

LARRY O'FARRELL
SHIFRA SCHONMANN
ERNST WAGNER
(EDS.)

2 | 2014

International Yearbook
for Research in
ARTS EDUCATION

WAXMANN

Outcome
Concepts
Arts Education
Research
Development
Implementation
Society
Peace Education
Education for Sustainable Development
IMPACT
Mapping
Perspectives
Monitoring
School Parameters
Creative Thinking
Parameters

International Yearbook for Research in Arts Education Volume 2 (2014)

edited by
Larry O'Farrell, Shifra Schonmann and Ernst Wagner



Waxmann 2014
Münster • New York



“The World Summit on Arts Education 2013”
has been supported by the Stiftung Mercator.

Bibliographic information published by die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the
Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic
data is available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>

Print-ISBN 978-3-8309-3003-7

E-Book-ISBN 978-3-8309-8003-2

© Waxmann Verlag GmbH, 2014

www.waxmann.com

info@waxmann.com

Cover: Anne Breitenbach, Tübingen

Typesetting: Stoddart Satz- und Layoutservice, Münster

Print: Express Printing Service, Hong Kong

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without permission in writing from the copyright holder.

Contents

Introduction	9
--------------------	---

Samuel Leong

Polylogue II World Summit on Arts Education 2013: An Overview	12
---	----

Christian Manhart

UNESCO's Present Position towards Arts Education	18
--	----

Evaluation and Monitoring

Shifra Schonmann

On Evaluation	23
---------------------	----

Lode Vermeersch

The Evaluation of Public Policies on Arts Education: Not just 'this-leads-to-that'	29
---	----

Michael Wimmer

Let us be brave! – Towards a Political Contextualisation of Arts Education	36
---	----

Susanne Keuchel

Arts Education Development Index (AEDI) – A Comparative International Empirical Research Approach in Arts Education	42
---	----

Tatiana Fedorova and Liubava Moreva

Arts Education in the CIS Countries: National Reports and Regional Observatory on Promoting Creative Capacities in the XXI Century	52
---	----

Jan Jaap Knol

On the Mapping of Cultural Education in Europe and More	57
---	----

Benedicte Helvad

Monitoring	63
------------------	----

Fianne Konings and Barend van Heusden

Evaluating Partnership, or how to Evaluate the Contribution of Cultural Institutions to an Integrated Curriculum for Culture Education in Primary Schools	66
--	----

Jessy Siongers, Dries Vanherwegen and John Lievens

The Multiple Layers of Arts Education in School	79
---	----

Competencies and Assessment

Ernst Wagner

The Concept of Competencies in Formal and Non-Formal Arts Education – The Perspective of Research	89
--	----

Eckart Liebau

Limitations of the Competence-Approach	93
--	----

<i>Ellen Winner, Thalia R. Goldstein and Stéphan Vincent-Lancrin</i>	
Does Arts Education Foster Creativity? The Evidence so far	95
<i>Robin Pascoe</i>	
Arts Assessment: A Need for Critical Engagement	101
<i>Diederik W. Schönau</i>	
Self-Assessment for Learning in Visual Arts Education	107

Arts Education and Education for Sustainable Development

<i>Samuel Leong and Ernst Wagner</i>	
UNESCO & Arts Education for Sustainable Development – An Introduction.....	113
<i>Yeon-hee Jung</i>	
Expanding Sustainable Thinking through Arts Education.....	116
<i>Gerd Michelsen</i>	
Education for Sustainable Development: Status Quo and Perspectives	121
<i>Ernst Wagner</i>	
Arts Education and Education for Sustainable Development.....	130

Arts Education and Peace Education

<i>Cynthia Cohen</i>	
Linking Arts Education with the Field of Peacebuilding and the Arts	141
<i>Eugène van Erven</i>	
Exploring the Peace Building Potential of Community Arts	146
<i>Wolfgang Dietrich</i>	
Education for the Arts and the Peace“s”	149
<i>Anne Bamford and Matt Qvortrup</i>	
Politics of the Soul: The Contribution of the Arts to Social Cohesion and Peace	152
<i>Peter Harris</i>	
‘Playing’ with ‘Others’ in a ‘Neutral Zone’: <i>Intergroup Contact in the Aesthetic Space</i>	160
<i>Vedat Özsoy</i>	
Arts Education and Violence in Schools.....	164
<i>Mousumi De</i>	
Rethinking UNESCO’s Commitment to Education for Peace and International Understanding through Art: From the Bristol Seminar to the Seoul Agenda	172
<i>Shifra Schonmann</i>	
Arts for Peace Education: False Reflections or a Real Chance for a Change?.....	183

Presentations given at The World Summit on Arts Education, Polylogue II, Wildbad Kreuth/Munich, Germany, May 2013

Nicole Pereira and Ralph Buck

Building Community Well-Being: Global and Local Policy Intersections 191

Nicholas Rowe

What Challenges face Students, Teachers and Researchers of Community Dance, within Cross-Cultural and Cross-Educational Contexts? A Sino-Kiwi Experience 193

