission Statement**  
Columbus Public Schools will provide a quality education to all students, enabling them to develop the knowledge and skills they need:  
- To achieve at their highest levels;  
- To think critically;  
- To solve problems;  
- To work independently and cooperatively;  
- To value diversity; and  
- To make informed choices.  
In collaboration with the community, Columbus Public Schools will provide a challenging, student centered curriculum and effective instructional strategies in a safe, stimulating environment.

**ICARE (the Initiative for Culture and the Arts in Education)**  
Cleveland, OH  
**Mission Statement**  
The Initiative for Cultural Arts in Education (ICARE) is a program that supports long-term arts-focused educational partnerships between the Cleveland Municipal School District (CMSD) and the Northeast Ohio cultural community. ICARE seeks to improve student achievement in both the arts and academic subjects. The partnerships treat the arts as a way of learning, a catalyst for motivating students and expanding their world. In ICARE partnerships, the arts become part of the daily education of students, both as distinct disciplines and in combination with other subjects.

**Abrakadoodle of Cleveland**  
Cleveland OH  
**Mission Statement**

**Cleveland Municipal School District**  
Cleveland, OH  
**Mission Statement**  
(As of August 2006) The primary goal of the Cleveland Municipal School District is to become a premier school district in the United States of America. (Previously) Each student in the Cleveland Municipal School District will be successful in a rigorous instructional program, and our teachers, principals and administrative staff will be valued, will hold themselves responsible and accountable, and will be rewarded for their professionalism.
APPENDIX D

SAMPLE QUESTIONS FOR SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

How was your organization’s involvement with Fine Arts Extended Learning Opportunities initiated? Did your organization develop the idea independently or were you recruited in some way to participate?

What other organizations, groups, institutions, or stakeholders are involved with you in ELO arts programming?

Are your organization’s policies, suggestions for best practices, or ELO arts activities in any way guided by any federal mandates, programs, or guidelines such as Goals 2000, 21CCLC, or ESEA/NCLB?

In the initial development stage, were art educators involved in any way? If so, please describe who were, and how were art educators (K–12 art teachers, district or state arts supervisors, academics, researchers) involved?

How are arts education standards and curriculum attended to by the policies of your organization in general? How are they addressed more specifically by your polices on ELO arts programming?

Do your organization’s policies call for parents, students, and/or their neighborhood representatives’ involvement at any stage of ELO arts programming? If so, please explain how the policy addresses these issues.

How has collaboration been defined by your organization for this program? How does it tend to actually operate in connection with other organizations/institutions?

In what ways do the policies and procedures of your organization seem to mesh best with the policies of other involved agencies and groups involved in ELO arts programming? Do they work best around issues of collaboration? Do the policies mesh best around art education standards and curriculum?
Are there policy differences between your group and the other organizations involved? Are the points of difference greatest around issues of collaboration? Do the policies have the greatest difference concerning art education standards and curriculum? Are there areas that your organization’s policies are silent on, do not address, ELO arts programming?

Do the policies of your organization call for any type of monitoring, quality control, or oversight pertaining to matters of collaboration or arts education curriculum/standards? Are such oversight policy measures created by your organization or required by some other entity?
# APPENDIX E

**THE PAGE © MATRIX**

## Layer 1

**Funder’s Function/Programming Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Restrictive</th>
<th>Less Restrictive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schooling, Grades, and Test Scores</td>
<td>Employment and Workforce Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Society and Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Socialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safe-and-Off-the-Streets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Layer 2

**Partnering Organizations’ Internal Statement(s)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Specific Non-Arts In-School Learning</th>
<th>No Statement Regarding In-School Learning</th>
<th>Supporting In-School Learning in General</th>
<th>Supporting In-School Arts Learning Specifically</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Layer 3

**Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituents</th>
<th>Temporal</th>
<th>Conceptual</th>
<th>Logistical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administration and Support Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-Level Arts Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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