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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The concern of this study is educational policy, more specifically the construction of policy for instruction in the visual arts in the various provinces of Canada. Recent literature has emphasized the role of policy and decision-making for art educators. MacGregor (1984), for example, recognizes that "educational decision-making policies dominate and control curriculum considerations rather than the other way around" (p. 1).

The way that educational policy is defined influences the manner in which classroom instruction, curriculum development, research, and professional development are organized. Apparent in policy and decision-making are the amount and kind of exchanges of knowledge and communication that exist between different Canadian Departments of Education who are in the business of curriculum planning and implementation in the visual arts. In a study conducted in the United States on the effectiveness of education policy, Wirt (1976) discussed the desirability of the interrelationship among the states.

Knowledge of these relationships seems a basic requisite to policy making at the national level and to scholarship, either comparative studies or in case studies. The larger view is necessary if one is to understand either national patterns in this matter or the significance of a single study (p. 167).
In preparation of this study three factors were taken as given: first, with ten educational bureaucracies at work in similar institutional and cultural environments there will inevitably be a measure of commonality; second, that a cross-fertilization induced by sharing ideas nationally would serve to enhance the art education policies of each of the provinces; and third, that the creation of a national policy would offer each of the provincial educational authorities a degree of consensus that would enhance their policy and decision-making.

This cross-provincial policy comparison of instruction in the visual arts seeks to formulate through a Delphi survey method a national inventory of policy goals for instruction in the visual arts. The creation of a national policy to which the provinces could then attach specific clauses or variations to accommodate local priorities could serve the course of advocacy for art education, specifically advocacy before school boards and educational administrators. It can also provide a well articulated philosophy for the uniqueness of Canadian art education. Finally it is hoped that such a nationwide policy will serve as a conceptual facility for continuing communication and an expanding relationship between visual arts policy makers and art educators in the various provinces.

Statement of Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent and the nature of consensus that exists in policy statements for the provinces in
Canada. This study was designed to elicit and rank a series of responses to three questions. The questions were:

1. To what extent does a consensus exist in those policy statements for instruction in the visual arts identified as being important by policy makers in the provinces across Canada?
2. In what order of priority do these provincial policy makers assign the policy statements for visual arts instruction?
3. Can a national macro-policy for Canadian Art Education can be derived from those policy statements?

The Canadian Education Context

Constitutionally, jurisdiction over education in Canada is assigned exclusively to the ten individual provinces. The Departments of Education for each province mandate the production of curriculum materials, select curriculum committee members and develop the basic philosophies of curriculum programming. The provincial governments appoint directors of curriculum who in turn, assign members of their staff to the task of administering one or more subject areas. What occurs with some regularity in these educational bureaucracies is that the promotion of the arts is attenuated relative to those areas of study which are viewed as being the 'core subjects.' A second result of this constitutional arrangement has been the almost total lack of communication and idea sharing in the arts at a national level.

Ultimately, then, and this must be borne in mind constantly, both the authority and the resources needed to respond to the educational needs of the Canadian public are reposed in the provincial Departments
of Education. These bodies possess the financial resources, the staff, the public visibility, and the legislative authority to set the pace. Lionel Orlikow (1981) observes that the course of Canadian education is unduly influenced by the power of a small elite who control the provincial departments of education, "senior civil servants control the only authoritative body in the province charged with education" (p. 235). He goes on to say that, "Developments during the past two decades obscure this power," and that "local control, participation, curriculum adaptation, are all important to a degree, but seldom lead to significant deviations from parameters established by departments of education" (p. 235).

The initiation of curriculum development in general comes from the Department of Education as part of a cycle of revision which takes place in all subject areas. When such a revision occurs, its nature is determined by policies of the particular administration in power. From time to time there may be other factors which influence the Department to revise a curriculum, such as a study done by the Manitoba Task Force on the Arts in Education (1980) which stimulated curriculum reform for that province. Generally, however, the Department of Education makes a decision and initiates a project by approving it, appointing a committee to implement it, providing the funding, and establishing its basic procedures. It oversees all stages of writing, piloting and printing the guide and assists with the initial stage of implementation. A member of the Department's staff is responsible for the organization and the functioning of the committee.
Curriculum development committees are composed of groups of teachers and art educators who work together over a period of time to produce a document acceptable to the individuals or group responsible for art education in the provinces. After a process that involves writing, piloting, and revising the document, it is eventually adopted for all teachers and determines the nature and direction of art education in the province for a period of years. "The provincial guide is the only direct way in which change in art education can be effected across the province and one of the few effective ways to improve programs in general" (Harris & Walters, 1984). If the Department of Education has a mandate to produce a curriculum, it is essential that it have ultimate control over selecting the committee members, appointing a chair, and developing the basic philosophy of the program. The provincial selection of committee members is done on a consultant basis according to loose guidelines which have developed through a process of prescription. Teachers and administrators make recommendations about committee composition and develop suggested guidelines which, for example, ensure representation from certain geographical areas and a balance between urban and rural divisions.

The operational structure of curriculum development for the provinces functions in two stages. Level one documentation provides rational goals and philosophical approach to teaching the subject. Level two documentation outlines objectives, resources, and activities designed to follow the goals. Due to the irregular timing in the development of curriculum materials, problems frequently arise. One major problem which occurs with the two level system is a lack of
cohesion between the levels of the curriculum. Emerson (1980) reports that "much curriculum development in visual arts is carried on in a fragmented fashion and lacks continuity throughout the system as well as in specific areas of growth" (p. 3). If the philosophy and content are developed by different groups, or if a great deal of time separates the writing at the two levels, a lack of coherence may be apparent in the final product. A long writing period may also result in a change of committee members and an invalidation of the commitment to the originally established goals. In reporting on such committee process for the province of Manitoba, Harris and Walters (1984) revealed that a committee laboured for five years on the art curriculum materials which led to a lack of reference in terms of writing style, use of terminology, and resulted in a clear separation between the two levels of the documents.

When reviewing the intent of establishing a national inventory of goals and objectives which could outline art education for Canada the following considerations have been taken into account. The two levels of operation in the formulation of instructional materials offers those in education in the visual arts in Canada the opportunity to use those funds normally allocated for the document one statement of philosophy and to apply these to the level two development. By adopting such goals and objectives for instructional boundaries, a curriculum committee is provided with a guide which clearly addresses the unique aspects of instruction in the visual arts, therefore, allowing for committee time to be expended on the local and regional needs of the province in its development of curriculum units for individual instruction. With such a
document available the problems of cohesion would be limited to instructional procedures and not to recurring debates as to the definition of the discipline as a whole. This approach will, then, enable the unique cultural needs of local groups to be met without compromising the minimal educational requirements which are the fabric of the discipline. A clearly defined set of goals and objectives, one established through the theory and practice of those in the field will provide a useful tool of advocacy yet unavailable to Canadian art educators when, for example, faced with governmental cuts.

The Ministry of Education in the Province of British Columbia recently released a White Paper (a government discussion paper which is circulated for comment prior to the preparation of a bill or of regulations) which disparaged the value of courses in the fine arts as requirements for university entrance. How advantageous it would have been to British Columbian art educators to be able to point to a comprehensive national policy for the arts in the course of mounting an argument against what could be portrayed as out of step parochial philistinism. The need for clear educational statements respecting art education and for continued refinement of such statements is apparent in the several National Art Education Association (NAEA) policy position papers published over the past twenty years. Canada is in need of such a statement, one that outlines the boundaries of the discipline within that country—not so much for reasons of cultural nationalism, but rather as a means of making advances in the discipline readily accessible at the local level.
Every province has a set of goals and objectives; these are readily inferred from the curriculum materials developed by individual committees in similar positions in art education across this country. The system for preparing and implementing such materials is similar whether one is on a committee in Prince Edward Island or in Alberta. The physical product with a few deviations in style is approximately the same across Canada. What is lacking is the common inventory, a list of essentials that could bind art education and art educators in Canada together.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Policy Development

Educational Policy

Questions concerning educational policy and its meaning have long been the subject of debate among scholars and practitioners. This study is not so much concerned with promoting a precise definition of policy as it is with establishing practical conceptual boundaries which will permit discussion of educational policy and, more specifically, art education policy.

Educational policy, like other forms of policy, is formulated from the needs of the society it serves. For the sake of clarity the definition of policy which will be utilized throughout the following discussion will be that of Roald Campbell (1982) found in The American Educators Encyclopedia. "Policy," he tells us, is "an authoritative decision which guides other decisions." Applying this definition to the realm of education, policy could be conceived as a set of educational statements that are guides intended to aid the educational decision-making body. Contrasted, then, with prescribed rules or specific regulations, educational policies are seen here as confines
which allow policy committees to exercise a certain discretion in their administration of a given educational design.

McClellan (1971)—Macmillan Encyclopedia of Education—lists three salient distinctions for educational policy:

Educational policy is intended to be a binding guide on the actions of those designated by the statement; second, it is enforceable and enforced by the society (large or small) which formulated it; and third, it is formulated and adopted through a political process—that is, a process which acknowledges the reality and legitimacy of conflicting interests and desires among its participants (p. 169).

Educational policy is created from the needs of the society and emerges from a number of contexts: from research findings, professional educators' guilds, local concerns, and federal and provincial governments. Such educational planning involves a variety of settings and individuals. Teachers plan for their teaching. School principals plan for the total educational program of their schools. School boards plan with respect to local educational policy and the means by which those policies are to be implemented. The provincial departments of education plan on the wider bases of educational development relevant to provincial objectives. Political decisions, in other words, define the limitations within which schools perform their function. These decisions or policies provide the legal structure underlying education's goals.

Scheffer (1978) asserts that irrespective of the particular setting or level at which educational planning and policy formulation takes place, the following basic operations obtain:

1. it is a process related to decision-making and implementation of programs;
2. it is an organized and thoughtful attempt to isolate and to inform choices by identifying and describing alternatives, and by selecting and assembling information which is most useful in the definition of alternatives;

3. it involves the analysis of educational priorities in their social setting, of alternatives or options for achieving those priorities of probable future conditions or contingencies, and of the operational features of the educational systems which may affect the implementation of the available alternatives;

4. it consists of several elements, a policy analysis element, a managerial element to support the decision-maker, a coordinating element, an information element, and a research element (p. 31).

Historical Overview of Educational Policies

In an attempt to better understand the formulation of instructional policy in the visual arts, it is appropriate to examine the larger context of educational policy. Throughout the history of public education, policy and decision makers have been engaged in formalizing the boundaries of that enterprise. Such identification of educational goals has resulted and continues to result in a re-assessment and restructuring of school curriculum as each of the subject areas comply with the new policies. The changes in the purposes of schools over the past two hundred years have been enormous. They have moved from the colonial period, in which a selected few attended private schools to today's mammoth network of comprehensive and specialized schools which blankets the nation.

In 1893 the United States National Education Association attempted to formalize the purpose of the high school through publication of The

They wrestled with the basic problem of how to articulate the college with a dual-purpose high school, a high school which had to serve as preparation for college and also a preparation for life. Down to 1893, when the committee reported, the prestige of the college preparatory function had predominated, enabling the colleges to dictate the high school curriculum. After the report of the committee, however, the high school came to enjoy a more independent position (pp. 241-242).

Four of the specific recommendations are cited as examples of the Committee of Ten's effort:

1. That all pupils should pursue a given subject in the same way and to same extent as long as they study it at all.

2. That every subject studied should cultivate the pupils' powers of observation, memory, expression, and reasoning.

3. That the function of the high schools should be to prepare pupils for the duties of life as well as to prepare them for college.

4. That colleges and scientific schools should accept any one of the courses of study as preparation for admission (Report of the United States Commissioner of Education 1893, pp. 1474-75).

The Committee on College Entrance Requirements of the National Education Association issued the National Education Association Proceedings (1899, pp. 635-636) which reiterated a triple function for schooling:

1. Preparation for life
2. Preparation of teachers for the common school
3. Preparation for college.
That the committee additionally attempted to paint a more congenial educational picture by stating that programs should be flexible, have a variety of electives, and take into account the student's abilities, as well as point up the NEA's growing concern for and influence over the condition of learning. By 1913 the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education appointed by the NEA recommended what was to become probably the most famous statement of the purposes of the high school. Labeled the [Seven] Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education (1918, p. 540), these objectives were memorized by countless numbers of prospective teachers as part of their preservice training. In a recent informal study conducted by Pierce (1972), prospective teachers were asked to construct their own set of educational aims for instruction. Of the original seven principles, six consistently appeared on the final lists of the teachers as worthwhile aims for today's students. A summarized version of the "[Seven] Cardinal Principles" follows:

1. Health. Good health habits need to be taught and encouraged by the school. The community and school should cooperate in fulfilling the health needs of all youngsters and adults.

2. Command of Fundamental Processes. The secondary school should accept a responsibility for continuing to teach and polish the basic tools of learning, such as arithmetic computation, reading, and writing, that were begun in the elementary school.

3. Worthy Home Membership. Students understanding of the interrelationships of the family in order for the give-and-take to be a healthy, happy affair, should be advocated by the school. Proper adjustment as a family member will lead to proper acceptance of responsibility as a family leader in later life.

4. Vocation. The secondary school should develop an attitude in students that will lead to an appreciation for all vocations. The basic skills of a variety of vocations should be made available to students who have the need and/or desire for them.
5. Citizenship. A basic commitment to proper citizenship on the part of students needs to be fostered and strengthened during the adolescent years. The secondary school needs to assume this responsibility not only in the social sciences, where one would ordinarily assume it would be handled, but in all subjects.

6. Proper Use of Leisure Time. The student should be provided opportunities while in school to expand the available possibilities for leisure time. The commission felt that leisure time properly used would enrich the total personality.

7. Ethical Character. The secondary school should organize its activities and personal relationships to reflect good ethical character, both to serve as an exemplar and to involve the student in a series of activities that will provide opportunities to make ethically correct decisions.

The [Seven] Cardinal Principles were an attempt by a group of educators to use the needs of society and the individual as a basis for describing what schools should accomplish. Other attempts were subsequently made to identify the central goals of schooling, and a few of the most noteworthy are described below. Depending upon the prevailing issues of the particular time and place, the statements of educational policy made by these groups show slight changes in emphasis and style.

In 1938 the Educational Policies Commission set forth a series of goals arranged in four major divisions with subsections concerning "the educated man." The four main divisions included: (a) self-realization; (b) human relationship; (c) economic efficiency; and (d) civic responsibility. A typical goal format under the civic responsibility subsection read: "The educated person respects the law" (p. 21).

After World War II a shift in priorities increased the emphasis on science. John S. Brubacher (1958) credits Herbert Spencer (1947) with a
large portion of the responsibility for this shift based on his essay entitled "What Knowledge Is of Most Worth," written by Spencer which drew wide attention. Spencer opined that despite the commonly held position that those things taught in the liberal studies were the most worthwhile, priority should be given to practical knowledge. He argued that the knowledge of most practical value was science. It is certain that the war time development of radar, sonar, rocketry, and atomic weapons did nothing to undermine this popular opinion.

In 1947, the National Association of School Principals delineated the Imperative Needs of Youth of Secondary School Age. This statement of policy was in essence, the restatement of the [Seven] Cardinal Principles of Education (1918), with added comments on the wisdom of appreciating aesthetics, becoming an intelligent consumer, and understanding the methods and influence of science. The thrust of the tabulation of goals changed from a "command of fundamental processes," to an emphasis on rationality, clear expression of thought, reading, and listening with understanding (p. 21).

In 1961, the Educational Policies Commission once again enunciated a series of goals. Without completely abandoning the ideas embodied in the preceding statements of goals, the Educational Policies Commission emphasized the idea that the primary objective of education should be to improve the rational powers of students. The specific aims included in the older lists were re-examined in light of the goals of creating the rational person.
Policy and Art Education

It is clear that the existence and the continued refinement of educational policy determine what is to be taught and what is to be learned in schools, and define curriculum content.