Naomi Faik-Simet

Undertaking Research for Dance Education 196

Lily Chen-Hafteck

Educating the Creative Mind Project: Bringing Arts-Based Education to Every Child 198

Andrea Creech

Community Opera in a Centre of Excellence: An Instrumental Case Study 200

Ann Kipling Brown, Susan R. Koff, Jeff Meiners and Charlotte Svendler Nielsen

Dance Learning in Motion: Global Dance Education 203

Susan A. O'Neill

Engagement in the Arts 204

Patricia A. González Moreno

Creating and Fostering Partnerships to enhance Arts Education: Challenges and Opportunities 208

Sergio Figueiredo

Why Advocacy? Music and Arts Education in the Brazilian Context 210

Samia ElSheikh and Mai Nour

Curriculum Development and Change are a Need to the Community in Egypt 214

Galyna P. Shevchenko

Improving the Quality of Artistic Education through Interaction of Different Kinds of Art: The Experience of Ukraine..... 216

Teresa Torres de Eça

Comparangoleiros: A Transnational Arts Education Project 219

An Artist Reflects

Judith Marcuse

An Artist's Odyssey: Adventures in Art and Education..... 225

Contributors..... 233

Introduction

The editors are pleased to introduce the 2014 INRAE Yearbook following the inaugural edition of last year. INRAE (The International Network for Research in Arts Education) was established through a collaboration of UNESCO Chairs and Observatories in the field. The current edition focuses on a number of important issues and opportunities that are becoming increasingly important to arts education.

Many of the articles in this publication originated in presentations that were given at The World Summit on Arts Education, Polylogue II, a conference involving 134 participants from around the world. This event was held at the Wildbad Kreuth conference centre near Munich Germany between May 13 and 17, 2013. It was organized by the World Alliance for Arts Education (WAAE) together with INRAE and the European Network of civil servants working in the field of Arts and Cultural Education (ACEnet). It was hosted by the German Federation for Arts Education and Cultural Learning (BKJ) and the UNESCO Chair in Arts and Culture in Education, Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nuremberg. This event was generously supported by the German Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth, the Hanns Seidel Foundation, the City of Munich and the Mercator Foundation.

The World Summit was organized around three central topics: Evaluating, Mapping/Monitoring and Competencies. The evaluation theme examined the question of quality in curricula, non-formal programs and student achievement with a particular reference to the three goals of the *Seoul Agenda* (access, quality, social dimension). The mapping/monitoring theme provided a transnational perspective on the *Seoul Agenda* with respect to the potential for monitoring the application of this action plan in every country. The theme of artistic and cultural competencies in formal and non-formal arts education was concerned with the shaping and implementation of this concept in curricula in formal education as well as in methods and programs outside of school in non-formal education. These themes are reflected in two of the major divisions of this volume, one of which is Evaluation and Monitoring while another is Competencies and Assessment. A commitment to monitoring implementation of arts education globally is central to the mission of INRAE. Following the World Summit, the organizers collaborated with the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) in Montreal, Canada in the preparation of a workshop on monitoring held in March of 2014 at UIS headquarters and for a subsequent planning meeting hosted by the UNESCO Chair in Arts and Learning at Queen's University in Kingston, Canada.

Participants at the World Summit took the opportunity to discuss current issues that were of increasing importance to the field of arts education. A result of this dialogue was a decision to explore ways in which the work of INRAE could be more closely integrated

into the major programs of UNESCO, notably Education for All, Education for Sustainable Development and Peace Education. With this recommendation in mind, the editors have introduced two other broad divisions in the Yearbook – Education for Sustainable Development and Peace Education. In this context two contributions by UNESCO chairs from these respective fields must be highlighted, the one of the German UNESCO Chair “Higher Education for Sustainable Development” and the other of the Austrian UNESCO Chair for Peace Studies. The theme of Peace Education was extended beyond the World Summit with the development of plans to inaugurate the International Arts for Peace Festival in Hong Kong in May of 2014. Collaborating organizers of this event include the UNESCO Observatory for Local Cultures and Creativity in Education, UNESCO-Hong Kong, UNESCO Chairs in Canada and Germany, the World Alliance for Arts Education and INRAE.

Yet another aspect of the World Summit to affect the structure of this Yearbook was a section of the Summit program entitled Pecha Kucha. It provided an opportunity for participants to present brief overviews of their current work. Several of these presentations were later developed into papers for inclusion in the book. The origin of these contributions, in the Pecha Kucha format, explains why some of the papers in this edition are relatively short. The editors have included these summaries to reflect the diversity of work being done in the field.

The members of INRAE continue to collaborate on advancing the major themes of this Yearbook. The monitoring workshop in Montreal and the launching of the Arts for Peace Festival in Hong Kong are excellent examples of this kind of cooperation. In addition, we are already making plans for the next INRAE Yearbook which will be edited by Dr. Shifra Schonmann, following a unique anthology approach that was pioneered in the preparation of her 2010 publication, *Key concepts in Theatre/Drama Education* and announced in the last chapter of the yearbook’s volume 1.

Editorial Board

Skye Burn, Executive Director, the Flow Project, Bellingham, Washington USA

Andrea Creech, Senior Lecturer in Education, the Institute of Education, London

Samuel Leong, Professor and Associate Dean (Quality Assurance & Enhancement) of the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, The Hong Kong Institute of Education.

Director, UNESCO Observatory for Research in Local Cultures and Creativity in Education

Eckart Liebau, Professor and holder of the UNESCO Chair in Arts and Culture in Education at Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany

Laura McCammon, Professor, Teacher Certification Program Coordinator, School of Theatre, Film & Television, University of Arizona in Tucson

Larry O'Farrell, Professor Emeritus and holder of the UNESCO Chair in Arts and Learning, Queen's University, Canada

Aud Berggraf Saebo, Professor in drama, the University of Stavanger, Norway

Shifra Schonmann, Professor ha'ver, Hanan Bar-Netzer Endowed Chair, Education, Society and Theatre for Young People at the University of Haifa, Israel

Ernst Wagner, UNESCO Chair in Arts and Culture in Education at Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany

Max Wyman, Cultural critic, policy advisor, former President, Canadian Commission for UNESCO

Samuel Leong

Polylogue II World Summit on Arts Education 2013: An Overview

Introduction

The Polylogue II World Summit on Arts Education saw over 130 arts and culture leaders, researchers and practitioners from 40 countries gathered at Munich and Wildbad Kreuth, Germany, May 13-17, 2013¹.

The rich programme kicked off with an evening reception at the historic Town Hall of Munich, followed by visits to arts education institutions and projects in Munich that showcase a great variety of real-world examples of education *in* the arts and education *through* the arts. The gathering moved from Munich to Wildbad Kreuth, where all academic activities were held including opportunities for delegates to share information through Roundtables² and Pecha Kucha³ presentations.

Main Themes

Three main themes were focussed during this world event:

- **Evaluating** what is quality in curricula, non-formal programmes, student's achievement in respect to the three goals of UNESCO's *Seoul Agenda* (access, quality, social dimension).
- **Artistic and Cultural Competencies** in formal and non-formal arts education.
- **Mapping/Monitoring** arts education in a transnational perspective concerning the three goals of UNESCO's *Seoul Agenda* (access, quality, social dimension).

Each theme was addressed by three keynote speakers and the main discussion points of roundtables are summarised below:

Theme 1: Issues Relevant to Evaluating Quality

Use of terminology: Different understandings of terminology can lead to confusion, e.g. assessment and evaluation are sometimes used interchangeably, sometimes understood as distinctly different concepts.

Purpose: Goals, aims and objectives of the programme need to be clear so that they can be evaluated.

- Why are we carrying out the evaluation? reflective practice through feedback, change practice, influence policy, accountability for parents and other stakeholders. Major part of evaluation purpose could be to feed back to teacher training and artists in the community
- What is being evaluated? E.g. classroom effectiveness (behaviour, attainment etc.), should take account of school ethos, quality, space. Evaluation is dependent on many variables so the purpose needs to be clear. Evaluation should also be relevant and useful, contributing to sustainability.

Methods for evaluation: Evaluation tools need to be aligned with purpose and be rigorous.

- Criteria should allow for evaluation of creativity and evaluation needs to be flexible enough to capture unintended learning outcomes.
- Qualitative and quantitative research approaches need to inform criteria for assessment in the arts.
- Multiple approaches are needed and they should consider such as process versus product, different arts disciplines and regions, and the embodied nature of arts learning.
- Who does the evaluation? Students, teachers, researchers, civil servants, community members, internal versus external, peer evaluation, school senior leadership having major stake in the evaluation. Partnership approaches to evaluation and self evaluation are important.

Contextual issues: Transnational evaluation should consider different contexts including socioeconomic factors. A useful approach is to use the global criteria from the *Seoul Agenda* to different countries, regions, and contexts.

- Considerations for teacher education should include: Why arts education is important, what teachers value, and what are the philosophical frameworks?
- For the evaluation of arts education outside formal contexts, considerations should include its purpose, who evaluates what and why.

Recommended Actions to take:

- Evaluation tools should be designed so as to convince a range of government departments of the value of arts education.
- Models of best practice in evaluation should be disseminated more widely, e.g. OECD
- Existing networks such as WAAE should facilitate the sharing of evaluation approaches and comparative studies, development of internationally understood criteria.
- Start to define quality criteria from a transnational perspective, avoiding eurocentric approaches.
- Networks should collaborate to find common ground, speaking with one voice as advocates.

Theme 2: Artistic and Cultural Competencies

Need for new competencies: There was some scepticism, even resentment regarding the need to discuss competencies and what would be gained by such discussions. On the other hand, there is a general consensus on the urgency and necessity for a global change that recognises how the nature of learning and teaching has changed radically under the influence of our globalized, diversified, and digitalized society.