Canadian art education, and indeed education in Canada in general, has from the beginning and continues to be close to the English speaking international mainstream. Many Canadian art educators are members of both the Canadian Society for Education Through Art, as well as the National Art Education Association and have available to them scholarly journals which offer both an overview of the field as well as regional and national content.

Over the years several movements for general curriculum improvement have influenced instruction in the visual arts in the United States. Most if not all, of these movements were felt and responded to by Canadian art educators. American influences on Canadian education are functions both of simple propinquity and of the common problems faced by modern industrial nations in a largely homogeneous North American cultural environment (Tomkins, 1981, p. 157).

From the early influences of the imitative drawing practices to child-centered art which viewed children as inately artistic and creative beings, Canadian art educators have expanded and adjusted curricula materials to remain current with prevailing theory. John Dewey's (1934) pragmatic and experimentalist theories about learning and about the nature of aesthetics were as highly regarded in Canada as they were south of its border. As Gray (1984) points out in an article which
examines the causal relationship which has existed between Canadian art educators and their American counterparts, "Canadian art teachers managed to maintain several productive coaxial connections that provide a steady flow of art education ideas and images. These connections run north and south, east and west, and span Atlantic and Pacific oceans" (p. 14).

In seeking to formulate a national policy position for Canada, one which reflects the national status of art education policy for that country, a number of policies were reviewed. To this end the following section lists policy statements issued by the National Art Education Association, as well as the foundation for its policy positions, followed by The California Framework for Art Education. The State Board of Education for the state of California has governed the development and evaluation of art programs, kindergarten through the twelfth grade as set out in the California Framework as a state document for the arts and it is for this reason it is included in a summarized form. The final document was issued by The Ontario Ministry of Education. This policy position paper sets out that province's stand on the arts from policy development to implementation of that policy. The Arts in Ontario Schools is to date the most complete provincial statement for arts education across Canada and therefore is a valuable addition to this section on the review of art education policy.
The National Art Education Association has been responsible for several national statements of policy—policies which define the boundaries of the field.

In his recent publication, Sullivan (1984) provides us with an overview of the position papers published by the National Art Education Association. As the author notes, the foundation for these position policy papers comes from both art and education to form the theory giving rise to underlying the instructional boundaries in art education. For the purposes of comparison the NAEA statement papers are arranged by Sullivan into four areas of emphasis: (a) the view of education, (b) the view of art, (c) the value of art education (which is described in both instrumental and intrinsic terms), and (d) the view of teaching and learning. The 1949 position paper "The Creed of Art Education," listed its educational aims as being the development of the whole child, while the art objectives were divided equally between the developmental nature of art and art as expression. The development of the whole child and the developmental nature of art are cited as critical instrumental values attaching to art education because they deal with the integration and the self-realization of the individual, whereas Art as expression was listed as an intrinsic value of art education—one which merited being promoted as it is viewed as being essential to the holistic development of the pupil and an agent conducing to freedom of expression. The overall effect of this policy was seen to favor development of manual
and social skills. Listed as implications of teaching/learning were the following:

1. personal growth and development;
2. all individuals capable of expression through art;
3. teacher as facilitator;
4. child centered setting; and
5. process rather than product.

In comparison, the 1967 NAEA policy statement, The Essentials of a Quality School Art Program, recited three educational aims: (a) individual development; (b) cultural understanding; and (c) community/social improvement. For Art, the theory reflected (a) artistic process, and (b) art as a body of knowledge. The instrumental values subsumed under Art Education were wholly derived from the three educational aims and were stated as: (a) art and the individual; (b) art and the culture; and (c) art and the community. The intrinsic values of art education are described as perceiving, performing, appreciating and criticizing—these being seen as being directly influenced by the artistic process while the content areas and the final intrinsic value of aesthetic concepts were viewed as a consequence of Art as a body of knowledge. Both the instrumental values and the intrinsic values of Sullivan's model for the 1967 policy statement combined to suggest the following implications for teaching/learning: (a) art is both a body of knowledge and a series of activities; (b) curriculum development is subject-centered; (c) cognitive processes and aesthetic concepts are to be emphasized; and (d) the further utilization of non-print instructional technologies is inevitable. It is apparent from
Sullivan's analysis that the formulation of policy in art education is a process greatly influenced by both aesthetic and educational theory (Sullivan, 1984).

Just as the 1949 The Creed of Art Education policy position reflected Lowenfeld's (1947) advocacy of human development through creative self-expression, so the curriculum reform movement of the 1960s and the writings of Jerome Bruner (1960) can be seen as furnishing the foundations for the 1967 NAEA paper, The Essentials of a Quality Art School Program, as well as for the most recent policy statements issued by that body. The 1985 policy statement issued by NAEA, entitled Quality Art Education; Goals for Schools, views the current standards for art education policy as follows:

1. All elementary and secondary schools shall require students to complete a sequential program of art instruction that is balanced to include the study of aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and art production.

1.1 Art instruction shall be conducted by qualified teachers of art.

1.2 Visual arts courses shall be required in middle, junior and senior high schools, and should not be scheduled so as to conflict with other required courses.

2. For graduation from high school, every student shall be required to complete at least one year of credit in one of the fine arts.

2.1 An acceptable course in visual arts shall include in-depth study in the techniques of at least one art medium, practice in several media, and studies in art history, aesthetics and criticism.

3. For admission to a college or university, every student shall be required to have at least one year of credit in visual arts (see 2.1 above).
Manifest in the NAEA policy position statements is the commitment to quality instruction in the arts. The goals articulate the NAEA Board's position on the status of art education in the schools, as well as the qualification desired in order to maintain effective instruction both with properly trained teachers as well as course availability and appropriate areas of study.

The California Framework of Art Education

The California Framework of Art Education is a document that was approved by the State Board of Education to govern the development and evaluation of art programs, kindergarten to twelfth grade. Its guidelines reflect the tenets for quality school art programs set forth by the NAEA position statements previously reviewed.

Art Education Programs in California Schools

 Should be Based Upon the Following Assumptions

1. Art education's major value is providing that which is unique to art: developing abilities to produce, comprehend and evaluate visual aesthetic form.

2. Art is as complex as other subjects. Skill, knowledge and appreciation do not develop automatically; they must be acquired through a systematic program of art instruction.

3. Art possesses intellectual and emotional components; they are both dealt with through appropriate art education processes.

4. Learning in art can be assessed; evaluation should focus on individual growth as it is reflected in what one produces and in the quality of one's response to aesthetic form.
**Education in Art Should Achieve the Following Principal Goals**

1. Citizens with deep involvement and lifelong interest in the arts, committed to support the arts among the competing priorities in American life.

2. Respect for originality in one's own visual expression and in the expression of others, including recognition of the impetus which creativity gives to human achievement.

3. Knowledge and appreciation of the visual arts in this and other cultures both past and contemporary.

**Implementing California's Framework for Art Education Will Require That**

1. Teacher preparation institutions examine their existing programs and make whatever changes are necessary in curriculum and personnel in order to prepare teachers capable of providing art learning.

2. Experiences are as set forth in the framework. School districts sponsor in-service workshops for their teachers where the new framework forms the basis for updating their knowledge of the media and processes of art education.

3. Administrators at every level of schooling assume the responsibility for carrying out this mandate to provide a systematic, thorough and vital program of art education for the children and youth in California.

**Ontario Art Education Policy Position**

The Ministry of Education for the Province of Ontario in response to the concerns about the status of the arts in the Ontario schools, prepared a discussion paper, *The Arts in Ontario Schools* (1982). The discussion paper was intended as a vehicle for stimulating dialogue among school staffs, trustees, parents, teacher education institutions,
teachers' federations, artists, government agencies, and community cultural organizations.

It is hoped that the discussion generated by this paper will lead to renewed commitment on the part of educators at all levels to the provision for each and every student of a curriculum which includes comprehensive programs in each of the arts in order to maintain an appropriate balance between cognitive and affective learning (p. 2).

It was hoped that the reaction to the paper and the debates concerning it at subsequent regional conferences would generate a series of recommendations which would assist the Ontario Ministry to formulate a policy for instruction in the arts.

Although the Ministry's discussion paper is not a formalized statement of policy, it has been adopted and is enforced at a provincial level, as was the California Framework of Art Education (1982). It bears a certain scrutiny because of its commitment to establish policy for the instruction in the arts for that province's entire school population.

The conclusions and discussion concerns relating to the arts in general were categorized under three main headings of policy, that of development, implementation and evaluation. A summarized version of each of the three headings follows:

Policy Development

1. There is a need for a renewed commitment to quality instruction in elementary and secondary schools on the part of teacher education institutions, school boards, school staffs, teachers' organizations, and provincial departments of education.

2. All students must have access to an education in the arts in both elementary and secondary schools.
3. The arts must be viewed by all school boards as basic to general education.

4. Provision of specialized or concentrated instruction for artistically gifted students needs to be established.

5. Teachers of exceptional children require specialized knowledge and expertise in the arts.

6. Ensuring that interdisciplinary activities involving the arts are supplements to and not substituted for developmental programs in each of the arts.

Policy Implementation

Policy implementation was identified by the Ministry as a major problem in the arts since it involves changing attitudes and beliefs as well as instructional strategies. The Ministry therefore felt that individual school boards must have the primary responsibility for its implementation and support from the regional offices of the Ministry.

The following twelve areas were identified as concerns in implementation of policy in the arts:

1. A comprehensive program in the arts requires a common understanding of, and commitment to the goals of arts education throughout the system.

2. There is greater need for coordination among supervisory personnel, principals and teachers in the delivery of arts programs.

3. Teachers must have a certain general understanding of the arts, some experience in perceiving and responding to the arts, and a continued commitment to their own continued growth in this area.

4. Professional development opportunities must be made available for teachers.

5. The arts have special needs with respect to time and space.
6. Art programs are integral to curriculum planning; therefore an equitable distribution of time allotted to the delivery of programs in music, visual arts, and dramatic arts must be assured.

7. Adequate funds must be made available for materials and resources required for quality instruction in the arts.

8. Resources must be made available to those boards which lack the expertise to develop exemplary art courses.

9. Teachers need and request professional development in the arts.

10. Principals, guidance counsellors, and teachers need to be alerted to the many career opportunities in the arts and in arts-related fields and they also need to encourage students to give the arts careful consideration when selecting their programs.

Policy Evaluation

1. It is essential that the Ministry of Education and the school boards continue to work co-operatively towards the improvement of implementation of quality programs in the arts for all students in the system.

2. Patterns of assessment in each of music, visual arts, and dramatic arts must take into account the goals and objectives of the discipline as well as the nature of aesthetic experience and development.

As educational aims shift, and research and theory in art and instruction in the aesthetic realm develop, new policies emerge. That recent literature calls for clarity in the policy formulations of current educational practices in the arts is apparent in the writings of Chapman (1982), Eisner (1972), Lanier (1978) as well as Broudy (1972) and others. The common point of view which informs all these writings plies in their emphasis on the educational, as opposed to the developmental functions of art education. The formulation of policy must address art as a school subject with distinctive goals, content and
methods. Beliefs about the nature of art, and the various functions it performs combined with the ways in which it should be experienced are all central to an effective policy.

The policies and policy position which we have been describing are all examples of macro-policy positions or advocacy--level one documents and discussion papers which recommend changes that are widely apprehended by the policy maker who developed the materials as well as those who implanted the policy, as being improvements to the teaching of art education within the schools, but which do not provide specific examples of how these changes might be implemented.

Policy Implementation

Economists recognize that policy can be formulated and implemented on two (and perhaps many) levels. It is insightful, we submit, to conceive of policy as functioning on macro- and micro-levels of activity. Kirst (1983) defines a "macro-economic policy as one which includes federal fiscal and monetary policy, such as money supply and budget practices, while micro-policy is created by the economic decisions of individual firms or consumers" (p. 285). When applying such a concept to curriculum policy Tyler's (1959) criteria for curriculum organization, such as continuity, sequence and integration, would then fall into the 'macro' category, while specific curriculum units of instruction such as those found in curriculum guides and texts such as that of British Columbia Elementary Art Education guide would be classified as an example of 'micro-policy.'
Although these guidelines assume many different forms, they all derive from the same concern: the attempt to make art education more comprehensive and specific. The next level, then, is the utilization of such recommendations in the formulation of specific curricula guides. Accepted tenets of policy are reified and articulated through actual instruction at the local level: national wines poured into regional bottles. This next step can prove to be a formidable one for committees facing the task. Fortunately, their tasks are facilitated by the existence of numerous texts and guides which serve as models. One detailed program for the construction of visual arts curricula is provided by the Ohio Department of Education. Under the leadership of the State Supervisor for Art Education, Jerry Tollifson's (1977) guidelines have been published for both elementary and secondary levels of schooling. These books serve as exemplars for program planning. Suggested goals and art activities related to three general aims of schooling to help each child achieve personal fulfillment, to improve society, and to transmit a cultural heritage. They can be useful to both curriculum committees in developing new guides, or to teachers as models for what they may do in the course of providing art experiences to their pupils.

The nature and content of educational policy in Canada is influenced in large measure by three important features of the institutional structure of the educational system. Firstly, the basic jurisdiction over education lies with the ten provincial legislatures. Secondly, a provincial legislature exercises its administrative role through its executive council or cabinet of which the Minister of Education is the
member through whom cabinet control of education is exercised. Thirdly, provincial governments have by legislation created a system of local government (school boards) with delegated powers to regulate and to administer educational services at the community level. It is the case in the provinces that the division of power and responsibilities between these two levels of government lies within the jurisdictional competence of the provincial governments to amend from time to time as circumstances appear or warrant, and as provincial objectives change. The provincial governments in the discharge of their mandates define educational goals for all the disciplines and the priorities of these goals for a province as a whole. These in turn are expressed in terms of provincial policies and programs. Given this constitutional organization it is instructive to look at how policy is enacted. Weiss (1980) makes the point that policy actions are not "decided" upon in the sense that people with authority sit down and ponder various options, weigh them against each other, consider relevant facts, and then choose one of the options. In reality, policies are decided upon in a much more diffuse way. The best way to characterise the process is as being one of "decision accretion." In the complicated dynamic interplay between interest groups arguments are advanced, administrative considerations, including the inertia of the system are pondered, and guidelines for action slowly begin to emerge.

When examining policy and its passage through the various levels of formulation on its way to the classroom, it is appropriate to outline the different commitments of those involved along the way. Level one or macro-policy is the concern of the provincial governments: the type
of policy which can be clearly stated and easily defended. Such policy in art education is, as we have seen, grounded in the content of the discipline and continuously informed by ongoing research in the field.

Ralph Smith (1978) has formulated what he terms 'six basic' questions which should be considered when assessing a good policy in art education. They are:

1. Is a policy for art education clear about its basic purposes, objectives, and outcomes, i.e., about the states of affairs it wishes to attain? In short, is the proposed plan of action really a policy?

2. Is a policy for art education a truly educational policy; or does it largely subserve essentially non-educational (say social or political) objectives?

3. Does a policy for art education emphasize the distinctive domain purpose of art education itself, or does it largely subserve general educational objectives or the instructional objectives of other school subjects and activities?

4. Does a policy offer good prospects for achieving its basic purposes and goals? That is, is a policy for art education likely to be an effective one?

5. Is it possible to hold accountable those who formulate and implement a policy for art education? That is, can appropriate estimates of success be made?