Key issues:

- Notion of competency: A “too Western” approach, the term has been questioned and has its limits. Would be better to focus on the “aims” as a starting point: what children/individuals need to *learn* (curriculum) versus what they need to be *capable of* doing (learning outcomes). Challenge of translating “competencies” to “what a student can do” and relationships and expectations between teachers and students should be considered. To clarify who these competencies are for, we should consider:
 - learners: children/pupils, youngsters/students, adults etc.
 - teachers: teachers in general, specific arts teachers; cultural/artist educators in non-formal settings; artists in general.

Often these categories are interlinked.

- Notion of the new “learner”: Invests in own education by bringing in own interests, i.e. creating own educational path and self-discovery of identity through the arts, with own culture ultimately leading to diversity and understanding of other cultures.
- Notion of “school”: This has to evolve with adjusted curricula to cater for the emerging student/learner so as to bridge the gap between school and everyday life. It should start from common values/principles: inclusiveness, diversity, quality, arts and culture as a universal right for all. Noted evolutions in educational systems all over the world that include the traditional formal curriculum inside school with non-formal outside school and the newer integration of informal within the formal curriculum inside schools/during school time. Would the latter approach require different competencies? How to implement this? Should there be a combination of both, a so-called “third way”?
- Notion of “artistic & cultural competencies”
 - Difficulties in defining and describing them.
 - “Artistic” competencies are “cultural” by definition.
 - All the arts hold social, cultural and embodied ways of knowing.
 - Competencies $\neq$ *skills*; competency includes skills, knowledge, ability, attitude etc.
 - *Attitude* may include creativity and imagination, “being open to unknown” etc.
 - May be both domain- and context-specific (formal vs. non-formal), although there can be overlaps or similarities.
 - Artistic or cultural competencies can entail or produce other skills.

- Should consider differences at the global scale: holistic view vs. a demarcation of disciplines or art systems. Do these entail a separation of competencies or integration and separate treatment?

Recommended Actions to take:

- Undertake research of teaching and learning methods/approaches in formal, non-formal and informal settings
- “How to measure the immeasurable”: The arts are another way of producing knowledge and should not try to conform to scientific methodologies but develop our own appropriate research methodology – interdisciplinary, transnational etc.
- Create means for sharing research – criteria for publication, synthesis, identify existing resources for publishing, use new media etc.
- Identify indicators for arts and cultural competencies, and recognize criteria for competencies
- Provide space for dialogue regarding social responsibility of research given interdisciplinary and transnational nature of cultural, arts education and cultural education research
- Mapping what overlap and arts systems/disciplines
- Teacher training: general and cultural or arts specific
- Transfer of competencies, e.g. through partnerships: artists in residence, cultural exchanges, arts in business (design, architecture etc.) – channelled by invested parties (i.e., government, UNESCO, ministries)
- Undertake project on individual learning paths: learner determines own trajectory of education; invests self and decides on chosen path
- Experiment: provide space for exploring arts as spiritual practice
- Teach/show/establish advantages of seeing the world through the eyes of art
- Evaluating: gather examples of different ways of evaluating; undertake integrated projects; evaluation tools should be developed by communities that implement them
- Identify goals: influence legislation; financial support; community support.

Theme 3: Monitoring/Mapping Arts Education

- All monitoring projects should have clear:
 - Aims and scope (size, depth, breadth).
 - Definitions and consistent use of terms.
 - Relevance and significance in different cultural contexts.
 - Relevance to specific audiences.
 - Review of literature and existing data.
 - Methodology – including consideration of the most suitable methods in respect to who the research target is, e.g., young persons, teachers, artists.
 - Transparent analysis and conclusions.
 - Monitoring must respect practitioners and value their voice.

- Methodologies can close the gaps between theory and practice, academics and grass roots practitioners.
 - Reflect on the dominant paradigms defining the research ethics, methods, findings, and consider implications for the teacher, communities, and children in diverse contexts.
 - Diverse monitoring projects with diverse methods are equally valuable, e.g., longitudinal, case study narratives, practice based/led projects.
 - Do current monitoring infrastructures and systems exist? E.g., do UNESCO Observatories have a role and value in facilitating monitoring? Similarly does ACE-net and other organizations have a role?
 - Advocacy is best when it is based on evidence based research. (Noting that evidence comes in diverse forms). Research needs to include local and global projects that accept ‘inconvenient truths’ or findings.
 - A standard taxonomy of terms needs to be developed (definitions made clear and used consistently).
- How does monitoring support relationships between children and: arts education, teachers, families, institutions/systems, cultural traditions and children and learning (on-line, in classroom, in community)?
 - Arguments for arts education should positively articulate the role of the arts across society, especially in economic terms; remembering, however, that data are never enough and stories also have power.
 - International mapping can be used as a tool to get information about what is going on and to find out about shared beliefs and differences.
 - Risks of mapping and monitoring:
 - Data can be interpreted in many ways.
 - Difficult to compare different systems etc.
 - It can lead to the creation of “mono-culture”.
 - Why make rankings? Can be used to bring more funding to education.

Recommended Actions to take:

- Rankings should be made based on both quantitative and qualitative data:
 - Aims and goals should define what we should do in arts education and how we should map what is going on?
 - Are there global values of arts education?
 - ~ Yes, but there is the risk of creating a “mono-culture”
 - ~ Respect for diversity, philosophies etc.
- Consider how to make a global database of information but which is not presented in an interpreted form:
 - Solutions to language issues should be considered.
 - What kinds of document should be in there?

Notes

- 1 Polylogue II was co-organized by the International Net for Research in Arts Education (INRAE), the World Alliance for Arts Education (WAAE), the European Arts and Cultural Education Network (ACEnet), supported by the German Federation for Arts Education and Cultural Learning (Bundesvereinigung Kulturelle Kinder- und Jugendbildung), the UNESCO Chair in Arts and Culture in Education at Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nuremberg, the German Commission for UNESCO, German Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth, the City of Munich, Stiftung Mercator Foundation, and Hanns Seidel Foundation.
- 2 Participants were to come with issues and ideas relevant to the theme, and be willing to share these. They were invited to provide perspectives and offer information from around the table including contrasting views, issues from diverse cultures and contexts, existing projects or activity that demonstrate good practice, discussion that deepens insight into specific issues. The round table discussions were meant to:
 - deepen and widen participants understanding of diverse issues.
 - give participants of the different groups the opportunity to discuss the themes further, and start 'translating' the themes to their own working domain.
 - develop networks of persons who have experience or insights that may be helpful beyond the summit.
 - produce recommendations that will assist (WAAE, INRAE, ACEnet) carry out strategic planning and action.
 - possibly identify 'leaders' who want to activate projects within the organisations.
- 3 Summit delegates were also treated to a unique sharing of 22 Pecha Kucha presenters featured in "Windows to the Diverse World of Arts Education". Each of the session was limited to six minutes, and they provided a succinct overview of key messages of a range of projects from different parts of the world. They encompass perspectives from the various art forms of dance, drama, music and visual arts and from countries including the UK, USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Ghana, Uganda, Ukraine, Aruba, Egypt, Hong Kong and Thailand.

Christian Manhart

UNESCO's Present Position towards Arts Education

Since its creation over 60 years ago, UNESCO has worked to mobilize the international community to support educational and artistic activities, with the aim to enhance dialogue and build peace among the people. Art is a tool for tolerance, social cohesion and peace building in our multicultural, connected societies. Young people must be taught to love and practice art: it will make them understand each other better. This love of art can be acquired from early childhood and maintained throughout all the life. It is our conviction that learning about creativity and the arts contributes to the building of prosperous and peaceful societies. Therefore, UNESCO encourages its Member States to support arts education, at school level and beyond.

The two **World Conferences on Arts Education**, held in Lisbon in 2006 and Seoul in 2010 helped to define clear objectives and strategies to achieve quality arts education for all. Lisbon gathered 1200 participants from 97 countries to share their experiences and practices. Seoul was attended by 650 participants from 95 countries, who adopted the **Seoul Agenda** as a concrete plan of action. It has been translated into the six official languages and is available on the UNESCO website under http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/CLT/pdf/Seoul_Agenda_EN.pdf.

In order to give art and creation the place they deserve at the heart of society, in 2011 the General Conference of UNESCO proclaimed the fourth week of May as **International Arts Education Week**, to appeal to all UNESCO's partners, in particular governments, educational institutions and citizens around the world to celebrate the arts and their unique role in stimulating cultural diversity, dialogue and social cohesion. The week of **21-27 May 2012** marked the first edition of this Arts Education Week. Celebrations were held at UNESCO Headquarters with various activities including a workshop, a symposium, a ceremony and exhibitions. It gathered arts education specialists, artists, educators, researchers and NGO actors from all over the world. This first edition was co-organized with the Government of the Republic of Korea that also provided its generous financial support. UNESCO wishes to thank the Korean Government for their continued interest without which our Arts Education activities would not be possible.

However, in 2013 UNESCO was not in a position to organize such an event, due to its **current financial crisis**. In the field of culture, Member States decided to allocate the remaining regular budget for culture mainly to the 6 international cultural conventions and not to creativity and arts education. This unfortunately also means that only very reduced staff time is available for this programme, which previously had one person working full time.¹

Thanks to extra-budgetary resources, UNESCO is still able to carry out some activities in arts education:

The UNESCO Bangkok office coordinates a **Network of Arts Education Observatories in Asia and the Pacific** in partnership with six specialized institutions in Hong Kong, Singapore, Kazakhstan, Korea, Australia and New Zealand.

The UNESCO Moscow Office implements a project “Arts Education in CIS countries: Building Creative Capacities for XXI Century” (with IFESCO Intergovernmental Foundation for Educational, Scientific and Cultural Cooperation) to conduct analytical studies to identify main trends and prospects of arts education in CIS countries (Russia, Belarus, Armenia, Moldova, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan).