6. Have serious and worthwhile options been considered and appraised before deciding on the adoption of a given policy? (p. 273)

Conclusion

Policy for instruction in the Arts is not the responsibility of the present day governments, governments who react to the pressures of several countervailing demands, nor is it the sole domain of the committees which the governments appoint when curriculum reform is necessary.
It is the domain of those in the field involved with the current literature, those engaged in research. It is up to the members in the field continually to furnish governments with clear, concise policy which sets the boundaries and which enables governments to initiate committee work which is founded on solid philosophy. With such policy in place, the following states of formulation become more directed and open to local and community interests. The policy thus established can offer a continuous development in programming in the arts in classrooms across the provinces and across the country. There is throughout the literature a commitment to the educational value of the visual arts in the school curriculum. The establishment of clear guidelines will clarify this position for some and will offer support for others. There is an agreement throughout the provinces of the importance of the visual arts in the school curriculum. The advantage of a national policy position lies in the guidance which it would offer for curriculum committees, advocacy groups, and provincial departments of education. With a clear national policy in existence to demarcate what should be taught, the discipline is much less likely to experience difficulties with provincial ministries whose first impulse in moments of financial stress is to discard or to suffocate the teaching of art in their schools. It is submitted further that a good clear national policy would stimulate innovation at the community level, the policy being implemented through the use of local resources and indigenous artifacts while at the same time—hopefully because of the existence of the national policy—operating recognizably within the discipline of art education.
Overview

The methodology employed in this study was the Delphi survey method. The Delphi was chosen because of its organized approach to correlating views and information pertaining to a specific policy area.

Developed by Olaf Helmer and named for the Oracle at Delphi in ancient Greece, this technique was originally used for technological forecasting. The Delphi is a structured multistep anonymous communication process which enables a group of individuals to address a complex problem. Enzer (1971) commented that Delphi is usually better than other methods for eliciting and processing judgmental data, since it (a) maintains attention directly on the issue; (b) provides a framework within which individuals with diverse backgrounds or in remote locations can work together on the same problem, and (c) produces precise documented records.

Strauss and Zeigler (1975) identified three basic types of Delphi: numeric, policy and historic.

The goal of the numeric Delphi is to specify a single or minimum range of numeric estimates of forecasts on a problem. The goal
of the policy Delphi is to define a range of answers or alternatives to a current or anticipated policy problem. And the goal of the historic Delphi is to explain the range of issues which fostered a specific decision (p. 263).

The defining characteristics of the Delphi method include:
1. Controlled feedback at various stages of the process.
2. Anonymous response ensured by questionnaire.
4. Revision of judgment in the light of added information.
5. Reliance on intuitive judgment which may or may not be 'expert.'
6. A goal of consensus or the delineation of pros and cons of an issue.

Groups involved in the process include the design and monitor team, the group of respondents on the Delphi panel, and the user group which requested that the study be conducted. The individual respondent and the Delphi panel are engaged in interactive communication through the feedback of individual contributions provided to the group, followed by solicited group judgments which are then computed and summarized by the monitor team for reassessment by the individuals. The process generally continues through three or four rounds of questionnaires until some kind of resolution is effected.

Modification of the Traditional Delphi

In the design and the conduct of a study it is the task of the researcher to decide clearly and consistently which methodologies constitute an appropriate 'technique' as method of measurement and which do not. In fact, the researcher is often instrumental in defining and redefining a technique for the field (Goldschmidt, 1975, p. 197). A
technique represents a set of procedures which are to be applied in a prescribed manner. As a technique does not exist independently of the way in which it is actually applied, any particular application of it will reflect the creativity or the bias of the practitioner who employs it.

In a paper designed to aid and to alert those interested in the conduct of a study using the Delphi method, Turoff (1970) offers statements which can be made in regard to the formulation of any Delphi study:

1. that no hard and fast rules exist to guide the design of a particular Delphi study;

2. that the utility of the results depends upon the close cooperation between the design team and the intended user, co-operation between the design team and the intended user body, or at least a clear understanding by the design team of the goals and requirements of the study;

3. that the success of the Delphi method is dependent upon the ingenuity of the design team and the background of the respondent group; and

4. that the Delphi requires a degree of quantification to be imposed upon subjective judgment factors and the definition of this qualification is a matter of principal concern to the design team (p. 150).

It is clear from the above statements that the Delphi is not a method to be applied to any study without considered modifications and a clearly defined and well formulated objective so as to construct the most efficacious possible tool for data collection.

Turoff (1970, p. 151) goes on to state that a Delphi exercise can encompass either or both of the following objectives: (a) to explore or
to expose underlying assumptions about information which can lead to
differing judgments; and (b) to seek out information which may generate
consensus. The emphasis in recent literature has focused on the
uncertainties associated with the design practices involved with a
blanket application of a Delphi method without a sufficient inquiry into
the various techniques and the numerous studies conducted to date.

One such adaptation of the traditional Delphi is one Turoff
described as a policy Delphi. The formal structure of Dalkley's (1968)
original Delphi still exist in that the policy Delphi has a number of
rounds ranging from two to four, the utilization of large numbers of
people is still effectively employed, as well as anonymity and
controlled feedback of data. What differs in the Turoff policy method
is the function of the Delphi itself. It is employed not so much as a
consensus identifying tool but rather to delineate all the differing
positions advocated by the respondents and the principal arguments
for and against each of those positions. Once the policy Delphi is
completed a small working committee can utilize the results for
formulating the required policy. It is in this aspect that the modified
Delphi is seen to be as valuable precursor for committee work. One of
the strongest advantages of the policy Delphi structure is its capacity
to highlight and to incorporate diversity, which contrasts, in our view,
favorably with the traditional Delphi method of forming the consensus.
This is done by constructing the exercise such that all alternative
solutions or options for consideration on a given policy issue are
elucidated together with their supporting evidence. Issues or options
are evaluated according to their desirability, feasibility, importance
and validity. Turoff (1970, p. 149) opines that policy Delphi should serve any or all of the following objectives:

1. to ensure that all possible options have been put on the table for consideration
2. to establish the impact and consequences of any particular option
3. to examine and to estimate the acceptability of any particular option.

The policy Delphi has been successfully employed in a number of studies, the results of which have validated the technique's usefulness as a decision-making tool from studies illustrating this.

The policy Delphi is not the only modification that the method has undergone. In a recent survey study of the Delphi application in a variety of designs, Preble (1983, p. 81) notes: "The application to date demonstrates that Delphi is capable of satisfying a wide range of educational research needs. However, minor modifications in the conventional Delphi methodology were often required to fit the researchers' situation best." Preble examined a total of 100 available studies which employed the Delphi technique. In most cases modification allowed the basic character of Delphi to be preserved as well as preserving its perceived advantages over other methods. This extensive computer assisted bibliographical search conducted in the public sector revealed broad applications for the Delphi technique. A natural clustering of studies was reported to have emerged in the areas of forecasting, communication, budgeting, goal setting in both the business applications as well as the three educational studies reviewed.
In another such review of Delphi studies undertaken by Riggs (1983) an elaboration of a standardized modification to the Delphi was reported. This modification called SEER (Systems for Event Evaluation and Review) modifies the process by establishing an initial list of forecasts that have been constructed through a series of interviews prior to the beginning of the Delphi process. It can result in reducing the number of questionnaire rounds, thus saving time. As well, participants can be asked to answer questions in only their area of expertise. This can aid in eliminating possible skewed responses caused by lack of expertise in a particular area.

In its simplest form the Delphi is merely an organized method for correlating views and information pertaining to a specific area and for allowing the respondents representing such views and information the opportunity to react to, and to assess differing viewpoints. It is clear from the examination of studies which have utilized the Delphi technique that those with the greatest success modified the method in the service of the study. The recent applications of the Delphi method have had and continue to have the added advantage of rigorous examination of the employment of the technique. A number of studies which seek answers in areas of education are utilizing combinations of modifications of the method and have been grouped as normative forecasting studies. Rather than speculating about what is probable within a given time frame, the normative Delphi focuses on establishing what is desirable in the form of goals and priorities. The idea of information feedback remains intact, but the content of the feedback differs. Respondents in the normative Delphi learn the priorities which
others assign to goal statements. The normative Delphi clearly serves a
different purpose in policy planning, its use having been to assess the
positions which constituents and members of a given institution (school,
school districts, universities, etc.) are likely to take with respect to
certain possible goals.

Whether or not systematic iterative explorations of this type should
be referred to as a Delphi method or even as a normative or policy
Delphi methods, depends upon one's sensitivity to the original purpose
of it as expressed by Dalkley (1968). It would seem preferable to
retain the Delphi name for the study in an attempt to set the record
straight concerning its utility, rather than to concoct a new name which
would only confuse the uninitiated with a model in search of a study.

Methodological Issues

Advantages and Disadvantages of the Delphi Method

Based on the premise that many heads are better than one, the Delphi
method refines and organizes group judgment on complex subjects in a
systematic fashion. The specific advantages listed by Barrington (1981)
include anonymity of participation, controlled communication and
feedback, time and cost efficiency, and pedagogical effects.

Anonymity of participation was seen to limit emotional and
psychological dynamics that may occur in group interactions. The Delphi
method avoids many of the disadvantages of face-to-face discussions.
Groups which are politically at odds or individuals who disagree can be
polled more reliably with fewer distracting factors intervening.
Dominant personalities and group pressures are down played, while hesitant participants are encouraged to contribute equally.

A carefully controlled communication and feedback process is viewed as more effective than a round-table discussion. The monitor acts as facilitator and editor. It aids in simplifying and clarifying the issues at hand while providing the opportunity for revision of opinion.

The administration of the method is relatively inexpensive, requiring only the time of the designer and monitor team and occasional secretarial assistance. Large numbers of participants can be involved in the analysis of a complex issue at their convenience. Geographical distance and tight schedules cease to be a problem in the bringing of individuals to the discussion. Barrington's (1981) last point concerning the pedagogical effects of the method is difficult to measure. While attempts have been made to explore the pedagogical effect of the Delphi, study designers continue to believe that respondents view participation as an interesting, enriching and useful undertaking (Weatherman and Swenson, 1974).

The Delphi method is not without its critics. Disadvantages cited throughout the literature can be categorized into five items, these being convergence, explanatory power, panel selection, predictive accuracy and process weakness.

A characteristic of a traditional Delphi is to provide panel members with group response means and each individual's earlier answers and to suggest revision of estimates. Given the conduct of a study in a series of rounds, between which a summary of the results of the previous round is communicated to and evaluated by the participants, the likelihood of
converging points of view is seen to be a natural outcome. The second and successive rounds often produce "a narrowing of the initial spread of opinions and shifting of the median" (Gordon, 1968, p. 254). Weaver (1970) identified forced convergence of opinion as the single most significant disadvantage of the Delphi technique. "Furthermore, deliberately shaping consensus on goals through feedback will have little pay off for policy planning unless certain underlying assumptions are bared in the process" (p. 8). In a study conducted by Uhl (1971), he sought: (a) to evaluate the procedure for obtaining from different groups their perceptions of the present and future goals for their institutions; and (b) to evaluate the procedure for obtaining convergence of opinion having regard to the importance of these goals. Uhl concluded that the Delphi method was a desirable instigator of independent thought on the part of the participants and was helpful to them in the gradual formulation of a considered opinion. He commented that the convergence observable in his studies occurred primarily between the first and second rounds of questions, apparently as the result of the participants having examined the returns of their co-respondents, and that there occurred only a minimal shifting of opinion after the second round. Uhl (1971) concluded his study by remarking that the Delphi technique employed in his research provided the institution under examination not only with an inventory of its current goals but also with some adumbration of what its future objectives were likely to be. In addition, if improving communication among groups can lead to a more informed opinion and thus to a greater agreement on the priority of goals, the complexity of the
decision-making or the 'political' process decreases significantly. The convergence issue ceases to be the major shortcoming of the Delphi method. With the researchers' use of a modified Delphi technique, it is no longer appropriate to refer to the method as 'forcing' a consensus. Uhl's (1971) study indicates that the existence of shifting opinion takes place after the distribution to the respondents of the first round's answers. This is viewed not as a forced convergence but rather a natural result of the respondents' having processed information not hitherto available to them, a shifting of opinion in light of the delineation of pros and cons of an issue as expressed by other members of the panel. Turoff (1975) referred to this as a possible pedagogical effect of the process, and listed as a possible objective of the modified policy Delphi the education of the respondent group as to the diverse and interrelated aspect of the topic (p. 149).

Explanatory power was viewed as the failure to clarify and share assumptions. The probing of only those items of disagreement for supporting reasons without knowledge of judgment which achieved consensus is often singled out by critics. Weaver (1970) claimed "... forecasts fail to convince. They offer no reasonable options. It seems fundamental that future studies will have little value to policy makers unless they open options" (p. 38). One recent Delphi innovation which counteracts this problem is the request that respondents provide supporting reasons for their statements or selections (Jillson, 1975).

An issue of long standing has been the 'expertness' of the respondents chosen as panel members. "An inadequate panel can produce nothing more than pooled ignorance" (Brooks, 1979, p. 379). In 1959
Helmer and Rescher defined an expert as having three characteristics: rationality, background knowledge in a particular field, and reliability and accuracy of prediction over time. A small panel of experts may reflect the danger of inbreeding, while a large, widely representative panel may discourage active participation in the study by reason of the complexity involved in its administration. The approach best suited for panel selection would appear to be a carefully matched panel expertness, breadth and size to the objective of the study in question, representing as many points of view in a given subject area as is feasible while still maintaining a certain manageability.

Predictive accuracy has not been viewed as a problem in the more recent modified Delphi studies. Recent Delphi have tended to be more of an exploration into complex issues in order to uncover options rather than to search for a right answer.

The final reported disadvantage of the method is process weakness. Delphi studies poorly designed and conducted have attracted severe criticism. One such critic of the Delphi technique was Sackman. In his critique Sackman (1974) focused only on the traditional Delphi and ignored the more sophisticated application of the many modified Delphi. Coats (1975) reviewed Sackman's data and dismissed the arguments with the conclusion that, "the critical points that Sackman makes vary from relatively prosaic work-a-day failings of practitioners in all areas (poorly designed instruments hastily prepared, inadequately handled and managed, i.e., the problems characteristic of mediocre workers in every field)" (p. 193).
The traditional Delphi format, developed by Helmer for the Rand Corporation, was a format designed for prognostication, a method designed to solicit expert wisdom and judgment about future events. Coats (1975) argues that Sackman's (1974) criticism that the method fails to conform to the scientific canons in existence for survey research, derives from Sackman's misapprehension of the method as a scientific survey tool rather than a device for stimulating those convergences of perception and opinion which may, in the end, lead to an identifiable consensus.

The Delphi's utility, says Coats, (1975) is its ability to assess crisis, "We face a crisis of concept, ideas, alternatives, diagnosis, foresight and planning; Delphi is an attempt to deal with all of that" (p. 193). Sackman errs fundamentally in selecting and in focusing upon only those studies which have used the Delphi method in a demonstrably improper or ineffective manner. He errs further by applying the standards of the conventional Delphi study as a rating scale against which he measures the modified Delphi studies to find them wanting, failing utterly to realize or to recognize that these modified Delphi studies have been specifically adapted to deal more effectively with the peculiarities of the particular social issues under study.

Goldschmidt (1975) concluded his critique of Sackman's (1974) article on the Delphi with the observation that, "Since an evaluator can only measure the results of an application, empirical information about the technique itself can only be gathered if there exists applications that are congruent with the evaluator's definition of the technique" (p. 197).
In various Delphi studies procedural weaknesses which have been demonstrated include:

1. A lack of certainty in guidelines for design. The basic strength of the method, its flexibility, can also be its downfall in a poorly designed study which is hastily constructed.

2. The character of Round One. Controversy exists over whether to have respondents react to prepared statements, mind sets, or other input or whether to have respondents reply in a non-structured fashion.

3. The process of summarizing and editing. Uneasiness has been reported by study monitors (Rasp, 1974) as to the construction of subsequent questionnaires, having them reflect sufficiently participants' views and comments while summarizing clearly and imposing some form of structure, at the same time editorial basis must be avoided.

4. Time frame. The Delphi method is relatively lengthy and is not a technique to be used in a crisis. Including design time, it can run from four to eight months and can not be rushed.

Features and Limitations of the Present Study

After analyzing a number of Delphi studies an attempt to design and to incorporate as many positive features as possible into this study has resulted in a specific methodology. This modified Delphi procedure includes the following features:

1. An identification of opposing views.

2. Anonymity of feedback.

3. Controlled communication permitting a clearer focus on theoretical issues not likely discussed in a meeting.

4. No forced convergence of revision of opinions in the light of group norms: rather a progression to consider estimated major forces as applied to a specific policy area.

5. Explanation of reasons for the importance of selection.

6. Efficient use of the time of geographically dispersed respondents.
7. Final report to serve as input to future committee work.

8. Possible pedagogical effect of panelists in future when considering policy decisions.

Process features of the study include the following:

1. Extensive research into the design of Delphi to strengthen the design of this study.

2. An open-ended Round One questionnaire, based on the expertness of the panel.

3. Use of a five-point rating scale to discourage a neutral stance.

4. The inclusion of two copies of each questionnaire in the respondent's package to provide a file copy an back-up for possible loss.

The major limitation of the study was seen as the use of a single study monitor rather than a design team. The summarizing and editorial quality of the study was limited by the knowledge and ability of one person. Due to the educational nature of the entire exercise, there seemed to be no solution to this problem.
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH DESIGN, PROCEDURES AND RESULTS

This chapter describes the research design and the procedures employed in this study. The section on research design includes discussions of the research variables, of the panel selection and its characteristics, of instrument development, of data collection procedures, and of analysis procedures.

Design of the Study

The methodological framework employed in the study was that of a policy Delphi of the type developed by Turoff in 1969 as a specialized form of Delphi designed to explore a specific policy issue. A number of policy Delphi studies were examined and relied upon as general models for this modified policy Delphi study. Methodological features of this study include the combination of informed judgments on policy decision in the visual arts and the evocation of reasons for the importance of all items identified.

The major limitation of the study was the employment of a single study monitor rather than a design team, a situation resulting
necessarily from the fact of this study's having been undertaken by a doctoral candidate working independently.

A unique characteristic of the design of a Delphi study is that each questionnaire in the series is designed from the data received in response to the previous round of questionnaire. For this reason it is impossible to divorce instrument development from the procedures involved in data collection and analysis. As a result each round of the study will be examined individually, looking first at instrument development, then at data collection procedures, and finally at analysis procedures and presentation of results. The Delphi approach is cumulative. The first round of the study was largely exploratory and was designed to stimulate responses from panel members on issues of policy in the arts under three major headings, Curriculum, Research and Advocacy. The final package of materials used in the three rounds of the study is annexed hereto as Appendix A.

Panel Selection and Characteristics

The intention underlying the survey procedure was to canvas those individuals who have demonstrated an interest in or involvement with educational policy and decision-making in the visual arts in Canada. According to Delbecq, Van DeVen and Gustafson (1975), once the desired characteristics of the respondents have been identified, then a nomination process should be employed to select individual panel members. The participants selected for this study were comprised of two sub-groups: government officials and university faculty responsible for
or having some influence upon education policy and decision-making in the visual arts. A letter requesting the names of the appropriate government officials was sent to each of the ten provincial departments of education on May 24, 1985. Participation by the members of this group was important because of their influence both upon the institution of new curricula directly and upon the composition of government appointed bodies charged with formulating visual arts instructional materials. The ten requests led to the participation of six government respondents, one from each of the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Newfoundland.

Different forms of invitations to participate were issued to government officials from those sent to the university panel members. The university panel members were identified by their activity in the academic community and by their expressed interest in educational policy and decision-making in the visual arts.

Fifteen requests led to eleven faculty members from ten major universities across Canada agreeing to participate in the study. The university respondents represented the following institutions: The University of British Columbia (2), The University of Regina (1), The University of Manitoba (2), The University of Toronto (1), Concordia University (1), Nova Scotia College of Art and Design (2), and The University of New Brunswick (1). Prince Edward Island did not proffer a university or a government representative. A letter requesting all respondents' participation was enclosed with the Round One materials on October 12, 1985. Of the 25 questionnaires dispersed for Round One, 17
were completed and returned. Table 1 shows panelist participation throughout the study.

Table 1. Panelist Participation Round One to Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Government respondents</th>
<th>University respondents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Acceptances</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Round One</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Round Two</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Round Three</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal Data of Panel Members**

Potential panel members from among the government officials were identified by means of a letter requesting the names of those persons responsible for curriculum and policy decision in the visual arts at the provincial level of government. The letter requesting the names of possible study respondents was sent May 7, 1985 to the Ministries of Education of each province, each of which then suggested the names of appropriate persons. The proposed members were then invited to participate. Six of the ten accepted.

Included in the package of first round materials was a personal data sheet which catalogued each respondent's age, his gender, his level of education, the number of years he has occupied his present position, and the number of years he has been involved in the field of art education.
The profile of the government respondents as provided in Table 2 reveals their mean age as being 41 years, ranging from 35 to 49 years. Four of the six respondents from the government group were women. Two of the six had completed a Bachelor's degree in Education, and one had completed some graduate courses. Four had completed a Master's of Education degree. Five of the six listed visual arts, and curriculum as major focuses of their studies. One respondent described his area of expertise as administration. Other areas listed as fields of study by the members of this group included curriculum supervision, English, media, and language arts. One respondent holds a degree in art education.

Of the eleven member university panel, nine were male and two were female. The group represented eight provinces, leaving only Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland without a university voice. The average period of time that each of these respondents has occupied his current position, as set out in Table 1, was 7.8 years, the range being from 15 months to 14 years. The mean age of the group was 42.2 years, with a range from 25 to 54 years. On average, the number of years in art education was 21.1 ranging from nine years to 35 years. Six of the eleven list a master's degree as the highest educational qualification attained, while five had doctorates. Although not requested and not listed by the government panel members, the university respondents recorded the name of the institution at which their highest degree had been obtained. Four of the five Ph.Ds were obtained at universities in the United States of America: two from the University of Oregon, and one from each of Ohio State University and Pennsylvania State.
University. The Canadian doctoral degree was granted by Dalhousie, Atlantic Institute of Education, Halifax. Of the five Master's degrees, all but one were received in Canada. One was granted by the University of Toronto, one by the University of Manitoba, one by the University of Calgary, and one by Concordia University. The lone remaining Master's degree was granted by the New York University. Nine of the ten university respondents listed their area of specialization as art education. One respondent included art history and secondary education, while another listed his area of specialization as being visual arts.

Summary of Panel Member Characteristics

In summary, a comparison of the two groups shows that among the government officials there were more female respondents than male, whereas the university group was more heavily represented by male respondents. The mean age of the two groups was similar, 41 as opposed to 42.4 years. What differed about the ages of these two groups was the range. The university respondents ranged in age from 24 to 54 years, while the members of the government group were closer to being contemporaries of one another, ranging in age from 35 to 49 years. All but one of the university respondents specified art education as being their primary area of expertise whereas the members of the government panel reported a more diverse base of academic activity including education, language arts, media and history. The average length of time in their present positions was different between the two groups, the government respondents having held their positions for half the number of years of the university group on average. The government
Table 2. Panel Selection and Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel Members</th>
<th>Provinces Represented</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Highest Education</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Years in position</th>
<th>Total Years in Art Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUP I</strong> Government Officials</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Mean 41</td>
<td>Range 35-49</td>
<td>3.2 mos/6 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Mean 41</td>
<td>Range 35-49</td>
<td>3.2 mos/6 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Mean 35</td>
<td>Range 14-15</td>
<td>14.5 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mean 41</td>
<td>Range 24-54</td>
<td>21.1 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newfoundland</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mean 41</td>
<td>Range 24-54</td>
<td>21.1 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mean 41</td>
<td>Range 24-54</td>
<td>21.1 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mean 41</td>
<td>Range 24-54</td>
<td>21.1 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mean 41</td>
<td>Range 24-54</td>
<td>21.1 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUP II</strong> University Faculty</td>
<td>U. British Columbia</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Mean 42</td>
<td>Range 24-54</td>
<td>7.8 mos/14 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U. Alberta</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Mean 42</td>
<td>Range 24-54</td>
<td>7.8 mos/14 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U. Manitoba</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Mean 42</td>
<td>Range 24-54</td>
<td>7.8 mos/14 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U. Toronto</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mean 42</td>
<td>Range 24-54</td>
<td>7.8 mos/14 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U. Regina</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mean 42</td>
<td>Range 24-54</td>
<td>7.8 mos/14 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nova Scotia College of Art &amp; Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mean 42</td>
<td>Range 24-54</td>
<td>7.8 mos/14 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U. New Brunswick</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mean 42</td>
<td>Range 24-54</td>
<td>7.8 mos/14 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mean 42</td>
<td>Range 24-54</td>
<td>7.8 mos/14 yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
group reported a mean of 14.5 years with a range of 11 to 20 years, compared with the range for the university members of 9 to 35 years involved in education in the arts, with a mean 21.1 years.

Round One of the Study

Round One, Instrument Development

An open ended format was selected for Round One. Initial drafts of the questionnaire, personal data sheet, and letter of explanation were circulated for comment among my thesis committee members and among doctoral students in education administration. As a result of the suggestions received, the questionnaires were revised to enhance their clarity.

The final version of the Round One package of materials was mailed on October 15, 1985. This package contained:

1. A cover letter
2. A tractate entitled, "What is a Policy Delphi?"
3. A personal data sheet
4. The Round One questionnaires, entitled "Research Items," "Curriculum Concerns" and "Advocacy Approaches"
5. Photocopies of the questionnaires for the respondents' files
6. A pre-addressed return envelope.

The total amount of time occupied by the development of the package was four weeks.

Questionnaire

Round One asked that respondents identify strategies which may have a positive impact on educational policy and decision-making in Canadian
art education in the areas of curriculum, advocacy (i.e., lobbying for resources to be devoted to art education), and research. The categories were provided as a framework. Respondents were asked to respond to the questionnaire by identifying the factors which they considered to be influential in determining the direction of Canadian art education. Space was provided for three responses for each category, but respondents were encouraged to list fewer or more than three items under each heading if they were so inclined.

Prior to the commencement of content analysis each sheet of each questionnaire was coded with the panelist's code number. The questionnaires were then photocopied and the originals preserved. All content analysis procedures were carried out on the photocopies.

Panelists were asked to respond to the following questions for each category:

1. **Curriculum**: Please identify curriculum strategies, actions, or positions that are of importance when formulating Canadian art education policy.

2. **Advocacy**: Advocacy is concerned with communicating the value and importance of art education. Please identify approaches to advocacy that are important for promoting Canadian art education.

3. **Research**: Please specify topics that may be influential in determining the direction of Canadian art education.
Procedures

Described by Deese (1969) as a practical enterprise, "a collection of techniques for providing interpretations of texts and similar procedures," (p. 39) content analysis was used throughout this study to make valid inferences from the data collected.

As Holsti (1969) commented, "many of the most interesting and significant content-analysis studies . . . depend on categories developed specifically for the data and problem at hand" (p. 115). A combination of qualitative and quantitative methods should be employed in content analysis. The judgmental nature of the qualitative methods employed in content analysis is offset to a degree by rigorous quantitative techniques. These include frequency analysis, scaling, and contingency analysis (Holsti, 1969, p. 113). Frequency analysis involves the statistical determination of what the content is, a straightforward counting procedure. Scaling, or dimensional ordering, applies a fixed value to a given item, placing it in a graded series, and can measure such properties as intensity or importance. Contingency analysis correlates or resynthesizes content elements after their initial unitization.

The content analysis procedures employed in this study were both qualitative and quantitative in nature. Round One was basically qualitative. The procedure included:

1. Development of categories
   a) Unitization of comments
   b) Coding
   c) Sorting

2. Summarizing of responses
   a) Compilation of similar responses
   b) Editing of unique responses.
Panelists' responses, including the reasons for importance given were digested under each of the three categories. The procedure involved identifying the similarities and the divergences of the panelists' responses and isolating those statements which embraced a single idea. For example, under the heading of Curriculum Concern two separate individual responses were received:

1. Concern: Importance of 'Canadian content.'
   Reason for importance: The need to explore the full dimensions of Canada's identity.

2. Concern: National, local and regional content.
   Reason for importance: Art courses at all levels should include Canadian and regional content.

Curriculum concern 2. was retained and appeared among the list of concerns for Round Two.

When a response appeared too vague for a clear group understanding it was deleted from the following round, e.g.,

a) Concern: Ignoring of research regarding creative thinking.
   Reason for importance: The educational powers appear to know only one kind of thinking.

_Results_

Not all panelist responded to all items, while others produced more than the requested number of responses. These results are reflected in Table 3 and Table 4. Altogether a total of 22 items were deleted due to vagueness from a total of 155 panel responses for all three categories. In all, from the remaining 133 responses similar concerns were compressed down to 60 items, 21 research items, 19 curriculum concerns and 20 advocacy approaches. An analysis of content for Round One
Table 3. Initial Responses from Round One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of responses</th>
<th>Total number of items collected</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Total number of items deleted</th>
<th>Total number of items used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Total Group Responses from Round One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Responses From Both Groups</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Advocacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Number of Responses Retained for Round Two</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Advocacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
responses is summarized and appears in Table 4. Analysis time for Round One data was two weeks.

Round Two of the Study

Questionnaire

Round Two questionnaires consisted of those 60 items elicited and summarized from Round One. These were sorted from among the headings beneath which the respondents had placed them into no particular order. Appearing with each item was the reason for its importance. The respondents were asked to rate each item for importance. A five point rating scale of importance was utilized, ranging from 1 (unimportant) to 5 (very important). Round Two materials were compiled and circulated on November 30, 1985. The packages contained:

1. Cover letter
2. Round Two questionnaires entitled "Research Topics," Curriculum Concerns," and "Advocacy Approaches," in two copies
3. Instruction sheet
4. Pre-addressed return envelope.

The total time involved in developing the package, once the analysis of Round One was completed, was one week.

Table 5 lists both the items with respect to Curriculum Concerns as well as those in respect of Advocacy Approaches which had appeared in the Round Two questionnaires. For the purpose of comparison, Table 5 charts the responses of the government panelists and the university panelists separately. The final column calculates the overall mean rating of each item by the entire panel.
Procedure

All seventeen questionnaires dispatched for Round Two were returned. Due to the Christmas holidays the total collection process took three weeks longer than anticipated.

The major part of the content analysis employed in Round Two was quantitative in nature. This round sought to identify by group consensus those items of major importance, and to determine and analyze group differences in this selection. Panel members were asked to consider each item and the reason given for the item's importance. They were then requested to rate each item according to the five point scale of importance, described in the Round Two instruction sheet. The frequency with which responses were retained for Round Three was a simple counting procedure. Those items which received an average group rating of 3.00 (important) or higher on the scale of importance were retained for the following round.

Five items received an overall rating by the group of 4.00 or higher, they being:

Teacher education--preservice and inservice

The objectives should be formulated to include all levels of teaching--elementary, secondary and post secondary instruction

Status of art courses for high school graduation

Ensure that all guidelines for instruction in art education are written by qualified specialists in the field of art education, and

Availability of art in schools.
All five items listed are factors which identify the place of art education in the school system while acknowledging the need for the proper preparation of teachers and materials so as to reflect the various essentials of the subject of art education. Of the 19 Curriculum Concerns set out in Table 5, only the final two received a ranking of less than 3.00 by the entire panel.

"Art testing/assessment instrument" was viewed by the panelists as not being an important national concern. This response can be compared to the panel's high ranking of items which indicate a desire for a highly flexible component to be worked into curriculum guides so as to enable expression to be given to the individual instructor's preferences in respect of the material contained within the actual units taught.