Currently two **UNESCO Chairs** have been established in the field of arts education. The first established in 2007 at Queen's University, Ontario, Canada and the second in 2010 at the Friedrich-Alexander-University Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany.

Also other programmes are implemented in favour of the arts and in particular to help young artists and craftspeople:

The **IFPC**, a quite old UNESCO Funds-in-Trust created by Member States was closed for many years. We revived it in 2012 with the establishment of a new Administrative Council and the set up of new statutes and operational guidelines. The first appeal for projects was launched from 1 March to 2 May 2013, which will be continued on a yearly basis. This Fund targets in particular young artists and designers 18–30 years old, to help them launching their career. But it can also support public and private institutions working with/for young artists. The Fund can contribute in a range between \$10.000 and \$100.000. We received some 1500 projects (half of them at the last two days before closing!) and 9 out of them were after a careful selection process finally chosen by the Administrative Council and received financial support.

The **UNESCO-Aschberg Bursaries for Artists** are designed to promote the mobility of young artists 25–35 years old, to improve their personal perspectives and develop a creative project by offering residencies worldwide. The focus is on creative writing, music and visual arts. Since 1994, over 700 fellowships in 149 institutions from 72 countries were awarded.

In partnership with the French Foundation “**Culture et Diversité**” for the project “Travel to learn the professions of the arts” we finance study tours for young designers and craftsmen and women from France to developing countries and vice-versa, in order to discover the artistic knowhow of other peoples. The main target groups are disadvantaged youth with the purpose of fostering equality of chances.

Finally, I wish also to mention UNESCO's **Creative Cities Network**. It consists presently of 41 Member Cities and 40 under evaluation. There are **seven** creative industry categories: **Literature, Film, Music, Crafts and Folk Art, Design, Media arts and Gastronomy**. This network has been launched in 2004 by UNESCO's Executive Board. Creativity and culture are playing an increasingly important role in urban renewal, and can be essential tools in solving today's urban challenges. We have recently received extra-budgetary funding for this programme from two Chinese cities, Beijing and Shenzhen.

Now we have to find ways to create synergies between these programs and those of the INRAE network, in order to find innovative and creative ways of responding to the

challenges of contemporary societies by **building bridges** among people of different cultures, identities and beliefs.

Editors's Note

INRAE understands that, during the General Conference held in November, 2013, the representatives of a number of National Commissions spoke highly about the importance of arts education. Unfortunately, however, the necessary budgetary changes were not enacted with the result that the Section of Museums and Creativity is now being dismantled, a process that will take several months. While this outcome may be disappointing for arts educators, it appears that arts education will continue to have a presence at UNESCO, notwithstanding the closing of this section. In a recent meeting with Mr. Christian Manhart, author of this chapter, INRAE learned that arts education is still mentioned in UNESCO's 4 year programme although without any Regular Funding. This means that activities will be undertaken only if extra-budgetary funds are provided by donors and that no regular staff will be working for this programme, only staff that would be financed under these extra-budgetary resources. Arts education will be situated under the umbrella of the 2005 Convention. This will take several months. Further information will be circulated when it is available.

Meanwhile, the UNESCO Chairs and Observatories in the field (which are funded by their host institutions, rather than by UNESCO) continue to work together to promote and monitor *the Seoul Agenda: Goals for the development of arts education*, and we continue to make plans to celebrate the International Week of Arts Education in the fourth week of May each year.

Evaluation and Monitoring

Methodologies

Quality

Monitoring

Outcome

Arts Education

Reliability

Evaluation

Prozess

Input

Plurality

Shifra Schonmann

On Evaluation

In Praise of Ambiguity and Clarity in Questioning what is Quality Arts Education?

Opening

To introduce the viewpoint *On Evaluation* in only 2500 words (authors' request) reminds me of the old Jewish story about a Gentile who came before a Rabbi and said to him: "*Rabbi, convert me – but on condition that you teach me the whole Torah (Bible) while I stand on one foot*" (i.e. very, very quickly). Shammai, for that was the name of the Rabbi, pushed him aside.

So that fellow went to another Rabbi; he was called Hillel and was known for his skill in facilitating things. The man came before Hillel and said: "*Rabbi convert me – but on the condition that you teach me the whole Torah (Bible) while I stand on one foot*". Hillel was also about to push him away, but then he reconsidered, converted him, and uttered the famous sentence: "*That which is despicable (disgraceful) to you, do not do to your fellow man. This is the whole Torah, and the rest is commentary. Go and learn it.*"

What I am trying to convey is that at the beginning, when I was trying to wrestle with the complexity of evaluation, I felt like Shammai, I was inclined to reject the attempt to articulate such an elusive concept, but then, like Hillel, I gave it another thought and the following is my try:

Evaluation in arts education is an impossible mission yet we should strive to make constant efforts to find solutions to carry out this mission.