Results

It is assumed that the panel members viewed testing as entailing prescription, i.e., prescribed units of instruction which would be identical across the country and which would fail to allow for the expression of regional or local interests.

The final concern listed in Table 5 was item S, "It is important to ensure that all those who seek entry to art schools, universities and other post secondary institutions have assimilated a similar and consistent body of content." The government panelists rated this item more highly than did the university respondents. Here again the overall low ranking is an indication that instruction in the visual arts is viewed by the panelists as a highly individualized enterprise, and that instruction received in this subject, whether studio production, art
Table 5. Respondents' Round Two Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Concerns</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Teacher education—preservice and inservice</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. A comprehensive set of teaching objectives should be defined. These objectives should cover all fundamental components of an art education program (i.e., seeing, knowing, thinking, expressing, doing).</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The objectives should be formulated to include all levels of teaching—elementary, secondary and post secondary instruction.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Curriculum statements must be implementable and not simply rhetoric. There should be little if any discrepancy between the ideal, official, formal curriculum and the experienced curriculum.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. There should be a national art education curriculum for Canada.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Coherence. It is important to adopt a format that will ensure a common core of learning (typically productive, historical and critical) while allowing individual schools opportunity to capitalize on strengths or special facilities to extend that common base.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Curriculum guidelines should allow for a great deal of teacher flexibility.</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Ratings Scale: 1 (unimportant) to 5 (important).

The items are listed in the random order in which they appeared on panel questionnaire.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Concerns</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. Status of art courses for high school graduation.</td>
<td>4.16 4.63 4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Ensure that all guidelines for instruction in art education are written by qualified specialists in the field of art education.</td>
<td>4.33 4.27 4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Art is an important part of all cultural life. This must be reflected in curriculum.</td>
<td>2.83 3.36 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. National, local and regional content.</td>
<td>3.33 3.09 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Availability of art in schools.</td>
<td>4.66 4.54 4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. It is important to expose students to at least three dimensions of art experience in the course of their school careers: technical, expressive and sociocultural.</td>
<td>3.00 3.45 3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Although the guides must be flexible they must also cater to the non-specialist. Proposed teaching strategies should be optional but explicit. They should also be concise, jargon free and accompanied by an articulated purpose.</td>
<td>3.66 3.27 3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Input from a number of groups directly and indirectly involved in implementing educational policy.</td>
<td>3.50 2.81 3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Reference the program to environment/consumption and to historical/analytical, as well as performance/production.</td>
<td>3.33 2.90 3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Awareness of implementation and change theory.</td>
<td>3.83 2.54 3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Curriculum Concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R. Develop and use a national/provincial art testing/assessment instrument.</td>
<td>2.50 2.18 2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. It is important to ensure that those who seek entry to art schools, universities and other post secondary institutions have covered equivalent ranges of art learning experiences and have assimilated a similar body of content.</td>
<td>2.83 1.72 2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bold print indicates those items which failed to receive an importance rating of 3:00 or more.

### Advocacy Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Visual arts must keep a high profile within teacher-education institutions (through exhibitions, public lectures, participation in internal and external committees and projects).</td>
<td>3.83 4.09 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Communicate clearly, simply, and with everyday language. Illustrate from programs in action.</td>
<td>3.50 4.18 3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Regular formal presentation of common arts-sector concerns and aspirations to public decision-making.</td>
<td>3.83 3.36 3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Although there is no Federal Office of Education in Canada, organizing political support for art education at the federal as well as at the provincial level is important. Legislation provides stability.</td>
<td>4.00 3.45 3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Advocate by doing what is being advocated.</td>
<td>3.00 3.72 3.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy Approaches</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. A strong central office for the C.S.E.A. is needed. This implies a number of things: (a) a more organized central executive, more politically aware and able to meet more than twice per year.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. (b) a central office employing a secretary.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. (c) a regular newsletter</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. (d) a journal which has relevance to classroom art specialist, but one that bridges the school arts and research journals a year.</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Advocacy is tied to curriculum. A theoretically sound rationale for art education should be formulated. Comprehensive programs which dovetail with the rationale should be developed. The rationale and the resulting programs should be propagated.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. A national policy will be of great value as will provincial and regional documents if they are disseminated efficiently and consistently.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Know your audience (refer to principles of advertising).</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Community art groups, parents' groups, and business and service clubs should be enlisted to support art at a local level as well as to promote its inclusion in school programs across the country.</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advocacy Approaches

N. Making the public aware of what art programs do. Part of our responsibility is public education.  
   3.50  3.81  3.70

O. Art educators should join forces with other cultural groups in the promotion of the arts and in the fight against budgetary cutbacks.  
   3.80  3.36  3.47

P. All art educators and particularly those who have positions of authority and influence must know the system and hierarchies of command up to the provincial and national levels. These figures must be active and aware/skilled in media work.  
   4.16  3.18  3.52

Q. Support among principals, administrators and teachers must be secured if art programs are to be given equal place with other subjects. This requires two things: gaining the attention of the group, and convincing it of the value of the program in relation to the competing claims of other subjects.  
   4.5  4.27  4.35

R. In addition to working with our friends and winning over the uncommitted, we should meet our enemies head on.  
   2.83  1.63  2.05

S. Arts producers/performers target key decision-makers, to help them become literate consumers in their personal lives.  
   3.00  2.09  2.41

T. Unity within the Fine Art sector must be evident to the public.  
   2.5  1.81  2.11

Note: Bold print indicates those items which failed to receive a ranking of 3:00 or higher.
criticism or art history, is an acceptable foundation prerequisite for the introductory courses offered at most post secondary institutions.

Two of the advocacy approaches received a ranking of 4.00 or higher.

Item A:

Visual art must keep a high profile within teacher-education institutions (through exhibitions, public lectures, participation in internal and external committees and projects), and

Item I:

A journal which has relevance to classroom art specialist but one that bridges the school arts and research journals.

Only one item received a substantially higher rating by the government members than the university respondents, Item 12: "Know your audience." The government members' mean ranking was 4.33 whereas the university panelists' mean rating of importance for this item was 2.27. The difference in the rating indicates the differences in the roles of the individual panel members in the implementation of the materials developed. The higher rating by the government respondents signals a more active role in the area of advocacy as a function of their positions with the provincial departments of education. Of the 20 Advocacy Approaches listed, 17 received a mean ranking of 3.00 or higher by the entire panel.

The remaining three items, listed as R, S, and T in Table 5, were eliminated from the final round due to a mean respondent rating of less than 3.00. These final three items relate to the targeting of particular interest groups within the arts and were determined by the panelists as not being important elements of a national advocacy approach. Reviewing these items, it can be concluded that they were
simply drawn so vaguely that a consensus as to their importance or lack thereof could not be elicited from the panel members.

The rankings of advocacy items by the government officials compared to the university respondents again showed no significant differences in selected items.

All the Research Topics received a ranking of 3.00 or more. As research in the field is a highly individualized phenomenon, it was perceived by the monitor that a consensus had been achieved at this point—essentially around the relatively trite proposition that research advances the field—and that the further pursuit of this topic would only elicit the various members' specific research interests and biases.

The following is a complete list of Research items elicited by panel members:

A. Anthropological, historical, philosophical, psychological, and sociological aspects of art education.

B. Design of inter/multi-disciplinary arts programs (aesthetic education).

C. Visualization as a component in thinking.

D. Effectiveness of in-service and professional development sessions and the relationship to classroom practices.

E. Collect programs from provincial and national conferences. Look for patterns and trends in presentations over five years.

F. A description of current practice in art education in Canada—philosophy/content/methodology, etc.

G. Study of implementation methods for new curriculum documents and support materials.

H. Art appreciation—specifically methodologies.

I. Survey provincial curriculum guides looking for patterns, trends and relative importance given to various expected learning outcomes.
J. Study teacher attitude toward new curriculum materials and relate change or lack thereof in classroom practice.

K. Facilitate information exchanges and joint projects amongst art education researchers. For example, the number of Canadian art education researchers is small enough that an annual compendium could be published.

L. Identify relative contributions of studio and history and criticism components at various school levels in various provinces.

M. Curriculum and instructional strategies for teaching and reinforcing arts concepts and skills in other courses and areas of school programs.

N. History of art education—local, provincial, national: including the roles of professional associations in art and art education.


P. A comparative study of program implementation, teacher education one that would examine the methods through which art education practices can be improved.

Q. Studies of the kind exemplified in this document are prerequisite for the articulation of national policy.

R. Connections should be made with relevant non-art education researchers and research organizations.

S. Links between learning in the arts and cognitive-affective development.

T. Macro-studies dealing with the socio-cultural-political orientation.

Round Two analysis took one week.

Round Three of the Study

Questionnaire

Round Three was limited to two questionnaires. Curriculum Concerns and Advocacy Approaches, the Research Topics having been eliminated from this final round. It was clear from the overall ratings of Research Topics that the members of the panel agree on the need for ongoing
research in a variety of areas in the field. Due to the individual nature of that research, it was the decision of the monitor to conclude that a consensus had been reached and that hence, a further probing of the panelists' opinion concerning this topic was not called for.

The two remaining questionnaires presented a total of 34 items for consideration by the panelists in Round Three. The Curriculum Concerns numbered 17 as did the final list of Advocacy Approaches. Table 5 furnishes an itemized accounting of the responses obtained in each category.

Having established this catalogue of items in Round Two, a further investigation of the desirability, the feasibility and the urgency of each item was sought in Round Three. Panelists received questionnaires for Curriculum and Advocacy concerns which set out the items in the order in which they appear in Table 5. The study respondents were then requested to rate each item according to a five point rating scale as to the item's desirability, then to assign a ranking of one to five for the item's feasibility, and lastly to rate each item from one to five as to its urgency. This ranking was requested for each of the 34 items in turn.

**Procedures**

Round Three materials were compiled and circulated on January 10, 1986. The package contained:

1. Cover letter
2. Round Three questionnaires entitled "Curriculum Concerns, and Advocacy Approaches" in two copies
3. Instruction sheet
4. Pre-addressed return envelope.
The total time involved in developing Round Three materials, once Round Two analysis was completed, was one week. The total time for analysis of Round Three was two weeks.

Results

Of the 17 questionnaires mailed, only 15 were returned. One from each group failed to complete the final round questionnaire. The Round Three analysis appears in its final form in Table 6. The initial analysis again showed no significant difference in item preference, in the result of which Table 6 combines the final ratings of both groups. Table 6 sets out from left to right the Curriculum Concerns, the numbers corresponding to the list of items displayed in Table 5 for Round Two analysis. The second column digests the number of responses for each item under the heading of Desirability, followed by that item's mean ranking and the standard deviation found for that item. This sequence is repeated across the table for each of the two remaining headings of Feasibility and Urgency. This analysis is then continued as described, setting out the items under the category of Advocacy Approaches. Panelists were requested to address each item separately, taking into consideration the item's reason for importance.

The final analysis was tabulated on the number of actual responses and the means rating as well as the standard deviation figures reflect this response number. The overall ratings of items across the three ranking headings maintained a level of 3.00 or higher. The panel maintained a consistent rating of items and a normal distribution for Curriculum Concerns across the three categories.
Table 6. Summary of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Concern #</th>
<th>Desirability No. of Responses Mean</th>
<th>Desirability S.D.</th>
<th>Feasibility No. of Responses Mean</th>
<th>Feasibility S.D.</th>
<th>Urgency No. of Responses Mean</th>
<th>Urgency S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Refer to Table 5 for description of items A to Q.
Table 6. (Continued) Summary of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy Items</th>
<th>Desirability</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Feasibility</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Urgency</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Responses</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>No. of Responses</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>No. of Responses</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Refer to Table 5 for description of items A to Q.
Item L received a 5.00 mean for desirability and a high rating of 4.80 with a Standard Deviation of 0.414 by the panel for Urgency, but dropped to a 3.143 with a Standard Deviation of 1.027 rating for Feasibility. This indicates agreement as to the importance of the item and a somewhat lower vote of confidence in the possibility of achieving this goal.

Three items under the category headings of Advocacy received feasibility ratings of 2.86, 2.92 and 2.92 respectively. These items were:

D. Although there is no federal office or department of education in Canada, organizing political support for art education at the federal as well as the provincial level is important. Legislation provides stability.

F. A more organized central executive, more politically aware and able to meet more than twice per year," and

G. The need for a central office employing a full time secretary.

All three of the items received a rating of 3.00 or higher from the panelists in the areas of desirability and urgency, indicating the respondents' overall acceptance of those items but indicating a lack of faith in the probability of effective action being undertaken in these areas.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

Purpose and Problems of the Study

The purpose of this final chapter is to provide a summary of this study and to draw some conclusions from the research findings.

In the larger context this study can be described in three aspects. First it was anticipated that the involvement in this study of panel members from the different groups responsible for art education policy across Canada would serve as a catalyst for a dialogue between the provinces on a national level. Second by eliciting an inventory of what are perceived as being the current needs of art educators within Canada it should identify among educational authorities a degree of consensus that should enhance policy and decision-making in the visual arts across Canada. And finally, by providing a well articulated policy position for art education, a conceptual facility for continued communication and an expanding relationship between visual arts policy makers and art educators across Canada could be established.
Statement of the Problem

The central problems in this study were set out in the form of three questions:

1. To what extent does a consensus exist in those policy statements for instruction in the visual arts identified as being important by policy makers in the provinces across Canada?

2. In what order of priority do these provincial policy makers assign the policy statements for visual arts instruction?

3. What national macro-policy proposition for Canadian Art Education can be derived from those policy statements which have been identified as being important?

Sub-problem

Of lesser significance, but likely to be available from the data generated by the answers to the questions posed in the statement of the problem, are the answers to three additional questions:

1. Given the national participation of panel members what, if any, regional, local or provincial content is apparent in policy statements present in panel responses?

2. Are the view of government officials and the University faculty members similar or disparate when it comes to the identification of major goals and objectives in policy statements for the visual arts in Canada?

3. Is the Delphi method a useful research method for analyzing a complex issue such as this?
Conclusion of Study Findings

This cross-provincial policy study was limited to policy and decision-makers in the visual arts from eight major universities and six provincial departments of education across Canada. (Consult Table 2 for a complete list of universities and provincial education departments involved in the study, p. 51.) The study sought to include all provincial government and university personnel involved in policy and decision-making in the visual arts across the country. A modified policy Delphi method was designed and the initial panel request contacted 28 individuals to participate in the study. In addition, telephone contact was made with those individuals who failed to respond after the initial contact. The final panel numbered 17. It was the decision of the study monitor to include the initial 28 individuals in the entire study and to this end, each received the panel's working results throughout the three mailings. Prince Edward Island was the only province without a government or university representative in this study. The study was conducted in English and the requests for francophone participation were not met. However, Concordia University participated and documentation of the study was sent to the Gouvernement du Québec, Ministère de l'Éducation.

The policy questions under consideration were considered under three major headings: Curriculum, Research, and Advocacy. The panelists represent individuals involved in the enterprise of art education spanning many and varied aspects of the field of art education. What is immediately apparent is that there is an overall agreement as to an
acceptable framework for the business of instruction in the visual arts. Such a consensus, it is submitted, is due to the very conceptual structure underlying the discipline of art education, which structure appears to supplant the individual, regional and national biases which one might expect to influence the formulation of policy for instruction in the visual arts, in such an ethnically, economically and regionally diverse country as Canada.

It seems apparent that in its consideration of the educational boundaries for instruction in the visual arts this panel has maintained a high degree of consistency with regard to the identification of concerns, actions, and avenues of further study. The panelists' responses reflect their collective orientation to the current international mainstream of art education. This gratifying result is somewhat predictable for according to MacGregor (1984) "our ideas are a product of British as well as American ways of thinking" (p. 15). Given the structure of art education it seems reasonable that the policy objectives reported by the Canadian art educators are consistent with the current principles being advanced by the profession as a highly coherent international discipline.