This is a kind of paraphrase of the words of Scott Fitzgerald who said:

"The test of a first-rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposing ideas in the mind at the same time, and still retain the ability to function. One should, for example, be able to see that things are hopeless and yet be determined to make them otherwise." (1936)

Revisiting the Known by new Questions

We have all read or even written a chapter in the last handbook of *Research of Arts Education*, edited by Bresler (2007); we have all read or written reports on program evaluation, on classroom assessment; we all know current theories and their relevance to arts education and still can learn more, for example, from the *International Yearbook for Research in Arts Education*, edited by Liebau, Wagner and Wyman (2013). So much has

been said already, written and spoken by our colleagues that I am afraid I cannot introduce news in the classical sense, **but I can revisit** (on one foot, so to speak) the ideas and topics which are **already known**, and **reframe** our knowledge within the struggle to hold ambiguity and clarity in the mind at the same time, and still retain the ability to function.

If this is the situation and we permit ourselves to revisit the known, I can try to raise doubts and ask questions, to set up anew the building blocks of knowledge (i.e. the questions) and to provide food for thought for further discussions. After almost fifty years of quite notable developments in the field of research in arts education we can ask:

- Do we really need to define what quality arts education is? Why is such a question not asked in the sciences? Why do the science disciplines not have to prove anything and the arts do?
- Can we say that there is a productive tension between the individual arts disciplines and the larger arena that is referred to as “arts” and “arts education”?
- Can we say that the individual disciplines have maintained their distinctive identities, organizations, traditions, specific skills and areas of practice and scholarship?

For many teachers and artist-educators *assessment* and *evaluation* are integral in the refinement and reflection of arts practices. What has been changed during the last decades is that the discussion now takes place under the gaze of other educators, and the scrutiny of the public at large. So, the question to be asked is this:

- How do we take the experience of practice and accepted implicit value of assessing the arts in educational contexts, and make assessment practices explicit and articulate to the public?

As we seek to evaluate both the art experience of individuals (be it dance or music or other forms of art) and the overall effects and effectiveness of art education programs, we can ask:

- How should we evaluate the hermeneutic circle of interrelationship of participants to programs?

In the field of evaluation, a great deal of talk has been about change, and substantial attempts have been made to introduce new practices.

My point is that evaluation in arts education is such a fundamental activity rooted in the practitioner's work that sometimes even leading figures in the field are not aware that the topic of evaluation stands at the core of understanding the nature of the field and the ways in which we want to develop its horizons. Exploring the interplay between the teachers, the students, the art (any form of it) as a subject in a defined context of school or any other educational context is a basis for constructing modes of knowing as inner structures of knowledge in use, leading to possible answers regarding what is quality arts education.

The following are observations on two main issues: *language and curriculum*, in an attempt to lead to clear premises and flexible approaches to quality arts education.

Language

In the endless wrestling between ambiguity versus clarity in dealing with issues in arts education, the language we use should be defined anew, in each context. For example, let's examine the terms *assessment* and *evaluation*.

Although the terms *assessment* and *evaluation* are often used interchangeably, Elliot Eisner (2002) explains that: “*assessment* generally refers to the appraisal of individual student performance, often but not necessarily on tests. *Evaluation* generally refers to the appraisal of the program – its content, the activities it uses to engage students, and the ways it develops thinking skills.” (p. 178). Unlike **program** evaluation, which according to Posavac and Carey (1997) “is a collection of methods, skills, and sensitivities necessary to determine whether a human service is needed and likely to be used, whether the service is sufficiently intensive to meet the unmet needs identified,” (p. 2), **assessing individual achievements** is based on a collection of chosen criteria to be used in deciding whether the performance of a student are proper or not. By the term *performance* I do not mean only the acting skills, but the entire student's executions in the discipline. The terms have no fixed meaning and thus, as said, the language we use should be defined anew, in each context.

However, the problem is not with the ways in which one uses one term or another, but with the ideological commitments that they expose. Different practices usually reflect different ideological commitments. My main claim would be that developing evaluation and assessment strategies is a manifestation of a wider conceptualization about life in schools in general, and about how arts education should be developed in the schools. We should ask ourselves how clear do we want to be about that? Maybe ambiguity at some stages can help?

Narrative accounts of teacher's practice indicate that teachers have to rely on what they call their “gut feeling” or “intuition” in addition to their experience. Lyn McGregor, for example, who wrestled with the notion of *standards* in drama in the 1980s, reports that a few pupils told her that they did not like drama because they were “not good at it”. She claims that “unlike a number of teachers, the pupils recognized that there are forms of achievements in drama and that for various reasons some pupils are better than others” (McGregor, 1983, p. 125). These opinions voiced by the pupils go hand by hand with Elliot Eisner's (1993) eight criteria for creating what he calls “authentic assessment” by which he tries to reshape the idea of assessment, however, the ambiguity-clarity dichotomy still remained.

Ambiguity-clarity dichotomy is rooted inherently in our very basic term: “*arts education*”.

What is arts education? Is there one an Arts Education program? No.

Is there any subject, or discipline that is considered as “arts”? No.