Study Panel's Policy Position

Macro-policy as defined in Chapter Two is one which addresses the policy and/or policy positions which are considered to be level one documents, and/or discussion papers which recommend standards, and/or changes which are widely apprehended to be improvements to the teaching
of art within the schools, but which necessarily do not provide specific instruction as to how these objectives should be implemented. This level of policy, then, is intended to operate as a guide for the development of micro-, or level two, policy which is devised to meet regional, local and individual needs.

The study's respondents have indeed identified and indicated agreement on policy statements which can be summarized into a macro-policy position for Canadian art education.

It is submitted that from the panel's final inventory of policy positions there emerges a very clear prototype of Canadian art education policy which one might outline as follows:

Curriculum Policy Items

1. **Art should be available in all schools at all levels**

   The availability of instruction in the arts was viewed consistently by the study's respondents as being an essential component of the general or core curriculum. Art courses providing a regulated sequence of instruction for all elementary level students followed by secondary school instruction timetabled so as not to conflict with required subjects, is fundamental to a wholesome education.

2. **Requirements for high school graduation should include at least one art course**

   Again this point is made in defense of those students who have expressed their frustration with timetables which relegate elective
subjects such as art to unfavourable positions, thereby making them difficult or impossible to fit into a graduating student's schedule. It was felt further that absent at least one course in the arts graduating seniors would be left wanting in their basic education and certainly unprepared for post-secondary instruction in the arts. It is the existence of such a course which panel members held to be crucial. The actual content of the course, so long as it surveys at least one of the areas of studio production, art criticism or art history, is perceived as being of secondary importance inasmuch as an acquaintance with any one of these areas would function as a stimulus to the students' future interest in the subject.

3. Curriculum must be formulated from theoretically sound, ongoing research in the field of art education

This statement recognizes the necessity for instructional materials to be continually updated by the ceaseless instruction of current theory. The process of translating this theory into practical application by the classroom teacher needs to be an ongoing process if we are to ensure that students are receiving the best possible instruction in the visual arts.

4. Instructional objectives must be formulated for all levels of teaching—elementary, secondary and post-secondary

Much curriculum development in the visual arts was viewed by the panel as being carried out in a fragmented fashion and therefore resulted in lack of continuity throughout the system as well as in specific areas of growth. Effective visual arts instruction is the
result of well articulated, planned, and sequential learning opportunities and for lessons with expanding content based on accumulated knowledge which is a direct result of such a policy.

5. **A comprehensive set of teaching objectives should be defined**

   There is a widespread agreement among the panel members in general terms as to what should be taught under the rubric of art education. This is reflected in the fact that this objective was deemed to be not only important and highly urgent but feasible as well.

6. **The formulation of curricula should derive from a common core of learning, one which includes instruction in studio production, art criticism and art history**

   This statement clearly echoes the current sentiments of the field insofar as it recognizes the potential richness of instruction when drawing upon these three areas of study.

7. **Canadian art education curriculum should include national, regional, and local content**

   One imagines that such content would be formulated and implemented at the local and regional levels in the form of individual units of instruction which would reflect the municipal suitability of any given art program and which could take advantage of locally available teaching resources.
8. Curriculum materials must be written by qualified specialists in the field of art education

Developing a quality program in the visual arts depends upon the expertise of the qualified personnel involved. The panel identified this objective as essential as well as listing preservice education, careful selection of adequately prepared classroom teachers, consultants, and specialists as being necessary for the development and for the continued re-evaluation of quality programs in the visual arts.

9. Instruction should be carried out by qualified teachers of art

Once again this statement highlights the need for committees to be informed and qualified when formulating instructional materials and the requirement for competent and informed pedagogy by properly prepared individuals with sufficient training in the instruction of the visual arts. This statement reflects the current lack of qualified specialists at the elementary level and the unfortunate deficiencies in the formal training of teachers who are presently engaged in such instruction.

10. Teacher education in the form of preservice and inservice training should be made available for all teachers

This policy statement recognizes the crucial position of the teacher in the implementation of new materials. Without proper training and continued inservice training the gap between theory and the actual practice can only widen.
Advocacy Policy Approaches

In addition to the policy positions of instruction listed by the panel members, advocacy approaches in support of the policy model were formulated. Identified as essential are:

1. The need to formulate provincial and regional documents which clearly state the national policy position for art education

The utility of a document which could be employed as a position paper when regional and local districts are facing budgetary distress and as an important checklist for curriculum committees faced with the task of constructing new instructional materials was indicated by the panel as a real need.

2. The formulation of policy should have the input from a number of groups directly and indirectly involved in implementation

The implementation of a comprehensive program in the arts requires a common understanding of and commitment to the goals and objectives of art education throughout the system. The panel indicated a need for a network of regional and provincial co-operation as being essential to the effective delivery of quality programs in the visual arts.

3. Support must be secured for art programs from principals, administrators and teachers

Both statements 2 and 3 identify those persons most pivotal in the process of policy implementation whose involvement from the onset of
4. Community arts groups, parent groups, and business and service clubs should be enlisted to support art at a local level as well as to promote art instruction as an integral part of school programs. It was seen as an essential aspect of any advocacy effort that those persons interested in the advancement of the visual arts in the school should be encouraged to participate in an active role and work co-operatively towards the improvement and implementation of quality programs in the arts for all students in the schools.

5. Making the public aware of programs in the arts through public education which includes exhibitions, public lectures and advocacy publication is an important way to enhance art education's image. A higher public profile for the arts it is believed would result in a better understanding of the arts and would ultimately result in more complete funding.

6. The need for a strong central office for the Canadian Society for Education Through the Arts, one which would be operational year round. Such an establishment would provide the year round support needed from our national organization as well as performing an active role in carrying the burden of advocacy across the country.
7. Although there is no federal office of education in Canada, organizing political support for art education at the federal as well as the provincial level of government is important.

This concern was fortified by the statement that "legislation provides stability." The thoroughgoing support for this statement is indicative of the need for art educators to work together in the promotion of the visual arts. This type of organization whether it occurs on a local, regional or national level is viewed as being as essential for the implementation of the aforementioned national policy inventory as it will be for the continued formulation and implementation of future policies in the visual arts.

**Discussion**

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary defines policy as:

a definite course or method of action selected from among alternatives and in light of given conditions to guide and determine present and further decisions (1981, p. 882).

The design of policy is, according to Smith (1978), formulated to regulate or to systematize activities in order to bring about the state of affairs which underlies the policies' purpose.

When comparing the cross-provincial policy objectives with the macro policy positions discussed in Chapter Two, it can be readily observed that, save for those policy items which possess a regional, local, or national focus, they parallel those listed by the National Art Education Association (NAEA), the Ontario Ministry of Education and the California Framework of Art Education.
For purposes of comparison the 1985 policy statement issued by the NAEA entitled *Quality Art Education: Goals for Schools* will be the policy statement under consideration. It is set out in Chapter Two of this paper.

The principal tenets of the NAEA statement are all listed both by the Ontario discussion paper and by the panel in its final inventory as being essential. They all include a requirement for art to be taught in the elementary level grades. The NAEA statement asserts the requirement for a balanced program, sequential in scope which includes the study of aesthetics as well as the study panel's recommended art criticism, art history and a studio offering. The Ontario policy statement makes no mention of content areas for instruction in the visual arts, but does view a comprehensive program as one which requires a common understanding of, and a commitment to, the goals of art education throughout the system.

The need for qualified teachers of art was once again identified as being essential in policy formulation for the visual arts. The panel members in their comments agreed with the Ontario statement which included a renewed commitment to quality instruction in elementary and secondary instruction. Both documents declared to be crucial the further upgrading of teacher education institutions, school boards, school staffs, teachers organizations, and provincial departments of education in order that educational programs in the arts might be enhanced.

Visual arts courses in junior and senior high schools were found to be desirable requirements for graduation which ought to be viewed as
basic core curriculum courses which must be made available in time slots which would make them accessible to all students.

The panel's list was congruent with the Ontario and California Framework in its statement recognizing the necessity for instructional materials to be continually updated in order that curriculum might be formulated from theoretically sound ongoing research in the field of art education. All policy statement discussed in the review of the literature above agree with the panel's position that teachers need and request professional development.

Just as there is no one way to define the nature of art, there is no one approach to developing an art curriculum. The inventory of objectives produced by the panel members supports this opinion inasmuch as this list is intended to supply a much needed guide for curricular development, one which is sufficiently open-ended to allow for particular age or grade levels, individual experiences and a multitude of settings and needs. This study indicates that there is a consensus in the field that there are policies which define the field, and that these policies provide a wide scope and allow for a desired and desirable flexibility, enough flexibility it would seem to offer sound footing for the formulation of provincial, local, and individual instruction within the context of the discipline.

In summary then, under the initial headings of Curriculum Concerns, Research Items and Advocacy Approaches, the respondents have identified desirable subject areas, asserted the need for qualified instruction at all levels of teaching, declared to be imperative the requirements of instructional materials developed by professionals whose training is
specific to the task, affirmed the overriding need for preservice and inservice training for teachers, and recommended that art be required at the elementary level with at least one high school course being required for university entrance.

The panel also targeted important individuals in the chain of command who would benefit from additional information and further training in the arts, and advocated a continuous updating of instructional materials and better communication between those responsible for curriculum development and the teachers charged with implementing and evaluating curriculum. An awareness of the need for higher political profile for art education is reflected in the panel's support for a national policy statement which would furnish a unified and unifying document for the purpose of advocacy. Voiced with this national resonance was the suggestion that the production of like documents for regional and local use is highly desirable.

Kerr (1978) opines that a viable and salutary policy should possess the following:

1. The desirability proposition: The goal of policy is desirable.
2. The effectiveness proposition: The means are likely to achieve the goal.
3. The justness proposition: The means are just.
4. Tolerability proposition: The side effects of the means are tolerable. In other words, a policy should not only be effective but must also be just and its effect tolerable.

The policy goals and objectives elicited by the study panel can be readily accepted as fulfilling the above criteria. The policy objectives grouped under the rubric of curriculum are goals which well
from the very matrix of the discipline of art education—the hearty offspring of the current conversation and the accepted practice of the field. It is further submitted that such policies clearly define and solidly grounded can not help but be effective in elevating the delivery of knowledge in an instructional setting. The panel has responded to the venue, that of the schools, in conceiving those policies which would be the most fruitful for the advancement of the visual arts. To this end it can be concluded that such policy positions for the visual arts in the Canadian schools are just, tolerable and highly desirable.

Implications

Delphi Method

In several ways, the Delphi method proved itself an appropriate tool for policy analysis. It provided a non-threatening environment in which to explore complex policy issues. It allowed a thorough means of eliciting informal judgments on a particular topic unlikely to be handled in such depth in the context of face to face meetings. It used the time of the geographically dispersed panelists efficiently. The major limitation of the Delphi method in its present format is that it becomes physically unwieldy when the respondent panel exceeds about 25 persons. The data generated were of substantial bulk and the collation of information was a lengthy process. Used as a supporting methodology in conjunction with other methodologies, more specifically analysis techniques, it would seem that the effectiveness of the Delphi will in future be enhanced through the use of computer systems. As computers
become more adept at verbal content analysis, the feasibility of computer conferencing will be enhanced through the use of the Delphi.

Implications for Art Education

An understanding of the interrelationship among the educational bureaucracies at work across the country is fundamental to a comprehension of both the decision-making and the scholarship which is being carried out in the field of education at any given point in time (Wirt, 1976).

This study, it is suggested, substantiates three propositions: first, that the creation of a national inventory of policy objectives for the visual arts in Canada could provide the provinces with a well articulated philosophy for Canadian art education; second, that such an inventory, to which the provinces could attach specific supplements, would enhance the function of advocacy for arts education before school boards and educational administrators; and finally, that such a nation-wide policy manifesto would suscitate a conceptual facility for continuing communication and for expanding the relationship between visual arts policy decision-makers across the country.

"In times of stress, when educational goals and practices are questioned, there is an accentuated need for educators to examine and justify the enterprise in which they are engaged" (Day, 1972, p. 1).

It is clear that such large scale social mandates are the job of the federal, provincial and local policy makers. This study canvassed those involved in the formulation of educational policy in the visual arts for Canada in an effort to identify the policy objectives which inform the
instruction of art education in Canada. In contemplating the energy and effort expended to realize any of the objectives mentioned in Chapter Two, whether considering the broad aims of educational policy, the position papers published by the NAEA, or the policy factors put forth by panel members in this study, two specific questions come to mind: (a) of what value are these enumerations of broad aims, and (b) what forces really influence the schools and instruction in the arts.

It is immediately obvious that in order for educational goals to have effect, the goals must reach the student, which means it is ultimately up to the individual teacher to implement these goals.

Does the publication of these educational objectives affect the teacher in the classroom? Probably not as much as one would like. When a prominent group such as the NAEA or one of its subgroups voices a set of objectives for instruction in the visual arts, it is assumed by most local educators that these 'experts' have researched the problem and speak from a position of authority. The authoritative knowledge, however, comes from the pooling of a variety of ideas, and the objectives thus generated are, of necessity, general guidelines suitable for use by almost all visual arts instructors in classrooms across the country. It has not been the intention of any of the national organizations, nor has it been the intention of this study, to prescribe instructional objectives for any particular school district because of the awareness of the wide variety of needs which exist. It is the task of the individual school districts and teachers to focus on the precise educational manifestations of broad national statements of policy objectives.
Much of the potential to respond to local needs rests, as we have observed, with the provincial Departments of Education. These bodies, as we have discussed earlier, possess the financial resources, the staff, the public visibility, and the legislative authority to set the pace. However, there must be a recognition that the implementation of these policies involves a skein of human interaction not controllable by those at a distance from the educational front lines. The policy makers, with their control of the structure of the educational institutions and their influence upon the relationship between the institutions and wider society, determine the limits of these responses. A tension arises between the mandate, the policy or new materials directed to be implemented, and the social reality faced by the teacher in the classroom. Policy makers must provide support, encouragement and conditions which are sufficiently flexible to aid in policy implementation in the individual schools.

Finally it can be stated that there must be continued communication among ministries, school boards, faculties of education and teachers' associations, to develop a more complete understanding of the validity and of the needs of art education in order to formulate coordinated strategies to serve those needs.
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APPENDIX A

Round One Study Materials
This letter is to request your participation in a Canada-wide study which seeks to identify the national characteristics of policy in art education. Your name was submitted because of your visibility in the Canadian art education. You may be assured that your responses will be kept in confidence at all times.

The Delphi technique used in this study was chosen as the research method because of the advantages it offers, considering the distance, cost, and the equality of response, and the desirability of maintaining an anonymity of item authorship.

The study is being conducted as a partial fulfillment of my doctoral studies at The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. The prospect of such a study has been greeted with a high level of enthusiasm from the members of my Committee as well as from the Canadian educators with whom it has been discussed.

The study will consist of three major rounds of questionnaires which will be circulated at intervals between now and December 1985, each successive round building on the information gained from the previous one. Between each round you may contact me for clarification, or amplification of your responses.

At the conclusion of the study you will receive a summary document which I hope will contribute to future planning and policy making in the visual arts. A follow-up working meeting is planned and will be held at the University of British Columbia campus in conjunction with the July 1986 CSEA/USEA conference. In addition the data collected in this study will be reported and made available to planning committees across the country upon request.

Please complete and return the Personal Data Sheet and a copy of the Round 1 questionnaire. The working copy is for your files. A self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

As preparations for the Round 2 questionnaire cannot be commenced until all of the Round 1 questionnaires are returned, please observe the deadline of November 15, 1985.

As the questions require some reflection, please give yourself ample time to respond. If you wish to discuss the questionnaire, I can be reached at (604) 422-7183 during the days or (604) 267-3211 in the evenings.

Thank you for your participation. I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours truly,

Laurie Rae Baxter
Doctoral Candidate
WHAT IS A POLICY DELPHI STUDY?

It is perhaps more appropriate to establish what a policy Delphi is not. It is not a one shot questionnaire completed quickly and returned, nor does it operate as a polling device. It is not a substitute for quantitative studies, committee work or decision making. It is however, a customized structure that facilitates the exchange of ideas, and encourages in-depth thinking, and provides for the exploration of a specific policy area. The panel is comprised of hand-picked experts who respond to rounds of questionnaires relating to a given topic until the group's opinions and attitudes emerge and some discussion has taken place on the policy options presented. Although a policy Delphi study takes a slightly different form with each application the following steps are usually present:

1. Formulate issues
2. Expose options
3. Determine initial positions on issues
4. Explore reasons for disagreement
5. Reevaluate positions
6. Pursue implications

As a panel member you may:

1. Express short responses to all issues about which you feel confident

2. Restate and answer a question if you feel the original was misleading

3. Consult information sources normally available to you in order to respond to particular questions so long as your response remains that of an individual

4. Choose not to answer a question if you are not confident about your response

5. Comment on the questionnaire design and make suggestions for change.

6. Question the summary of responses if you feel the interpretation is incorrect

7. Contact me for clarification of your task
Background:
The purpose of this Delphi study is to obtain your expertise. The intended outcome of this process is to identify strategies that may have a positive impact on educational policy and decision making in Canadian art education in the areas of:

1. Curriculum
2. Advocacy
3. Research

INSTRUCTIONS

The attached questionnaire has been divided into these three major categories. The categories merely provide a framework for your reflections. Feel free to add additional categories. Please respond to the questionnaire by identifying factors that you consider influential in determining the direction of Canadian art education. Space has been provided for three responses but this is simply a guideline. You may wish to suggest fewer or more than three items.
Cross Provincial Examination of Policy in Art Education in Canada

PERSONAL DATA SHEET

Name ____________________________
Mailing Address ______________________________________
Postal Code
Telephone (days) ___________________ (evenings) ________________________
Name of Assistant/Secretary ___________________________
Periods of absence from your office for more than 5 consecutive days during the period of October 25 and December 20 1985: _______________________
Age ___________________ Sex __________________________
Educational background __________________________________
Area of specialization ___________________________
Current position _______________________________________
Length of time in position ________________________________
Former position ________________________________________
Length of time in previous position _______________________
Total number of years involved in education in the arts __________
Have you ever participated in a Delphi survey ______________
If yes when ______________________ research title ____________
1. CURRICULUM

Please identify curriculum strategies, actions, or positions that are of importance when formulating Canadian art education policy.

Curriculum concern 1:

Reason for importance:

Curriculum concern 2:

Reason for importance:

Curriculum concern 3:

Reason for importance:
2. ADVOCACY

Advocacy is concerned with communicating the value and importance of art education. Please identify approaches to advocacy that are important for promoting Canadian art education.

**Advocacy approach 1:**

Reason for importance:

**Advocacy approach 2:**

Reason for importance:

**Advocacy approach 3:**

Reason for importance:
3. RESEARCH

Please specify research topics that may be influential in determining the direction of Canadian art education.

**Research topic 1:**

Reason for importance:

**Research topic 2:**

Reason for importance:

**Research topic 3:**

Reason for importance:
APPENDIX B

Round Two Study Materials
The quality of responses in Round 2 has resulted in a very informative document for the final round of this Delphi study of national policy in Canadian art education.

This last phase of the Delphi survey asks that you review the results of all participants and then respond by ranking the importance of each item.

A word about the construction of the Round 2 questionnaire... Duplicate responses have been summarized into one statement. Although this second questionnaire appears somewhat lengthy, it has been field tested as taking approximately thirty minutes to complete. Please consult the instruction sheet in the questionnaire for complete details.

I would appreciate your returning the completed questionnaire to me by December 18, 1985.

Thank you for your continued cooperation. I am looking forward to your responses. A final report will be sent to you as soon as it is available.

Yours truly,

Laurie Rae Baxter
Doctoral Candidate

Phone: (604) 422-7183 daytime
      or (604) 267-3211 evenings
INSTRUCTION FOR ROUND 11

1. Consider each item and the reasons given for its importance. These reasons have been suggested by you and your colleagues and do not represent the only reasons for the item's importance, nor are they always the most important ones. However, at least one participant felt that each reason was a good argument in favour of the item's importance.

2. Rate each item for importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unimportant</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Circle the answer of your choice. Please provide any additional comments you feel to be relevant.

3. The questionnaire has been field tested as taking approximately thirty minutes to complete.

4. Please return your completed questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope provided; no later than December 18, 1985. An additional copy of the questionnaire is included in the package for your files.

Thank you once again for your continued participation.
Concern:
Teacher education — preservice and inservice.

Reason for importance:
Typically, our teachers have not had a solid exposure to the fine arts in public school or university.

Concern:
A comprehensive set of teaching objectives should be defined. These objectives should cover all fundamental components of an art education program (i.e. seeing, knowing, thinking, expressing, doing).

Concern:
The objectives should be sequential.

Concern:
The objectives should be formulated to include all levels of teaching — elementary, secondary and post secondary instruction.

Reason for importance:
Such a guide will facilitate teacher planning. It will also aid teachers in defending their program or demanding support to improve and inadequate program. Such a guide will help eliminate both gaps and redundancies in a student's art education.
**SCALE OF IMPORTANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unimportant</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CURRICULUM CONCERNS:**

**Concern:**
It is important to ensure that those who seek entry to art schools, universities and other post-secondary institutions have covered equivalent ranges of art learning experiences and have assimilated a similar body of content.

**Reason for Importance:**
Current practices of portfolio examination and scrutiny of individual programs and the general atmosphere of ad hoc-ery that governs admission neither builds confidence in applicants nor permits establishment of baselines for first year higher education courses.

**Concern:**
Curriculum statements must be implementable and not simply rhetoric. There should be little if any discrepancy between the ideal, official, formal curriculum and the *experienced* curriculum.

**Reason for Importance:**
Curriculum must be implementable.

**Concern:**
There should be a national art education curriculum for Canada.

**Reason for Importance:**
One that is flexible enough to allow for provincial and regional differences.
CURRICULUM CONCERNS:

Concern: The national art education curriculum should include a global content.
Reason for importance: Canada is part of a larger whole—the world—this should be reflected in the curriculum.

Concern: Coherence. It is important to adopt a format that will ensure a common core of learnings (typically, productive, historical, critical) while allowing individual schools opportunity to capitalize on strengths or special facilities to extend that common base.
Reason for importance: Numbers of art teachers have tended to use the individualistic nature of artistic production to justify programs built around their own ideas of what is best for students. The results have been uneven and sometimes downright whimsical. The three areas noted above offer a common and commonsense focus for every art program, since they are based on a spectrum of art activities.

Concern: Curriculum guidelines should allow for a great deal of teacher flexibility.
Curriculum Concerns:

Reason for importance:
Teachers need to adapt their programs to a variety of conditions. Those conditions include the needs, skills, and interests of the students; the expertise and interests of the teacher; the particular cultural environment; the dynamic nature of art.

Concern:
Status of art courses for high school graduation.

Reason for importance:
Courses in art must carry credit for university entrance (in all provinces).

Concern:
Ensure that all guidelines for instruction in art education are written by qualified specialists in the field of art education.

Reason for importance:
Many decisions on the structure of art education and what is taught are made by professional organizations not necessarily comprised of qualified art educators.

Concern:
Art is an important part of all cultural life. This must be reflected in curriculum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE OF IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CURRICULUM CONCERNS:**

**Reason for importance:**
If the arts are to be perceived as an important part of the curriculum we need curricula which stress the **why** of the arts.

**Concern:**
National, local and regional content.

**Reason for importance:**
Art courses at all levels should include Canadian and regional content.

**Concern:**
Availability of art in schools.

**Reason for importance:**
Art must be a core subject in all elementary schools and available to all secondary students in all provinces.

**Concern:**
It is important to expose students to at least three dimensions of art experiences in the course of their school careers: technical, expressive, and sociocultural.
CURRICULUM CONCERNS:

Reason for importance:
The three dimensions noted are individually distinct, but material from each can be applied to enhance learning in each of the others. Technical and expressive modes have a long history in art education; sociocultural learnings that consider art as strategy for dealing with current problems, or that provide means to reflect on aspects of society, are recent additions to the curriculum.

Concern:
Although the guides must be flexible, they must also cater to the non-specialist. Proposed teaching strategies should be optional but explicit. They should also be concise, jargon free, and accompanied by an articulated purpose.

Reason for importance:
Many elementary art teachers have little or no art education background. Thus we either work to improve their programs, or we retrench and fight for art specialists in the schools.

Concern:
Reference the program to environment/consumption and to historical/analytical, as well as performance/production.

Reason for importance:
Seeking to develop a well balanced program with value for all students.
SC A L E  O F  I M P O R T A N C E
unimportant unimportant very important
1 2 3 4 5

CURRICULUM CONCERNS:

Concern:
Input from a number of groups directly and indirectly involved in implementing educational policy.

Reason for importance:
Input into policy formulation assures a sense of ownership and a greater chance of involvement in implementation of policy. It can also be a recognition that educational policy is often greatly enhanced or impeded by other than the experts who traditionally formulate arts education policy—i.e.—others such as parents, administrators, etc.

Concern:
Awareness of implementation and change theory.

Reason for importance:
An awareness, form the start of the factors which bring about change, of where that change actually takes place and under what condition—should be apart of policy formulation and communication.

Concern:
Integrated arts programs for elementary and secondary level instruction.

Reason for importance:
The arts can be better served in terms of time, cost and scope if they are part of an integrated program.
SCALE OF IMPORTANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unimportant</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CURRICULUM CONCERNS:

Concern:
Visual literacy.

Reason for importance:
Stress artistic literacy rather than artist training for elementary and secondary schools.

Concern:
Courses leading to certification for school principals (elementary and secondary) should contain a mandatory component in art education.

Reason for importance:
Often decisions on staffing, budgets etc., are made mainly if not exclusively by the principal. Candidates for principals qualification usually have minimal formal background in the arts.

Concern:
Direction -- coordination

Reason for importance:
Someone with some sense of the process must synthesize and summarize, always keeping the agreed goals in mind or the resulting policy will be a compromise that says little and that no one is really happy about.
**Curriculum Concerns:**

**Concern:**
Develop and use a national/provincial art testing/assessment instrument.

**Reason for importance:**
Canadian art education would be improved by developing provincial and or national standards of student performance.

**Concern:**
Support teaching all three domains — studio, art history, art criticism.

**Reason for importance:**
Teaching art history and art criticism as well as studio will help heal the split between intuition and analysis.
 SCALE OF IMPORTANCE

unimportant  important  very important

1 2 3 4 5

RESEARCH TOPICS:

Concern:
Curriculum and instructional strategies for teaching and reinforcing arts concepts and skills in other courses and areas of school programs.

Reason for importance:
If arts education is to become entrenched in school programs, it seems that it must thrive in more than the art or music classroom.

Concern:
Studies that deal with the translation of theory in practice ought to be undertaken across the country. Particularly useful are those that employ case study and participant/observer methods.

Reason for importance:
It is particularly important in establishing national policy to keep in mind what is feasible and what may be expected in terms of adherence to the policy at a local level. The difficulties experienced by classroom teachers in translating policy into practice.

Concern:
Meta-studies dealing with the socio-cultural-political orientation.

Reason for importance:
There is a need to look at this whole direction reflected by social concern.
RESEARCH TOPICS:

Concern: Connections should be made with relevant non-art education researchers and research organizations.

Reason for importance: A more indepth investigation for art education researchers.

Concern: Links between learning in the arts and cognitive/affective development.

Reason for importance: For years we have justified the role of the arts in education by looking for improvements in other more established subject areas — reading, social studies — we must be more definitive about what constitutes good.

Concern: History of art education — local, provincial, national: including the roles of professional associations in art and art education.

Reason for importance: Very little has been done yet, on the remarkable body of existing material.
# Scale of Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unimportant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Research Topics:

### Concern:
Studies of the kind exemplified in this document are prerequisite for the articulation of national policy.

### Reason for importance:
Given the diverse nature of settlement and external political influences in Canadian education generally, the need to establish the nature of grounds on which consensual agreement may be attempted is a first step toward a national programs.

### Concern:
Facilitate information exchanges and joint projects amongst art education researchers. For example, the number of Canadian art education researchers is small enough that an annual compendium could be published.

### Reason for importance:
If the research is important in itself then increased cooperation will be beneficial.

### Concern:
Study of implementation methods for new curriculum documents and support materials.

### Reason for importance:
Improvement of delivery.
RESEARCH TOPICS:

Concern:
A comparative study of program implementation, teacher education one that would examine the methods through which art education practices can be improved.

Reason for importance:
If we want to improve art education in Canada, what are the best methods through which this can be achieved?

Concern:
Art appreciation - specifically methodologies.

Reason for importance:
Numerous rationales and models presently exist - however, many need simplifying or developing to make them understandable and operationally effective for use in the classroom setting.

Concern:
Survey provincial curriculum guides looking for patterns, trends and relative importance given to various expected learning outcomes.

Reason for importance:
Indication of what might be considered either new or persisting concerns in Canadian art education.
RESEARCH TOPICS:

Concern:
Identify relative contributions of studio and history and criticism components at various school levels in various provinces.

Reason for importance:
Aspects such as this reveal policy thinking re-place and nature of art in local education. There is evidence that the history/criticism component is gaining a higher profile in recently revised curricula.

Concern:
Study teacher attitude toward new curriculum materials and relate change or lack thereof in classroom practice.

Reason for importance:
More effective implementation.

Concern:
Survey published writings and thesis in art education by Canadiana 1980-1985

Reason for importance:
Indication of what might be considered either new or persisting concerns in Canadian art education.
RESEARCH TOPICS:

Concern:
Effectiveness of in-service and professional development sessions and the relationship to classroom practices.

Reason for importance:
Findings could assist in the improvement in the delivery of in-service.

Concern:
A description of current practice in art education in Canada - philosophy/content/methodology etc.

Reason for importance:
To determine similarities and differences in current programs. Is there anything unique about Canadian art education?

Concern:
Collect programs from provincial and national conferences. Look for patterns and trends in presentations over 5 years.

Reason for importance:
Indication of what might be considered either new or persisting concerns in Canadian art education.
SCALe OF IMPorTANCE

unimportant | important | very important

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

RESEARCH TOPICS:

Concern:
Visualization as a component in thinking.

Reason for Importance:
Much of our knowledge is transmitted by spoken or written word. Yet a number of people report thinking in images which do not necessarily have verbal equivalents. A study of how to identify and maximize this type of learning would have important consequences for art education.

Concern:
Design of inter/multi-disciplinary arts programs (aesthetic education).

Reason for Importance:
Reference to teacher readiness and education, defining essential learning and implementation strategies.

Concern:
Anthropological, historical, philosophical, psychological, and sociological aspects of art education.

Reason for Importance:
This is broad, but all these things relate to education (all education, not just art education). They help us understand where we are coming from, how and why we are, where we are, where we should be going and why, and how we might get there.
ADVOCACY APPROACHES

Concern:
In addition to working with our friends and winning over the uncommitted, we should meet our enemies head on.

Reason for importance:
If we have a worthwhile art program, then those who work to weaken the program should be put on the defensive. Art educators might as well stand tall. It's better than getting sore knees.

Concern:
Visual arts must keep high profile within teacher-education institutions (through exhibitions, public lectures, participation in internal and external committees and projects, etc.).

Reason for importance:
Tomorrow's education administrators are spawned in these institutions, and their attitudes toward arts education will be influenced by such contacts.