So why are we speaking about Arts Education and not about a particular discipline as we do in science? Maybe we should not be too keen to find theories that embrace *all* the arts?

In the context of praising clarity, we may say that Arts Education constitutes a broad range of academic disciplines and as a relatively new field in education we want to create a close intellectual and creative community. Our common goal is to make connections

across the fields of learning. To nurture the intellectual skills of inquiry, analysis, argument, and to cultivate creative expression, all are needed for a meaningful life. However, in the context of accepting ambiguity, we should tolerate chaotic constellations that admit intuitive authentic and original processes of evaluation and assessment in practices.

When speaking about *implementing standards*, *what do we mean by standards*? If we want to fix standards for quality in aesthetic education we need to understand that the concept of standards is multifaceted. The term is attractive – the word, standards, implies high expectations. But in thinking of a standard meal, there is nothing to rave about as Eisner used to say (Eisner 1995; 1998 and 2002). Do we need standards at all? What do they imply? According to my understanding we should not create standards in arts education, but we *do* need to look for criteria. A statement that one particular work of art is better or of greater aesthetic value than another assumes that there are criteria by which one can arrive at such a conclusion. I believe it would *not* be an exaggeration to claim that many attempts to define good art or quality aesthetic experiences have failed. Nevertheless, when we speak about art it seems everyone knows what we mean; this understanding is echoed in a number of studies (See: Schonmann, 2007a and 2007b), and leads me to comment on the second issue, which is the curriculum and its practical concerns.

Curriculum

Along with the critical questions that I have posed, I clearly take the realistic stand that only those subjects that can be properly evaluated can be treated seriously in the framework of a formal curriculum and other educational settings. Moreover, ever since the ancient Greeks instituted dramatic contests on the analogy of the Olympic Games, people have looked for ways of assessing works of art. We want to know what to respect and why, thus the question that we have to make our main concern is not *how do the arts educate*? But *how do we educate to appreciate the arts*?

Intentions and decisions about the contents (i.e. *what* to teach) and the methodologies (i.e. *how* to teach) characterize disciplinary knowledge. If this is the case, then it can be argued that arts in education do not stand out as a discipline in the traditional sense because there is no consensus as to what we actually teach in this field. Neither are there any common claims to any definite methodology.

Arts in education, then, do not seem to fulfill the two conventional criteria (*what and how*) necessary to define a discipline in education.

Thus the difficulties of assessing students' achievements or evaluating educational programs rise to a level that explicit or implicit discussions that took place in the field remain incomplete and without a conclusion, leaving us with no clear-cut tools to appreciate the value of the arts in the curriculum. Moreover, we should constantly bear in mind that arts taught in school differ in significant ways from arts as they are found in non-school locations.

So, where does this leave us? If we take the realistic stand, as mentioned before, that only the subjects that can be properly evaluated can be treated seriously in the frame-

work of a formal curriculum and other educational settings, then we can try to define premises (as basis to the criteria), whose language will fit the logic of curriculum.

Premises and Approaches

Thus in the continuing search for constructing appropriate assessment and evaluation in arts in education which, in essence, I see it as a search for identity, I have tried (in other works of mine, Schonmann 1997; 2007a; 2007b) to define premises whenever an attempt is made to assess a student's achievements and whenever an attempt is made to construct curriculum and evaluate its quality:

1. "One size" does not fit everyone. The metaphor implies that different learning styles call for different types of assessment/evaluation. (*difference*)
2. Information should be gathered on the basis of using several elements from many diverse sources. (*plurality*)
3. The many variables should serve as a check on one another and provide support for a more reliable assessment/evaluation. (*reliability*)
4. There is a need to define ethical principles to guide the assessment/evaluation procedures. (*ethics-values*)

These four premises offer us, in principle, an opportunity to develop flexible approaches to assessment and evaluation.

These premises have served me as building blocks for admitting three different **approaches** to assessment ranging from clarity to ambiguity:

1. The directive approach: *pointing out which learning action leads to an artistic and aesthetic "right" or "wrong"*.

This approach accepts the basic idea of defining goals and finding suitable means for achieving them. However, instead of detailed criteria to monitor the progress of the student this approach proposes phases to control the process, not the student. This model is in the spirit of Tyler (1950); it is very clear and it is linear.

2. The dialectical approach: *organizing and prioritizing values that are particular in the nature of the art (any form or aspect of art that is studied) over others via a set of dialectical questions that create a profile of the student's achievement.*

The dialectical approach is designed around cluster of questions: How can one know or discover whether the students have undergone a change? The deliberation goes through a series of dialectic questions at the end of which a student's profile is reached. It is based on a constructivist pedagogy which is inherently connected to arts.

Questioning as a tool for teaching and assessment is a known strategy (Hubbard & Miller, 1993).

3. The chaotic approach: *Chaos theory offers us a new set of metaphors with which to make sense of the world – such as the flow of a river, the collapse of the Berlin Wall (Hancock 1995). The idea of chaos in arts education is actually allowing the chaotic non-linear process of evaluation to develop our mental image about quality in arts.*