Concern:
Communicate clearly, simply, and with everyday language. Illustrate from programs in action.

Reason for importance:
Jargon, verbosity, cliches, abstractions alienate rather than convince.
### ADVOCACY APPROACHES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern:</th>
<th>Regular formal presentation of common arts - sector concerns and aspirations to public decision - making.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reason for importance:</td>
<td>Demonstrating a serious systematic view of arts in education which speaks for various disciplines and roles is more influential than isolated reactive outbursts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern:</th>
<th>Unity within the Fine Art sector must be evident to the public.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reason for importance:</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary and inter-role (teachers, professors, artists, etc.) rivalry and contention easily destroys and other advocacy efforts directed to the public or decision makers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern:</th>
<th>Advocate by doing what is being advocated.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reason for importance:</td>
<td>To often advocates for the arts in education talk about the value of the arts in education - but run their tired old programs - rather than convince others through exemplary programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADVOCCACY APPROACHES

Concern:
Arts producers/performers target key decision-makers, to help them become literate consumers in their personal lives.

Reason for importance:
Few public decision-makers can fully separate their own values from their public decisions.

Concern:
A strong central office for the C.S.E.A. is need.
This implies a number of things: a) a more organized central executive—more politically aware and able to meet more than twice per year. b) a central office employing a secretary c) a regular newsletter d) a journal that has relevance to classroom art specialist, but one that bridges the school arts and research journal styles. e) several research journals a year.

Reason for importance:
The above are important for a number of reasons:
a) a more organized executive would be a able to apply for funding through grants and other government monies. b) a central office would streamline com-
ADVOCACY APPROACHES

continued...

muications and subsequently affect c,d,e, making sure these tasks are met and disseminated across Canada.

A strong central executive ought to be able to develop national policies and communicate those policies to the various regions. Further, more regular communication with the provincial affiliate associations would strengthen the CSEA as a whole. Vehicles for this type of communication need to be conceived and carried out.

Concern:
Although there is no Federal Office of Education in Canada, organizing political support for art education at the federal as well as the provincial level is important. Legislation provides stability.

Reason for importance:
Some provinces do not have a minister directly responsible for Cultural Affairs; a number do not have a post within the Ministry of Education occupied by a Fine Arts Specialist. It is crucial that whatever channels exist be exploited, since visibility brings material advantages.

Concern:
Advocacy is tied to curriculum. A theoretically sound rationale for art education should be formulated. Comprehensive programs which dovetail with the rational should be developed. The rational and the resulting programs should be propagated.
ADVOCACY APPROACHES

Reason for importance:
Support for art education should not be based on blind faith. A worthwhile program is the only program worth advocating.

Concern:
A national policy will be of great value as will provincial and regional documents. "If they are disseminated efficiently and consistently.

Reason for importance:
Often the people with ideas are not able to articulate them, such a policy would be a valuable tool for advocacy.

Concern:
A sound storehouse of literature — basic publication in art education. Such as — pamphlets, research, curriculum materials.

Reason for importance:
Our credibility must not be undermined by poorly presented and insubstantial publications.

Concern:
Know your audience (refer to principles of advertising).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE OF IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADVOCACY APPROACHES**

### Reason for importance:
Different types of communication will be needed for different audiences. The advocate must be able to connect in a very concrete way with the intended audience.

### Concern:
Making the public aware of what art programs do. Part of our responsibility is for public education.

### Reason for importance:
Art educators need to interpret and translate what we do in ways that are accessible to society at large. Part of the art teachers' job is to introduce others to the world of art.

### Concern:
Community Art groups, parents groups, and business and service clubs should be enlisted to support art at a local level, as well as to promote its inclusion in school programs across the country.

### Reason for importance:
Grass roots support remains one of the best ways of giving momentum to policies that are ultimately national in scope. The messages given by such support are likely to be attended to by politicians, since they are a reflection of the attitude of the voting constituency.
ADVOCACY APPROACHES

Concern:
Support among principals and administrators must be secured if art programs are to be given equal place with other subjects. This requires two things: gaining the attention of the group and convincing them of the worth of the program in relation to the competing claims of other subjects.

Reason for importance:
Research shows that a principal's attitude can enhance or inhibit a program's place in the curriculum. Many principals have, however, never had a course in art, and remain unimpressed until shown directly that the subject brings concrete benefits to the school.

Concern:
The national voluntary assn. (CSEA) must appoint a public relations officer to develop high profile campaign aimed at general public (press releases, etc.) and national bodies such as Council of Ministers of Education, Canadian Education Assn., Federation of Home and School Assn., etc.: similar P.R. approaches are also urgently needed at provincial level.

Reason for importance:
The national association is often overlooked or rejected by both Provincial and Federal authorities, on the excuse that education is a provincial jurisdiction.
ADVOCACY APPROACHES

Concern:
All art educators and particularly those who have positions of authority and influence must know the systems and hierarchies of command up to the provincial and national levels. These figures must be active and aware/skilled in media work.

Reason for importance:
Advocacy that rests only on the school teacher's in school exhibitions is not advocacy at all. Our problems have in part been due to lack of combined effort.

Concern:
Art educators should join forces with other cultural groups in the promotion of the arts and in the fight against cutbacks.

Reason for importance:
Art education is important because the arts are important. Taking a narrow view which promotes art education to the detriment of other art and cultural concerns is not only opportunist, it is self defeating in the long run.
APPENDIX C

Round Three Study Materials
The original request for your participation in this study of Cross Provincial Policy in Art Education, asked that you respond to two rounds of questionnaires. Frankly, I had not anticipated the degree of consensus already existing, nor the level of interest among the panel members which has resulted in an 80 percent return of the questionnaires. The results from the two previous rounds have provided an inventory of objectives and goals which reflect the concerns of Art Educators from Nova Scotia to British Columbia. I have designed a third round that with your continued co-operation will add the depth desirable when addressing the area of policy in art education in Canada.

The third round is an attenuated version of Round Two. This last round consists of only those concerns in the area of curriculum and advocacy which received a rating of 3 or more on the importance scale. The purely research items have been eliminated from this final round. Issues are evaluated for Round Three according to their desirability, feasibility and urgency.

Please consult the instruction sheet for complete details. I would greatly appreciate your returning the completed questionnaire to me by January 31, 1986. Once again, thank you for your continued assistance. I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours truly,

Laurie Rae Baxter
Doctoral Candidate
INSTRUCTION SHEET FOR ROUND THREE:

This final round asks that you rate the advocacy and curriculum items according to the following three criteria:

(a) Desirability

not desirable desirable most desirable
1 3 5

(b) Feasibility

not feasible feasible most feasible
1 3 5

(c) Urgency

not urgent urgent most urgent
1 3 5

Once again thank you for your continued cooperation. Please return round three by January 31, 1986.
## CURRICULUM CONCERNS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>desirability</th>
<th>feasibility</th>
<th>Urgency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher education -- preservice and inservice.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for importance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typically, our teachers have not had a solid exposure to the fine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arts in public school or university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic: A comprehensive set of teaching objectives should be defined.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These objectives should cover all fundamental components of an art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education program (i.e., seeing, knowing, thinking, expressing, doing).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic: The objectives should be formulated to include all levels of</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching -- elementary, secondary and post secondary instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for importance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Such a guide will facilitate teacher planning. It will also aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers in defending their program or demanding support to improve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an inadequate program. Such a guide will help eliminate both gaps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and redundancies in a student's art education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic: Curriculum statements must be implementable and not simply</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rhetoric. There should be little if any discrepancy between the ideal,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>official, formal curriculum and the experienced curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for importance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum must be implementable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CURRICULUM CONCERNS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>desirability</th>
<th>feasibility</th>
<th>Urgency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There should be a national art education curriculum for Canada.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reason for importance:**
One that is flexible enough to allow for provincial and regional differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>desirability</th>
<th>feasibility</th>
<th>Urgency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coherence. It is important to adopt a format that will ensure a common core of learning (typically productive, historical &amp; critical) while allowing individual schools opportunity to capitalize on strengths or special facilities to extend that common base.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reason for importance:**
Numbers of art teachers have tended to use the individualistic nature of artistic production to justify programs built around their own ideas of what is best for students. The results have been uneven and sometimes downright whimsical. The three areas noted above offer a common and commonsense focus for every art program, since they are based on a spectrum of art activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>desirability</th>
<th>feasibility</th>
<th>Urgency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art is an important part of all cultural life. This must be reflected in curriculum.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reason for importance:**
If the arts are to be perceived as an important part of the curriculum we need curricula which stress the why of the arts.
### Curriculum Concerns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>desirability</th>
<th>feasibility</th>
<th>Urgency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important to expose students to at least three dimensions of art experiences in the course of their school careers: technical, expressive and sociocultural.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for importance:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The three dimensions noted are individually distinct, but material from each can be applied to enhance learning in each of the others. Technical and expressive modes have a long history in art education. Sociocultural learning which considers art as a strategy for dealing with current problems or which provide a means to reflect on aspects of society are recent additions to the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern :</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although the guides must be flexible they must also cater to the non-specialist. Proposed teaching strategies should be optional but explicit. They should also be concise, jargon free and accompanied by an articulated purpose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for importance:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many elementary art teachers have little or no art education background. Hence we either work to improve their programs or we re-trench and fight for art specialists in the schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern :</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input from a number of groups directly and indirectly involved in implementing educational policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 2 3 4 5
## CURRICULUM CONCERNS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for importance:</th>
<th>desirability</th>
<th>feasibility</th>
<th>Urgency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input into policy formulation assures a sense of ownership and a greater chance of involvement in implementation of policy. It can also be a recognition that educational policy is often greatly enhanced or impeded by persons other than the experts who traditionally formulate arts education policy, i.e., parents, administrators, etc.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference the program to environment/consumption and to historical/analytical, as well as performance/production.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for importance:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeking to develop a well balanced program with value for all students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CURRICULUM CONCERNS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>desirability</th>
<th>feasibility</th>
<th>Urgency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National, local and regional content.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for importance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art courses at all levels should include Canadian and regional content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of art in schools.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for importance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art must be a core subject in all elementary schools and available to all secondary students in all provinces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum guidelines should allow for a great deal of teacher flexibility.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for importance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers need to adapt their programs to a variety of conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those conditions include the needs, skills, and interests of the students; the expertise and interests of the teacher; the particular cultural environment; the dynamic nature of art.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of art courses for high school graduation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRICULUM CONCERNS</td>
<td>desirability</td>
<td>feasibility</td>
<td>Urgency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for importance:</strong> Courses in art must carry credit for university entrance in all provinces.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concern:</strong> Ensure that all guidelines for instruction in art education are written by qualified specialists in the field of art education.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for importance:</strong> Many decisions on the structure of art education and what is taught are made by professional organizations not necessarily comprised of qualified art educators.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concern:</strong> Awareness of implementation and change theory.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for importance:</strong> An awareness of the factors which bring about change, of where that change actually takes place and under what conditions, should be a part of policy formulation and communication.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**ADVOCACY APPROACHES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>desirability</th>
<th>feasibility</th>
<th>Urgency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Although there is no Federal Office of Education in Canada, organizing political support for art education at the federal as well as the provincial level is important. Legislation provides stability.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for importance:</strong> Some provinces do not have a minister directly responsible for Cultural Affairs; a number do not have a post within the Ministry of Education occupied by a Fine Arts Specialist. It is crucial that whatever channels exist be exploited, since visibility brings material advantages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate by doing what is being advocated.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for importance:</strong> To often advocates for the arts in education talk about the value of the arts in education - but continue to run their tired aid programs - rather than endeavoring to convince others through exemplary programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support among principals, administrators and teachers must be secured if art programs are to be given equal place with other subjects. This requires two things: gaining the attention of the group, and convincing it of the value of the program in relation to the competing claims of other subjects.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ADVOCACY APPROACHES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for importance:</th>
<th>desirability</th>
<th>feasibility</th>
<th>Urgency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research shows that a principal's attitude can enhance or inhibit a program's place in the curriculum. Many principals have, however, never had a course in art and remain unimpressed until shown directly that the subject brings concrete benefits to the school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy is tied to curriculum. A theoretically sound rational for art education should be formulated. Comprehensive programs which dovetail with the rationale should be developed. The rationale and the resulting programs should be propagated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for importance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for art education should not be based on blind faith. A worthwhile program is the only program worth advocating.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach:</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A national policy will be of great value as will provincial and regional documents if they are disseminated efficiently and consistently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for importance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As often the people with ideas are not able to articulate them, such a policy would be a valuable tool for advocacy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADVOCACY APPROACHES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach:</th>
<th>desirability</th>
<th>feasibility</th>
<th>Urgency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A strong central office for the C.S.E.A. is needed. This implies a number of things: (a) a more organized central executive, more politically aware and able to meet more than twice per year. (b) a central office employing a secretary (c) a regular newsletter (d) a journal which has relevance to classroom art specialist, but one that bridges the school arts and research journals a year.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason for importance:
The above are important for a number of reasons: (a) a more organized executive would be able to apply for funding through grants and other government monies (b) a central office would streamline communications and subsequently affect items c, d, and e, making sure that these are met and are disseminated across Canada. A strong central executive ought to be able to develop national policies and communicate those policies to the various regions. Further and more regular communication with the provincial affiliate associations would strengthen the C.S.E.A. as a whole. Vehicles for this type of communication need to be conceived and carried out.
ADVOCACY APPROACHES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>desirability</th>
<th>feasibility</th>
<th>Urgency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual arts must keep a high profile within teacher-education institutions (through exhibitions, public lectures, participation in internal and external committees and projects).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for importance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomorrow's education administrators are spawned in these institutions, and their attitudes toward arts education will be influenced by such contacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate clearly, simply, and with everyday language. Illustrate from programs in action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for importance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jargon, verbosity, cliches and abstractions alienate rather than convince.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular formal presentation of common arts - sector concerns and aspirations to public decision - making.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for importance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating a serious systematic view of arts in education which speaks for various disciplines and roles is more influential than isolated reactive outbursts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
---

**ADVOCACY APPROACHES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for importance:</th>
<th>desirability</th>
<th>feasibility</th>
<th>Urgency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art education is important because the arts are important. Taking a narrow view which promotes art education to the detriment of other art and cultural concerns is not only opportunist, it is self defeating in the long run.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approach:**

All art educators and particularly those who have positions of authority and influence must know the system and hierarchies of command up to the provincial and national levels. These figures must be active and aware/skilled in media work.

**Reason for importance:**

Advocacy that rests only on the school teachers in school exhibitions is not advocacy at all. Our problems have in part been due to lack of combined effort.

**Approach:**

Know your audience (refer to principles of advertising)

**Reason for importance:**

Different types of communication will be needed by different audiences. The advocate must be able to connect in a very concrete way with the intended audience.

---
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ADVOCACY APPROACHES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>desirability</th>
<th>feasibility</th>
<th>Urgency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making the public aware of what art programs do. Part of our responsibility is public education.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for importance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art educators need to interpret and to translate what we do in ways that are accessible to society-at-large. Part of the art teacher's job is to introduce others to the world of art.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                     |              |             |         |
| **Approach:**       |              |             |         |
| Community art groups, parents' groups, and business and service clubs should be enlisted to support art at a local level as well as to promote its inclusion in school programs across the country. | 1 2 3 4 5   | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| **Reason for importance:** |              |             |         |
| Grass roots support remains on to the best ways of giving momentum to policies which are ultimately national in scope. The messages given by such support are likely to be attended to by politicians since they are a reflection of the attitude of the voting constituency. | 1 2 3 4 5   | 1 2 3 4 5 |         |

|                     |              |             |         |
| **Approach:**       |              |             |         |
| Art educators should join forces with other cultural groups in the promotion of the arts and in the fight against budgetary cutbacks. | 1 2 3 4 5   | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |