

5-10-2014

# Arts Integration: Models and Methods in Elementary Art Education

BRIANA M. LONG

*Georgia State University*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/art\\_design\\_theses](http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/art_design_theses)

---

## Recommended Citation

LONG, BRIANA M., "Arts Integration: Models and Methods in Elementary Art Education." Thesis, Georgia State University, 2014.  
[http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/art\\_design\\_theses/141](http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/art_design_theses/141)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Ernest G. Welch School of Art and Design at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Art and Design Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@gsu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@gsu.edu).

# ARTS INTEGRATION: MODELS AND METHODS IN ELEMENTARY ART EDUCATION

by

BRIANA M. LONG

Under the Direction of Dr. Melanie Davenport

## ABSTRACT

This thesis addresses the methods and models of current arts-integrated education curricula and their basic frameworks. The review of the literature surveys information currently available on the subject of arts integration, focusing on applicable models, theories, and the results of specific educational applications. This study compares details from non-traditional models, allowing other educators a glimpse of various arts integrated strategies that might be incorporated into their own schools. A basic and modified arts integrated art education curriculum model is suggested in order to encourage educators to create the most appropriate model for their instruction, ultimately allowing students to achieve higher level thinking and learning through the arts, as well as cross-curriculum integration.

INDEX WORDS: Arts Integration, Art Education, Curriculum, Models, Methods

ARTS INTEGRATION: MODELS AND METHODS IN ELEMENTARY ART EDUCATION

by

BRIANA M. LONG

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Art Education

in the College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

2014

Copyright by  
Briana Marie Long  
2014

ARTS INTEGRATION: MODELS AND METHODS IN ELEMENTARY ART EDUCATION

by

BRIANA M. LONG

Committee Chair: Dr. Melanie Davenport

Committee: Dr. Melody Milbrandt

Dr. Kevin Hsieh

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies

College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

May 2014

## DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my family: my husband Jason A. Long and our son, Nathan; both of whom have always gracefully supported my goals and aspirations and have surely felt my absence in this quest for knowledge. In addition, I would also dedicate this thesis to my mother, who has enduringly encouraged my education inside and outside of the arts and who has also been a partner during this process as she achieves her Master of Art Education as well. Thank you all for your sacrifices. I look forward to spending more time with each of you, and I love you very much.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take a moment to express my deepest thanks to Dr. Davenport, for her support and encouragement while assisting me with the preparation of this thesis document and the many emails, phone calls, and meetings, which never failed to leave me uplifted. I would also like to thank the additional members of my committee: Dr. M. Milbrandt and Dr. K. Hsieh for their commentary, commitment, and constructive criticism while reviewing this document. Without these dedicated professionals, I would certainly not have had the remarkable experience I did during these last two years.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	3
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	4
Purpose of The Study .....	7
Definitions of Terms .....	8
CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....	10
Arts Integration .....	10
Details of an Art Integration Framework .....	12
Student Success .....	14
Schools Which Integrate the Arts.....	16
Strengths.....	17
The Common Core .....	18
Teacher Retention .....	18
Dilemmas of the Model.....	20
Summary .....	22
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY .....	25
Research Method.....	25
Research Questions .....	25
Data Collection.....	26



	2
Timeline .....	26
Limitations .....	26
CHAPTER 4 CURRICULUM MODELS .....	28
Current Curriculum .....	28
A+ Schools .....	30
Higher Order Thinking Schools .....	32
Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge .....	33
Bailey’s Elementary School for the Arts and Sciences .....	34
Pros Vs. Cons and What’s Missing? .....	37
The Important Aspects of Curriculum .....	38
Emergent Collaborations .....	39
CHAPTER 5 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CURRICULUM .....	42
Formation of a Modified Arts Integrated Curriculum .....	42
Validation .....	43
Findings .....	44
Conclusions and Implications .....	46
APPENDICES .....	51
Appendix A .....	51
REFERENCES .....	53

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Key Characteristics of Arts-Integration and Models.....	23
---	----

## CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

### **Alternative Perspective in Art Education**

My initial introduction into teaching perhaps comes from a different perspective than most art educators. I never attended public school, therefore I never had an art lesson from an art educator who was obliged to work within certain public school frameworks. Most of my own art education as a youth stemmed from varying private school establishments and from the direction of my artist mother. That said it was heavily infused with the visual and performing arts, be it traveling to art museums in faraway countries, participating in different forms of dance, or interweaving art into my day-to-day academics. Though I experienced my share of the arts, it was not in the traditional avenue which most students find themselves experiencing. Even later when attending college, my undergraduate degree was not in Art Education, but rather in a design field where I went on to work professionally for a number of years. By this time, I had my own small son and my interests were certainly directed more towards the younger generation than they had ever been previously. After much self-reflection, I decided that I missed being in an art studio classroom, being in an environment suited to my family, and the undiluted creative process that came with it. It was then that I decided to seek my art education certification in the non-traditional way, through TAPP.

TAPP, though fast and furious, placed teachers in the classroom experience right away. Through self-reflection and the support of a guiding Teaching Instructor, an educator will find themselves on a fast track to somewhere (whether or not it is where you hope to be is to-be-determined). I learned a great deal through this experience, and I learned it quickly. I learned what worked for me, what worked for my Teaching Instructor, and what didn't work for either of us. I was able to go into classrooms and evaluate the strategies of others as well. Though TAPP

suited me-and-my-needs then, I believe there was a slight disadvantage to this process for an art educator: I still was unable to experience as much interaction from art educators themselves as I would have liked. Consider; how many art educators are typically within one school? In an American public school setting, especially at elementary and middle school levels, the answer is usually just the one. Unlike a second grade team or a first grade team, there isn't usually an art team to banter back and forth with. It takes a while to build up those comfortable connections, even to other art educators in your own district.

I found that my initial position as an art educator that my program didn't have much support from parents or other teachers in the building. Community resources were scarce, 98 % of my students were considered to be from a socio-economically disadvantaged background, and I had bars on my classroom windows. On the bright side of stakeholders not taking much interest, I was allowed the freedom to establish my own foundation for this school. I found in my students some amazing talent and we eventually earned much recognition from the surrounding art education world. I made the effort to establish connections in my community, which brought in additional opportunities for my program and my students. This didn't seem to impress many other people within my own building or sway them one way or another, and it made me question the ideals of the public school setting. If anything, this could be called my initial bias; that public schools can't provide the same level of art as a private school would and that all public schools were the same. Up to this point, I had not experienced public school art education in any other way and knew of no other variations. Remember, I had jumped into this with no prior experience. I remained in this environment for the next four years.

Finally, light was shed; a dawning if you will! I was recruited into another position, one in another public school in my very same district. I originally knew nothing of this school: an

elementary fine arts magnet school whose mission was to integrate the arts into the every aspect of a student's education. It was actually a newer endeavor for my district, which found the school site hosting a school-within-a-school since the year 2009. While a portion of the traditional students were non-magnet and districted to attend the school, the magnet program accepts students via application process and operates on its own program. The application requires a completed packet containing commitment/consent forms, photo/video permission forms, a copy of the student's report card, and two teacher recommendations (one from a fine arts teacher). Students are also required to audition for a specific focus area teacher (music, dance, theater, or visual arts) after the second grade, though younger students may select classes based on their interest. Teaching strategies in this magnet curriculum, just like the traditional portion of the school, are set according to state and national standards; however, strategies in the magnet program are enhanced with interactive and hands-on opportunities through the arts; like script writing, ballet, guitar, arts in motion, scheduled guest artists, performance hours, arts related field trips, etc. Parents, teachers, and students alike seem to share an enthusiastic excitement for learning in this arts integrated environment.

From an art educator's perspective, while I was once the sole art educator in my building, I then found myself collaborating with a fine arts team containing two art educators, two music specialists, a drama teacher, a dance teacher, and more. If my own background was untraditional, so were the aspirations of my new school. There are certainly obvious and initial differences between the two schools I have been privileged enough to serve. From my perspective, some of these included overall expectations of the student, as well as of the educators and the parents, in addition to schedule flexibility, and support from administration, staff, and parents. More than

that, I discovered that the objectives were very different within the same district between the schools, and even between the programs, although the demographics are much the same.

### **Purpose of The Study**

Many art educators, like me, who were certified through non-traditional methods, begin their journey into the classroom with a limited view of potential art models and methods. Having experienced the restrictions that I once felt in teaching and entering into a very divergent context within my own district has drawn me to compare the differences and similarities between my two circumstances. While literature was available on the subject of arts-integration, much of that literature focuses on definitions of the model and the theory of the arts-integration, and thus provided less comparative detail.

I believed there was a need for this study, because as a beginning art educator I was knowledgeable in my content and practice, but eventually discovered the roadblocks to traditional art education frameworks. Where would I go from here in regard to my curriculum? I inherited no official curriculum, nothing written at all. Informal communication of what had been taught up until this point is what I had to build upon. I needed a guiding light. When I first sought answers in literature, I found little to assist me in developing my own arts-integrated art education model. Thus, I sought further insight by examining in more detail other current arts integrated programs, as well as in the observations and conversations in my new school, and in consideration of the current art programs' unofficial framework.

My aim was to discern what exemplary arts-integrated schools might have to offer arts-centered schools such as my own. I asked myself questions like: What are the differences between these experiences? Where could I take my inherited fine art magnet program from here? Where might I find information and/or data about arts-integrated programs, which by design

have goals for art to play a more significant role in the education of children? Being thrust into an environment of this nature had caused me to question what works and what doesn't in integrating art education.

I find it is not really a question of what a public school offers in juxtaposition to a private school within the arts, but rather, what strengths can be found within the specific programs I aimed to compare. When examining and comparing other situations--those I had found with an arts-based curriculum-- I hoped I might learn strategies to grow my art program to its fullest potential. After consulting the literature that had been produced on this topic, I have uncovered some informative details in regard to what other models of arts education are typically available and successful. The context of my research consisted of reviewing formal documents describing the various models mentioned in art education, as well as other literature revealing what those in the field have to say. Additionally, I have offered my own comparisons between the models I have explored and experienced as a teacher in order to present a further in depth understanding of arts integration. I believe we learn much from the successes and failures of others. I also wish that by promoting and examining various models of art education and any findings, others might become more knowledgeable in their own practice and their promotion of arts integration curriculum.

### **Definitions of Terms**

**Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligences:** As will be discussed below, Howard Gardner's (1991) Theory of Multiple Intelligences can be defined as the identification of seven distinct intelligences. Gardner, Professor of Psychology at Harvard University, believed that people are intelligent in different ways. Those intelligences Gardner identifies are physical, logical-mathematical, linguistic, spatial, musical, an ability to understand others, and an ability to

understand ourselves. He later added existential and naturalistic intelligences to his original list. These new intelligences were formed through Gardner's observations of those who were gifted, idiot savants, typical children and adults, experts, etc. Intelligence exists in separate development pathways and is susceptible to codification within a symbol system.

**Arts Integrated Curriculum:** An educational model that establishes creative learning. This is not a setting where an art specialist is removed from the school, but rather where creative learning and the arts are integrated in the methodology of other academic core subjects; considered as connecting ideas across disciplines to make them interdisciplinary (Stokrocki, 2005).

**A+ Schools:** An example of an arts integrated educational model known as the A+ Schools. Developed by the Oklahoma A+ Schools Network, this is the public school magnet's leading approach to education. What began as 14 schools has now grown to 70. The school system is well known for its high integration of the arts "both in their own right and infused across the curriculum" and explores instruction through use of multiple intelligences (Robelen, 2012, p. 10).

**Common Core Standards:** Standards emphasizing college and career readiness currently being voluntarily adopted by varying States in North America (Robinson, 2013).

In the following literature review, I have looked more closely at several topics, including: frameworks, details, and definitions of Arts Integration and what it means to our students. I have also discussed the strengths and weaknesses which others have pointed out through their own observations, in order to establish a foundation for my own records, observations, and reflections of teaching in an arts integrated setting.



## CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Many art teachers new to the classroom are initially focused on the fundamentals: classroom management, lessons plans, and school environment/culture, to name a few. Once the basic *needs* or foundations of their teaching practice have been met, a time arises where we can further conceptualize the *wants* for our students and the programs that we could provide to them. I had found myself at such a juncture. Because I believe we learn much from the successes and failures of others, I sought to examine various models of art education literature concerning arts integration, particularly to become more knowledgeable in my own practice of art education and in my current journey of successfully implementing arts integrated instruction. Further, I wanted to investigate literature regarding the effectiveness of an arts-integrated model, potential benefits that might derive from this model in education, and especially, any strategies that seem to be successful for students in such an environment. Additionally, I have noted any mentioned frameworks, dilemmas, and strengths of such various programs, as well as any recognition received by schools that are providing an arts-integrated curriculum. The literature review that follows examines insights on arts integration and models of art infusion, from which I derive key concepts to weigh against my own experiences.

### **Arts Integration**

To begin with, what counts as arts integration? Why is it important? Education as an enterprise must be adaptable, as students and society differ with each generation. Technology today, specifically the Internet and the speedy transfer of information, has changed how students learn. The more connections that they can make, the more they can solidify the larger ideas of their educational experience. Arts integration makes this possible. Stokrocki (2005) defines integration as “the process of creating relationships and a way to connect ideas across disciplines

making them interdisciplinary” (p. 6). While she says that historically integration typically revolved around holidays or folk art, it was Winslow (1939) who argued that art could be enriching to an entire curriculum if integrated.

In today’s society, as with each generation, teachers must reach out to a different audience accustomed to different modes of communication than they were taught. Lackey (2005) provides an insightful description of visual arts integration as well as current trends outlining its importance. She suggests that “a visual culture education is viewed as critical to the extent that it involves examining power issues and tacit or taken for granted messages within our visual culture and consumer society” (p. 202). Students I currently teach have grown up in a world of ever-expanding contact with diverse forms of visual culture.

Visual integration is necessary in the internet-friendly world that students find themselves in today. It is only natural that we integrate visual mediums into their school day as well. Many people have weighed in on what arts integration means to them and the values that they believe arts education integration can bring. Lajevic (2013) offers a helpful definition for the term that really resonates, stating “arts integration, a complicated term with no one universal meaning, can be explored as a dynamic process of merging art with another discipline(s) in an attempt to open up a space of inclusiveness in teaching, learning, and experiencing” (p. 42). This definition offers an important key point: inclusiveness. We must understand that arts integration isn’t only about the art classroom, but encompasses the entire building’s educational experience. Lajevic (2013) continues that traditionally, students have typically learned through lecture, worksheet, or memorization in a regular classroom, but that arts integration explores the same important key concepts except with an exciting and innovative learning approach. There is a meaningful connection present that might have been missing in the curriculum before.

Arts integration needs all classroom teachers at the school site embracing learning through the arts. In an arts integration model, the art educator would be a *go-to* for insight on creative instruction and offer support to the other teachers. Rather than the art class operating as a separate entity, it is now functioning on a collaborative level. Robinson (2013) offers another perspective on the definition on arts integration, supporting the collaborative cross-curricular notion. She states that “arts integration can best be understood, because of the lack of consensus on any one definition, as being defined by three categories: arts integration as learning through and with the arts, arts integration as a curricular connection process, and arts integration as a collaborative engagement” (p. 191). Smilan and Miraglia (2009) say that Authentic Arts Integration (AAI) can be further defined as learning which is meaningfully connected “to art content and art instruction” (p. 39). Further, AAI is the search and construction of multidimensional knowledge where “students engage in real and tangible work involving critical thinking, art-based, and problem-based methodologies that are developed in collaborative efforts among teachers” (Smilan and Miraglia, 2009, p. 40).

### **Details of an Art Integration Framework**

What are the characteristics of an arts integrated framework? Surely, there must be some sort of structure in place to create successful models or arts integration. In typical fashion, the school faculty would function independently of each other, meaning that an art educator’s classroom wouldn’t operate in collaboration with classroom teachers. Since art integration practice isn’t as common as traditional means, it is necessary to examine what others might have found on the topic of frameworks. Stokrocki (2005) says, “contemporary models include informal integration, cross-disciplinary or trans-disciplinary, and multicultural unit or course (Hobbs & Rush, 1997), as well as intercultural and visual cultural investigation” (p. 8). She continues that

there are naturally other frameworks available, but that art teachers feel most familiar with informal integration (relating other disciplines into their regular teaching). Stokrocki (2005) lists that some approaches are “parallel-discipline, where teachers focus on an agreed theme within different subjects.” Others are multidisciplinary where several disciplines investigate a theme. Despite the multiple ways that the arts *can* be integrated into education, the most significant portion to such models is the inclusion of the arts into academics or vice-versa; the creation of meaningful instruction to incorporate multiple disciplines that enhances that particular educator’s classroom.

Smilan and Miraglia (2009) report that arts integration is not a movement toward the removal of art programs in schools, but rather an opportunity toward education reform where student learning style and art programs can *both* be improved. Both in the traditional art education classroom and in the reformed arts integration classroom, art is present. Rather than the art teacher and classroom teacher working independently--as in a more traditional framework--collaboration is encouraged, enhancing the possibilities of an authentic art integration model.

Robinson (2013) tells us arts integrations models should have high quality arts integration involving a circular union strategy that promotes learning through and with the arts. She quotes Bresler’s (1995) findings from a four year ethnographic study on arts integration from three elementary schools to have art integration models to be identified in to four integration styles: “the subservient integration approach (most prevalent), the co-equal cognitive integration approach (least prevalent), the affective integration approach, and the social integration approach” (Robinson, 2013, p. 192). Educators who used arts as an extra filler were considered to be using the subservient approach while the co-equal cognitive approach required specific content knowledge or skill level. In the affective approach, students were immersed in the arts combined with self-

expression, complementing curriculum. She says that this approach toward social integration is performance-based and used to increase parental participation through school plays or other performances. These integration styles Robinson (2013) explains, are a few of the types of models that might make up various arts integrated frameworks.

### **Student Success**

Do we find that arts integrated models in education promote student achievement? While we can examine anecdotal records that indicate benefits of arts integration, hard factual evidence is more difficult to find and report. Findings by TETAC report in 2001 (Transforming Education Through The Arts Challenge) found that “the arts could enrich learning environments, promote integrated learning, and increase learning collaboration among school staff” (Smilan and Miraglia, 2009, p.44). Robinson (2013) states that much research has been conducted on the arts impact on student achievement, but that fewer studies are offered to examine effects of an arts integrated model on student attainment. In fact, Robinson (2013) reports that after,

[a]n exhaustive search of electronic data-bases for meta-analyses on the impact of the arts on students learning located seven studies (Vaughn and Winner 2000; Winner and Cooper 2000; Vaughn 2000; Burger and Winner 2000; Butzlaff 2000; Podlozny 2000; Hetland and Winner 2001). Out of these seven meta-analyses, only one specifically examined the effects of arts integration. Furthermore, in the one meta-analysis on arts integration, drama was the only art integrated. (Robinson, 2013, p. 192)

In that study, there was a significant statistical relationship evident between drama and oral and written story recall, reading success on standardized tests, reading and writing; but there was no relationship found between drama and the development of student vocabulary. In the remaining

six meta-analysis studies, researchers examined how the study of art relates to student learning. Robinson (2013) recounts that Vaughn and Winner (2000) determined a strong relationship between SAT scores increasing with the increase of art classes. Winner and Cooper (2000) further determined significant associations between art and academic conclusions in three correlational meta-analyses though they did not establish a significant association. Robinson (2013) also reports that Vaughn (2000) found a considerable relationship between the study of music and student success in math. Burger and Winner (2000) report a small growth between visual arts and reading readiness, but not reading improvement. Robinson (2013) notes that Butzlaff (2000) found a strong connection between music and reading ability and performance. She also says Hetland and Winner (2001) located substantial evidence for “listening to music and spatial-temporal reasoning, learning to play music and spatial reasoning, and classroom drama and verbal skills” (Robinson, 2006, p. 193). They also found links between learning to play music with math and between dance and non-verbal reasoning; but these could not be generalized to new studies. Robinson says that Hetland and Winner (2001), due to mixed feelings, want to remind others that “although art programs make valuable contributions to academic outcomes, arts education should not be justified based only on its contributions to non-arts academic outcomes” (Robinson, 2013, p. 193). Consider that, from this statement we recognize that there is value in integrating the arts with academics and that this may be beneficial through multiple means, not simply academically. Once we have established that this evidence determines it so, we must also appreciate that once we launch multiple connections for learners in the classroom, learners are able to attain a deeper understanding of concept.

In her personal study, Robinson (2013) reports, “of the five studies on visual arts integration, there was one moderately strong causal design study that was well implemented and had

positive effects (Andrzejczak & Trainin, 2006) and no studies reporting negative effects. These findings suggest that visual art integration is a potentially positive practice in increasing reading/math achievement, writing, and empathetic behaviors for disadvantaged students” (Robinson, 2013, p. 200). Additionally, in a study conducted by Chappell (2005), a connection was:

found between the art-integrated element and the improvements seen in students’ attitudes towards, interest in, and engagement with, as well as involvement in visual studies and other disciplinary inquiries. In fact, these intents and outcomes are reciprocal. Because student’s attitudes toward, interests in, and engagement with, as well as the involvement in visual arts studies improved, this shows the arts-integrated element to be fundamental. (p. 39)

Chappell (2005) also noted that students were better equipped to synthesize inquiry knowledge not only visually, but through writing and verbal avenues as well. It seems that this research supports a conclusion tying student success to the integration of the arts.

### **Schools Which Integrate the Arts**

What are some specific, currently ongoing situations employing arts integration that might serve as models? Though it is outside the scope of this study to identify every last one in the US, let’s consider some well-known dynamic representations available for arts integration. Smilan and Miraglia (2009) report various schools to be shifting in educational reform, as seen in programs like Connecticut’s *The Higher Order Thinking Schools* (HOT) and *Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge* (TETAC). “The HOT schools students are encouraged to seek, establish, and test connections, allow(ed) to synthesize relationships between ideas” (Smilan and Miraglia, 2009, p.44). As for the TETAC, it was found that “the arts could enrich learning environments, promote integrated learning and increase collaboration among school staff”

(Smilan and Miraglia, 2009, p.44). These models use support from administration and incorporate the expertise of the art educator, classroom teacher, community stakeholders, parents, culture, and local teaching artists in order to collaborate an overall effective avenue of instruction.

Another school well known for their arts integration are the A+ Schools. This system is a public school magnet's leading approach to education by the Oklahoma A+ Schools Network, which was modeled in 14 schools but now has grown to 70. The school system is well known for its high integration of the arts "both in their own right and infused across the curriculum" (Robelen, 2012, p. 10). The A+ approach was originally from North Carolina, first launched in 1995, where there are currently 40 active schools. Robelen (2012) states that A+ schools are guided by eight *essentials*, including a heavy dose of the arts, collaboration between teachers, explorations of the *multiple intelligences*, and experimental learning. Oklahoma's A+ schools focus more on "nurturing creativity in every learner" and is the arts integration model my current school is considering (Robelen, 2012, p.11). The students they serve are a mixture of urban, rural, and suburban areas. Though most schools are public, some are also magnet, charter and private. Robelen reports that funding is typically a struggle, but the models in Oklahoma use both public and private dollars. The main drive behind these schools seems to be a desire to change, a desire to improve, and a desire to reform education.

### **Strengths**

What are the strengths of an arts integration classroom model? Smilan and Miraglia (2009) find that the an arts integration model "supports simultaneous teaching and learning focused on experiences that lead to increased and assembled understandings in art as well as other disciplines" (Smilan and Miraglia, 2009, p. 40). They consider art teachers capable of enhancing education because they are typically inventive individuals who are able to approach matters in a



multifaceted ways. Alternatively, in multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, and cross-disciplinary models, separate subject matters remain distinct, with content linking to a common theme. They conclude that the “greater” objective should be mastery in each subject area, which arts integration allows the student to do by providing “real-world based organizing components related to the learner, thus authenticating each individual’s experiences” (Smilan and Miraglia, 2009, p.40).

### **The Common Core**

Authenticating individual experiences, we also know that not all children learn in one way. That said, another strength that arts integration has to its credit, according to Stokrocki, (2005) is conformity to Gardner’s (1991) Theory of Multiple Intelligences. Arts integration provides many solutions to meet students with their own individual needs. Robinson (2013) supports arts integrated education because a real world approach in “arts integration is an excellent strategy for planning and teaching the Common Core standards," which emphasizes college and career readiness, an initiative that most states are voluntarily adopting (Robinson, 2013, p. 192). This allows a curriculum with rigorous instruction where students can make connections to larger and lasting concepts. Another strength of this model is identified by Robinson (2009) as the multiple means of assessing students. Robinson says the co-equal cognitive arts integration framework creates 21<sup>st</sup> century learning skills, which are also supported by the Common Core. As the Common Core is presently the government's solution to the many problems facing education today, this is only yet another advantage to an arts integrated approach.

### **Teacher Retention**

When considering teacher retention, what can be expected between an arts-integrated model and a traditional setting; or is there even a difference? Jennifer H. Waddell identifies the problem that the American teaching profession experiences every year, “the issue of teacher at-

trition” (Waddell, 2010, p. 70). Statistically, Waddell (2010) reports that the teacher attrition rate is one of greatest of all professions, twice as much as nurses and five times as much as lawyers. The reason it is a problem is because Waddell also cites Wong’s (2003) findings. Wong (2003) states that it takes between five and seven years to develop as an effective teacher and that over half of the teachers leave before they are considered to be effective. This causes students to encounter inexperienced teachers, which affects school reform and student achievement. Additionally, Waddell (2010) mentions it also costs urban school districts millions of dollars annually in attempts to identify, hire, and retain exceptional teachers. Reasons cited for teachers leaving their profession are lack of support, lack of influence, low salaries, and challenging working conditions, especially in urban situations. Knowing this, Waddell (2010) reports, has still not helped slow down the flow of teacher attrition and such studies show that the programs, which support new teachers with quality induction programs, have warm and open administration and are key factors in forming a culture of professional respect.

In respect to Waddell’s findings, teacher attrition depends upon the internal workings of each school setting, and those differ depending on the individual environment; urban or not. Even within the urban districts, a large county might offer a variety opportunities or challenges for an educator. Therefore, if the school setting provides the necessary support in regard to professional development and peer support, and we find that the discussed art integrated schools are doing so; one could conclude that teacher attrition rate would be slower than that of an educational setting that did not. It is in the formation of a working school culture where teachers find satisfaction, despite who or where they provide their knowledge.

### **Dilemmas of the Model**

If there are strengths in an arts integration model, there must also be identifiable weaknesses. What limitations could be examined in a model such as this? Lajevic (2013) explains that educators use too much of their own prior schooling methods and life experiences integrated into their own style, rather than the innovative learning models needed;

much of a teacher's understanding of arts integration is formed through formal and informal education and experiences. This generation of educators did not learn from the methods that we find current learners do best with. While most traditional learning was teacher centered and in lecture format, we now strive to create models of change for today's student. Because each teacher's schooling and life experiences are different, understandings of arts integrations widely differ. (p. 50)

Lajevic (2013) believes that educators can fall back into the typical, comfortable routines, those that are safe and recognizable and less effective. If the educator doesn't know how to talk about art or engage in the art making process; it impacts the level of instruction and connection the student might have experienced. It is important to continue to push forward creatively and allow students to step forward and shine in their productions. It is necessary to "move beyond" what earlier encounters in education might have taught us, and enter into risk-taking where uncertainty takes an important role in teaching and learning (p. 52).

Other authors weighing in on the limitations possibly occurring in an arts integration model are Smilan and Miraglia (2009). They state that "problematic situations" are observed in schools when classroom teachers are brought in to teach in arts integrated classrooms with;

little to no art education: community artists, untrained in the art of teaching, re-

placing or circumventing art teachers and the misapplications of well-intended art integrated curricula. There are many artists who consider themselves *teaching artists*, but would not assume the responsibilities of an art educator who is certified. These problematic situations are exacerbated by art teachers' understandable reluctance to lead school wide art integration initiatives. (Smilan and Miraglia, 2009, p. 39)

They express that one possible explanation for this reluctance may be that most teachers need clarification about what art integration might incorporate. They believe that true art integration places visual arts at the heart of teaching and learning, while the professional providing the classroom instruction must *also* be educated in the art of teaching art. Simply put, not everyone who simply enjoys the visual arts is capable of teaching it. For example, offering art materials to students is “a far cry from incorporating art concepts in the school curriculum with the objective of exploration and the construction of learning through these materials” (Smilan and Miraglia, 2009, p. 42). Such educators must be provided with enough support to be able to identify any possible weakness in their instruction and the ability to change their methods to benefit such school reform. Alternatively, consider that visual art teachers might also be compelled to integrate academic curriculums into their instruction as well. Should this be the case, professional development would also be needed to support these cross curriculum connections.

Charland (2011) agrees, quoting Kindler (1987) that often “arts integration offerings are grounded in common assumptions of their inherent value with little consideration given to pre-existing structural, cultural, and dispositional barriers to teacher professional development that may defeat program acceptance and persistence” (Charland, 2011, p. 2). He continues with his analysis by offering insight on how to develop a culture of change in regard to approaches of

faculty development. He also says that despite the many volumes of supportive statistics presented recommending the arts in schools, this does not mean that the benefits will continue. He makes a distinction that “too frequently, art integration offerings are grounded in common assumptions of their inherent value, with little consideration given to overcoming the pre-existing structural, cultural, and dispositional barriers to teacher professional development that may defeat program assistance and persistence” (Charland, 2011, p.2). Charland warns that all stakeholders and staff must be committed and supported to bringing about a successful and lasting arts integrated model. Isn't this the case though with all educational models, however? All personnel involved must be dedicated to the vision and mission that the school sets its sights toward.

### **Summary**

Further research in arts integration is required in order to fully paint the picture of how arts integration collaboration successfully happens. I felt I had yet to find much literature that provided the fine details of what an arts integrated community experiences in comparison to one another, which might have helped me to develop a detailed arts integrated curriculum framework of my own. In addition to the development of such a framework, I hoped that from this study, I further tease out what such models experience and strive for within their practice of arts instruction across the curriculum. In regard to this curriculum framework guide, the desire was to provide a concept of structural foundation rather than specific lesson plans, along with my comparisons. To facilitate my process of comparisons, I compiled the following chart of key points from the literature. These are descriptive characteristics typically mentioned in my literature review discussions of arts integration that I believe have assisted in focusing my inquiry. What is needed, are further details regarding how various arts integrated educational opportunities operate, which would provide further insight to such comparisons.

Table 1. 1: Summary of Key Characteristics of Arts-Integration and Models

<b>The Four Types of Art Integrated Frameworks</b>	<b>Strengths of the Model</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>	<b>Schools Using Art Integration</b>	<b>Student Success</b>
-Subservient integration (Stokrocki)	-Support is available: across disciplinary curriculums and through content. Art supports content and content supports art (Smilan and Miraglia)	-Teachers may fail to provide arts integrated instruction by falling back to the more traditional methods of teaching that they may have been taught with, lecturing as example (Lajevic)	-Connecticut's The Higher Order Thinking Schools (HOT)	-There is value in arts integration with academics, beneficial through multiple means (Robinson)
-Co-equal cognitive integration (Stokrocki)	-Arts integration supports real-world learning and connections (Smilan and Miraglia)	-Some teachers are not capable of instruction through the arts, certified vs. non-certified (Smilan and Miraglia)	-Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge (TETAC)	-Findings report arts integration can enrich learning environments (TETAC)

<p>-Affective integration approach (Stokrocki)</p>	<p>-Teachers are able to enhance experiences of the student, because they are typically inventive (Smilan and Miraglia)</p>	<p>-It can be difficult to facilitate long-lasting change in school culture, such as initiating arts integration (Charland)</p>	<p>-A+ Schools</p>	<p>-Students are successful because they are interested and engaged with the arts; studies show arts integration to be fundamental (Chappell)</p>
<p>-Social integration (Stokrocki)</p>	<p>-Mastery of content can be the objective, due to the connection to material provided</p>	<p>-All staff and stakeholders MUST be committed for success to happen (Charland)</p>		<p>-Students better equipped to synthesize inquiry knowledge not only visually, but through writing and verbal avenues as well (Chappell)</p>

## CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

### **Research Method**

The purpose of this study was to explore possible models and methods of arts integration in education, while honing in on my past involvement and experience teaching. I hoped to introduce other comparisons between the curriculum models, and to specifically develop my own curriculum framework in order to guide my future teaching strategies. I sought to compare my perceptions of these environments to understand more deeply from a teacher's perspective the differences between an arts-integrated models, as well as examine published documents from other arts integrated educational frameworks: frameworks, educational missions, resources, student and teacher successes, discipline issues, student drive, and environmental differences are each under consideration. I have reflected upon my findings and compared them to Table 1.1, while considering any similarities or dissimilarities between the two school environments in order to cluster my findings and relate them to my thesis questions. Through my curriculum construction and self- reflections, I have also considered documents gathered during my experience concerning arts integration practices, such as curricular materials from my schools, application procedures, program expectations, and documentation of student learning or documents from other arts integrated schools.

### **Research Questions**

The questions that I have investigated in this study are:

What information could be learned from other currently operating arts-integrated frameworks to expand my magnet fine arts curriculum?

1. What insights could I, as an art educator, offer to others in my field, based upon my own experiences, regarding the benefits or challenges of an art-integration practice?



2. What insights could I, as an art educator, offer to others in my field, based upon my own experiences, regarding the benefits or challenges of an art-integration practice?

What insights could I, as an art educator, offer to others in my field, based upon my own experiences, regarding the benefits or challenges of an art-integration practice?

### **Data Collection**

As I sought to develop and implement my own magnet visual arts curriculum, the only human participant in this study was myself. However, in the course of my responsibilities as an art teacher, I have had ongoing conversations with other teachers, administrators, students, and other stakeholders and my rendition of such events are included. These conversations will provide opportunities for me to reflect upon what I perceive others to be expressing. In addition to these conversations, other sources of data included are curricular information, mission statements, and various other administrative documents, itineraries, school website data, and staff handouts. Documents were considered for their potential to shed light upon the activities and priorities of an arts-integrated environment.

### **Timeline**

The study of arts-integration took place during the 2013-2014 school year. I began formulating this study around the beginning of August 7<sup>th</sup>, 2013 and anticipated finalizing my thesis by the end of March 2014. The timeline of this study has been approximately 7 months.

### **Limitations**

This study was limited to my own singular perspective teaching the fine arts between two schools in one county of the Georgia Public School System, as well as my own perspective of other arts integration models. Further limitations are restricted to what I observed and what I did not observe within my school settings, as well as what information I located other sources. Be-

cause my experiences involve collaborations with other educators and other educational curriculums, I must acknowledge that their attitudes and portrayals also impact what I was able to accomplish, although they were not formal participants in my study. The experience of the educators within the building range from first year teachers to 25+ year veteran teachers; each having their own experience with arts-integration practice. Documents collected from various websites and personal correspondence, are also limited to the information I have found or have received.

## CHAPTER 4 CURRICULUM MODELS

### **Current Curriculum**

My understanding of the current magnet curriculum, which I have inherited, is that there is no formal structure in place, decreed as such by the school, district, or previous art instructor. Though certainly there are high expectations from all stakeholders, and previous habitual occurrences that are expected to take place in this curriculum, its structure is not prescribed nor mandated. Prior conversations with the art educator who first headed this magnet program, in my attempt to discern what was currently in place and what others might expect of me, revealed that the visual art magnet program was flexible in nature and no set curriculum existed. Most of the program's development in future depends upon what I foresee for its future, but what do I foresee? Currently, my students rotate through my classroom, as well as through dance, theatre, and music. They focus on one fine arts area specifically, and visits to that focus class happen more frequently than a non-focus student. For example, one of my focus students would visit my classroom in a regular rotation with their homeroom, but they would also see me on Friday in a small group of their grade level peers. In the past, guest visual artists would conduct a class about 16 times per year. This year, with the addition of myself to the team (an equivalent of two art teachers) this guest artist number has dropped to 6 visits, per administrative directive, due to having more art offered to students this year within the regular schedule. Visual art sketchbooks had also been previously established in the visual art focus student's program; this has also been continued this year. However, due to the increased number of students in the program and the expense of sketchbooks, I foresee that the current structure will need to be revised. One method that might work in place of visual art sketchbooks is the new school-wide journaling program being implemented. Students would take their journals to each "specials" class, including mine.

I could use these journals as assigned sketching/writing integrated pieces and better yet, they would be for every student in the magnet program and not just my art focus students! Moreover, showcases for art student work has and is currently being held twice per year with each students showing at least one to three pieces of artwork in each showcase. This year, I incorporated the high school magnet jazz band to play during our fist showcase in hopes to establish lateral collaborative planning and mingling. I also invited school board level guests to interact with visual art students. I do not believe either of these occurrences have previously been held.

I must carefully consider what has been devised in the past, so I can continually increase the quality of my program. When the other art teacher and I collaborate, I enjoy the experience. I can learn from her, and she can learn much from me; however, I do not want us to end up with too similar a product. What difference would there be if we provided all the same projects for display? Though we are different in our methods, we are alike in goals for our students. Another addition to my program I attempt is a higher profile with outside school displays and contests. This is an area in which I had success at my previous school. Many of my previous students have taken state level awards. The magnet schedule, however, does make these tasks more difficult to accomplish, as kids see more of their focus teacher than others and performance schedules can take precedent.

Regarding what students study in the visual arts, though there were no prior lesson plans available to examine, in conversation the previous magnet art teacher mentioned she simply taught a grade level higher than what was expected of the student. My students also integrate fine arts into their academics, and collaborative planning as well as technology integration within this framework is highly encouraged. For example, in arts integrated academics, the fifth grade teachers were teaching a Science lesson about genetics, while having student study recessive

genes. While teaching this, they also taught the students how to draw a self-portrait. I gave the teachers my power point on step-by-step methods of facial proportion for self-portraits so they could integrate the lesson effectively. Each of these foundations mentioned are currently in place within my curriculum. Some items I have inherited and some items as for mentioned I have added; now I seek knowledge as to what I might add to my current practices.

### **A+ Schools**

The A+ Schools Program might be considered the largest and longest running arts based educational program, mainly due to its reported success in school reform. Similar to my own arts integrated school; their curriculum is based upon continuous teacher support to establish their teachers with creative collaboration. Their instructors seek to create meaningful hands on learning situations for their students and these contribute to the quality of A+ Schools instruction. Another characteristic of this program is arts integration and arts education. Similar to my current school setting, this program offers visual arts, drama, dance, music, and creative writing. Students learn to collaborate with each other in a creative environment meant to support other academic subjects, such as Math, Science, and Literacy. The emphasis is on real world application, instilling curiosity in learning, and connecting ideas.

The student success data collected by A+ Schools displays positive results, but they do not attribute this to just the arts integration component. Generally, the students do as well or better than non-A+ students, and without the narrowing curriculum that occurs in traditional schools. The school wide curriculum offered at A+ schools, similar to my own, provides student access to all disciplines, and all forms. In the case of my own school, we report positive trends in academic student data similar to A+ schools; though like the A+ schools I personally cannot attribute it succinctly to an arts integrated curriculum either. After reviewing our previ-

ous CRCT data results, every grade level tested (third through the fifth grades) show an increase of scores over that of the district as well as the state of Georgia. Why? I do believe that the arts integration curricula we use at my school does display creative teaching strategies that challenge and inspire students, but also I know that the students would not be in the program without acceptable scores, creative talent, and good behavior. Our audition requirements establish a report card and recommendations to enter our program, and from what I have uncovered, A+ schools does not require such items. There is additionally less distraction from learning within a classroom because high expectations for student behavior are typically met with outstanding results from the student. This is because, should a student acquire more than two written office referrals, our policy is to discontinue the student from the program. There, perhaps, is the bias to our program's student successful results: students begin the program with proven high achievement and continue with the support of parents who have contracted to offer mandatory participation. Yes, this is a fabulous program with dedication from all involved, but the candidates participating have been screened and groomed accordingly.

As far as schedules for art teachers go, there isn't one set schedule for all schools to follow, but each site school decides their own. Collaborative planning is believed to be the key process of the A+ schools, so most schedules do incorporate time within the day to allow such planning. In the A+ Schools in North Carolina, for example, art teachers are responsible for their daily curriculum based upon the NC State Essential Standards for the curriculum, and they are expected to integrate non-arts and/or other arts standards in their classrooms; this is known as 2-way integration in the A+ schools. Homeroom teachers integrate the arts, and arts teachers are meant to integrate academics. Generally, good behavior is shown in such models, and this is understood to promote highly engaged students where children are allowed to take ownership in

their school. Unlike my school, there is no audition and entry requirement to the program. I find this school model most interesting because my school is considering joining the A+ Schools Network.

### **Higher Order Thinking Schools**

The approach to Higher Order Thinking (HOT) Schools is a whole school education approach where assistance is provided to schools and teachers to reform the school's culture over a six-year timeline; creating change in an environment is recognized to take time. The process is to strengthen the arts, instill democracy, and integrate the arts. HOT's mission is to inspire education about and through the arts. Similar to the A+ curriculum, HOT seeks to incorporate hands-on, child centered, arts integrated learning. In the arts centered environment, they feel that increased creation of performance and response leads to improved behavior and increased attendance and score achievement, similar to how A+ schools perceived their models. Also like A+ Schools, there is allowance for individual schools to find their own niche. HOT schools simply provide the framework where each participating school may grow individually. A common theme can also be seen in professional development, where parents and teachers alike are invited to weeklong Summer Institutes that feature arts integration and community development. Unique though is their Peer Partner Days; in-service professional development for art specialists with classroom teachers and parents. An open dialog is encouraged for safe and respectful communication; this can be established through trust and the creation of partnerships. This curriculum however might focus even more on collaboration than the A+ Schools, because it has many programs to embrace community as well as focusing more on teacher-art teacher collaborations to strengthen its framework. Teachers and artists jointly design and teach the arts-integrated experiences together, forming a partnership in the provided planning time. The focus

is primarily planning and implementing events with one artist per two or three teachers within said school.

Though my current fine arts magnet schools doesn't typically focus on such intense planning with the art teacher involved in the classroom teacher's plans, we do have school wide collaborations with *Arts Now*. (*Arts Now* is a group who seek to provide professional learning initiatives, where arts integration and instructional strategies collide and align with standards.) On these days, our school set asides time to focus on arts integration throughout the school site and attempts special lesson plans and collaborative planning efforts. This also seemingly resonates with the HOT schools, where they provide students with opportunities for the entire schools are enriched and thematic arts enrichment experiences. Similar to all the schools thus far considered for their arts integrations models, HOT schools base the art education curricula on standards; however, there is an emphasis not only on product but the process in which it was created. Arts integrated schools also find opportunities for improvement, and struggle with the same issues traditional schools do in their models. HOT schools report that scheduling issues, funding, curricular priorities, scheduling facilitators to assist with goals and planning, and simplifying year end reporting all are areas for which their frameworks can be enhanced.

### **Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge**

Like most education models that practice integrating arts education into their curriculum, TETAC aims to approach comprehensive education of learning in and through the arts. TETAC, however, centers on instruction of artwork and assessment, and generates its content from four foundational art disciplines (art history, art production, art criticism, and aesthetics (i.e. DBAE) that contribute to the creation and understanding of art. A large national network of stakeholders interested in educational reform is engaging TETAC's curriculum. When designing curriculum,



TETAC suggests that teachers should make sure objectives are truly outcomes for learning: diversity in the artwork, as well as the artists being studied, units centered on ideas or about works of art, technology should enlist components for promotion of learning, and local museums and artists should be utilized if available or appropriate. While some of these customs I may not have previously considered, I will state that incorporating available museums and artists is something I do consider and do currently participate in an introductory state. My program currently has 6 visits per year with the aim of inspiring students; from guest artists in varying mediums visits to local museums and performances depending on availability. I do wonder if we are accessing all resources currently available, however.

In TETAC's Unit format, they suggest introducing an idea or key concepts, following with essential questions based on the human experience as well as another about art. TETAC finds importance in the following format within their curriculum: overview, objectives, materials, planning, background information, vocabulary, body of lesson, summary, assessment, connections to other academics, and listing local state or national standards that the lesson encompasses. This seems to be fairly standard in format, except my lessons plans currently seem to incorporate more detailed information beyond these mentioned, like the inclusion of differentiated instruction or how I am modeling the concept being learned. Thus far, I have noted that each school model discussed depends upon national or state standards to reinforce the direction of their lesson's instruction. The inclusion of standards to validate and drive instruction is generally central to instruction throughout public school education models.

### **Bailey's Elementary School for the Arts and Sciences**

In much of my research I found many alliances that supported policy change to enhance education through the arts from the educator's vantage, meaning short professional development

series and workshops. However, I was seeking more putting-into-practice models. Then I came across CETA, which is a little bit of both. CETA stands for Changing Education through the Arts program and their collaboration with the Fairfax County School (Virginia) system began in 1999. Though it began with a smaller number in the Fairfax district has now expanded into eleven schools at last count. One such school participating in the Fairfax County School is Bailey's Elementary School for the Arts and Sciences. Bailey has been a magnet school for 21 years. Their aim is to integrate technology and the arts in all areas of curriculum. Some enhancements that this school offers to their arts enrichment program are Science and electronic music labs, performing arts theater, museum-in-progress, a fine arts studio, as well as a strings program.

This school, similar to my own and unlike the other models presented, admits applicants based on positive behaviors and then lottery. The art curriculum in Fairfax County Public Schools is considered a core subject, and essential to all students. Their art curriculum is devised into three stands: process, product, and understanding. Process incorporates idea development, planning, material processes, and reflection. Product contains media, techniques, content, subject matter, craftsmanship, and presentation. Understanding is meant to bring students into learning art history, cultural context, criticism, art vocabulary, and aesthetics. Further, Fairfax and therefore Bailey, have designed their art curriculum to develop content and skills in personal expression using art production, problem solving creatively, understanding the artist role in society, history, and culture, and the technical processes. The art instruction is meant to provide a challenge to students, build upon their differences, and allow students to express themselves positively. After reviewing the many possible models and details identified in various arts integrated schools, I find that CETA's model is the most likely possibility for my own educational curriculum to follow.

In the broader spectrum, CETA, similar to other models, begins with hopes of long-term change by providing constant support and education for teachers. Collaboration is a large part of their plan, but unique to their program is that they allow their teachers to have a wide selection of professional development options in arts integration for various level needs. Mentors can even provide individual attention to assist in development of curriculum. Fairfax County Public school curriculum, along with CETA, doubled staffing for visual arts and band teachers. They also created additional arts instruction and allowed additional planning time for teachers. Early release happens on Mondays to allow for even more planning time. Support is given to its arts specialists to implement arts integration and intertwine them both.

The structure of a CETA school is yearlong courses, workshops for educators, curriculum development, summer institutes, monthly in-school study group meetings, support with in-school Art Coaches, and action-based research. This arts integration model incorporates visual art vocabulary in its courses, encourages risk taking in classrooms, motivation for faculty and integration of the arts, and allows art teachers to take on leadership roles in schools as art content experts. CETA school models invite art specialists to lead educator workshops to build leadership capacity in the arts teaching workforce. CETA schools demonstrated significant success compared to the more traditional schools. CETA students displayed significant improvement in non-arts subjects, and teachers showed increased desire to instruct with expected instructional practices. Similar to other arts integration models, CETA bases its curriculum context on local, state, and national standards. They embrace instruction to favor the multiple intelligences as well as differentiated instruction; which they believe gives framework to arts integration. In order to improve instructional quality, CETA schools actively recruit teacher candidates nationally so that teaching missions align. Like most models for change, CETA knows that the implementation of

change is tough. They feel that such processes, which allow curriculums to change, only will change when people change, and people change only when invested in the process.

### **Pros Vs. Cons and What's Missing?**

In order to enhance, strengthen, and/or modify my curriculum, I want to examine the mutual findings; there are many positive offerings found from our sources. Many of the similarities seen between curricula is the continuous on-going support offered for the educator. This professional development might be implemented during planning times, early dismissal, or intensive summer sessions, but it is none-the-less offered as a main pillar to orchestrate an arts integrated curriculum around. We can see that some arts integrated models allow the visual art teachers to have placements of leadership within the school. They are allowed collaboration on more formal level between those teaching the academic and those teaching the fine arts. My elementary magnet and district is exceptional at providing opportunities for professional growth. Common planning periods and weekly professional development with our fine arts team is offered, and often we have an early release day where we can join altogether as a community of educators. However, I have noticed other models implementing some ideas that my own school has yet to, but which may be of benefit. Continuously I read that to encourage a system of change, educators must be vested into the system through personal choice. If that is so, how are educators investing in their schools? One such way might be offering a menu of options for professional development, like CETA offers, which would allow for those educators to personally fulfill their personal potential. While we realize the potential of offering differentiated instruction to our students, wouldn't the same be advised for their educators? The placement of leadership of the fine arts teachers' role is also something of a dynamic point. If instruction were to be arts infused, wouldn't we collaborate more with our most accessible resource, the art specialist? While

my school has some teachers that often ask to collaborate, other teachers rarely or never do this. Though often they might want to borrow a material for a specific purpose, it isn't normally to discuss lesson plans. I think that this collaboration on some level should be initiated and maintained through formal structures. Time could be offered during early release days or even considered electronically depending on rotation schedule, as often planning for grade levels interferes with the fine arts teaching schedules.

### **The Important Aspects of Curriculum**

Let us consider what makes up the important areas of an art teacher's curriculum. Recall that TETAC places curriculum importance with overview, objectives, materials, planning, background information, vocabulary, and body of lesson, summary, assessment, and connections to other academics. One I relate to most is CETA, or Fairfax County Public Schools. It is because it seems to have a similar format to TETAC, but rather in a more organized structure. Their art curriculum is devised into three main stands: process, product, and understanding. To reiterate for the readers sake, recall that CETA's model incorporates the following into their methods of instruction: *Process* as idea development, planning, material processes, and reflection. *Product* contains media, techniques, content, subject matter, craftsmanship, and presentation. *Understanding* is meant to bring students into learning art history, cultural context, criticism, art vocabulary, and aesthetics into account. This format allows for enough freedom with content, yet covers all the learning skills and techniques we want our students to achieve. Also, one detail every model seems to agree with is that the visual art format should incorporate local, state and/or national standards, perhaps for further validation among all stakeholders. This is something I have I place already, and is being continued. Another piece to the curriculum's pie is that visual art teacher must implement hands-on, meaningful, learning experiences that allow for

cross corroboration into other academics, as well as those academics incorporating the arts. Finally, we must not just cease at collaboration within our own buildings, but invite local community resources to benefit our students as well. Forming partnerships with local places to display student work, enticing visiting artists, offering local arts integrated experiences are items for visual art teachers to be involved with. Though this is something I have challenged myself to do every year, there of course are always more opportunities to provide growth and stretch to one's program. Building lateral and horizontal partnerships is perhaps an item I have yet to find nor mention within my readings on curriculum. When I first began teaching, I didn't understand its importance. However, this year I feel less solitary in my practice and more central to the team of players. I see how my new school collaborates with the middle and high schools in various arenas, and I yearn for more of that knowledge. Reaching out allows us to build partnerships and trust; even with other art teachers, for the good of our students. We share knowledge of free resources or current opportunities in the arts.

### **Emergent Collaborations**

One recent example of lateral partnership is through my 5<sup>th</sup> graders and their need to seek placement in the middle school magnet visual arts program. Through conversation with the middle school art teacher, I want him to come to trust my judgment on recommendations for his program. Having only recently become acquainted with him, I know this will naturally need time to develop. The more I learn from him, and he from me, we can come to understand better the needs and wants of our student population, current and future. Collaboration between the middle school and elementary school is something I consider as currently missing. The only collaboration in the visual arts up to this point has been a singular visit from the middle school fine arts, at the end of the year, to speak to potential 5<sup>th</sup> graders in a group setting. In my arts inte-

grated magnet elementary school, we call our students who select to participate in a specific art program, more in-depth and more often, a “focus student”. They can focus on visual arts, dance, theater, or music as determined by their choice and/or audition. As for my program, I want more; I want to get my visual arts focus students in front of that art teacher, as well as perhaps even one day having our students collaborate together on an artwork. Further, I understand that the middle school magnet’s new art building is currently being re-constructed. The program is supposed to boast three art studios with 27 clay wheels, as well as a digital art studio. While I currently integrate various computer designs, and bring into my program digital guest artists, I would like to tour their new facility and communicate with the middle school art teacher regarding their expected teachings following the opening of this facility. Communication is key and provides reassurance to my student’s parents who may be stressed under such a transition for their children.

Collaborations with my students are also being developed. Thus far, all they have known to this point is one art teacher; an art teacher who I find to be humorous, creative, and well-liked by staff and students alike. I enjoy working and collaborating with her as well; trust and friendship has grown, at the same time as between my students and I. When coming into an established school culture and adopting another educator’s art curriculum, it has been my experience that this is something that may take years to develop. Students must move on from the prior years of expectations established by another art educator, and learn to work within the current framework. That being said, I find some students gravitate toward the new persona and others take a while to come around.

The relationship between my co-workers and I was at first timid, and as time progresses they find more reasons to consult me or ask about a material they might need. As art teachers

working in a team, we try to accommodate whenever we can, but it also must be understood that we serve an entire buildings population on set materials and cannot always afford to provide these materials. Such relationships must be approached with caution.

My relationship with the surrounding community has been in process for many years, as I have remained within the same school district with my transfer of schools. Some collaboration was already in process; like my partnership with the local library and displays. These need to be maintained and others cultivated.

Much of what I have discovered are the pro-active methods for me to instill the importance of the visual arts role within my curriculum by building collaborative relationships. Partnership and trust are key factors, those between staff, students, lateral art programs, and local enterprises, but also is collaboration and opportunities to build relationships. I understand now why many educational reformers notate such items like trust and relationship within an educational community. Going forth with my own curricula, I must implement a more formal realization of how I might implement such understandings and findings within my own structure.



## CHAPTER 5 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CURRICULUM

### **Formation of a Modified Arts Integrated Curriculum**

For my initial consideration, I sought to answer the question, “What information can I learn from others currently operating arts-integrated frameworks to expand my magnet fine arts curriculum?” The process of reviewing other arts-integration models has allowed me to note that there are multiple successful methods for developing an arts-integrated curriculum and that there are many schools that seek to excel at it. I have found that there is not a single standard “cookie cutter” way in which one educator can integrate the arts into an educational setting, but that these models do offer multiple ideas and share some commonalities between them, which I will outline below.

First, arts integration can only be achieved through teamwork. Many of these establishments seek to attract and attain educators who *want* to be at their school, strive to excel, and truly believe in integrating the arts into their classrooms. To build further upon this, I realized through conversation with my administration that the teachers need to be supported to be effectual arts-integration instructors; and should they not be able to pull that weight, then they should be allowed to move to another situation with dignity. An educator shouldn’t be made to feel as if they aren’t successful to this adaptive style of teaching, for perhaps they are successful in an alternative educational situation. However, in order for an arts integrated program to be successful it is necessary to have an effective teacher who is on board with the mission and vision of the school. Change can only be established and cultivated with powerful leaders who develop and establish such programs passionately and build their team to enhance the outcome.

Second, another resounding theme within arts-integrated establishments is the amount of professional development and staff support that schools offered to their teachers. Common plan-

ning periods are needed to execute successful cross-curricular instruction between grade levels as well as allow teachers to find leadership within them. One example of professional development done well is allowing these educators personal choice and the chance to connect to arts-integrated learning in ways individually needed. This allows educators to become invested in the school's mission and personally motivated. Because of this, I would like to see my school administrators respond to teacher feedback regarding which professional development courses are offered, perhaps taking note of how the HOT schools embrace teacher-art teacher collaboration. In this case, rather than planning within the grade level solely, HOT schools have found that the formations of partnerships between these educators are effective in horizontally supporting each other. I find that educators cannot simply develop their own teaching curriculum without the need to share and excel with the other educators in their building. This allows for aligned curricula. This is important because curriculum is the driving force behind any teacher's success, and making sure the curriculum is effective for students and a reflection of school's mission is an important undertaking, as well as my own.

### **Validation**

Another resounding connection in successful curriculum is that all the models I have uncovered base their art curriculums on national and local standards, positioning their programs to be validated by the outside community, as well as within the building. Though this is expected within my district and I actively accommodate such expectations, I know not every art educator embraces such external standards. Here it is: because not every stakeholder realizes the importance of the arts, though most do in an arts integrated curricula, we still must actively educate those stakeholders as well our students on why we do what we do. Certainly now, in our current economic climate, it is necessary to advocate for the arts and most especially to protect these rare

educational curriculums *such as* arts integration. Specifically, I find that these nuances, such as listing standards within my lessons plans and classroom, photographing my involvement in external non-mandatory displays and uploading them appropriately, pointing out the essential question for the topic, providing pre- and post-data for student learning, does actually assist in allowing those outside forces (which are the reason why students have access to my program) validate my reason for “being.” We can effectively determine this as an important aspect, because all of these art integrated programs mention they apply state or national standards to their curricula. Of course, *I* know what goes on in my classroom, but others do not always know. As all of us in the visual arts may attest to, pro-actively offering our stakeholders a visual image of learning can be a powerful thing.

### **Findings**

After determining the commonalities which can be observed between the arts integrated curricula I researched, I defer to my second question, “what insights can I, as an art educator, offer to others in my field, based upon my own experiences, regarding the benefits or challenges of an art-integration practice?” In my case, I feel empowered to share my own insights from my experiences: specifically I am fusing an adopted curriculum put into place by others before me and I have questioned how or if I may cultivate it further. My research tells me there are many options in my current setting, and many things “we” (my team), are doing correctly. An effective curriculum for me is one that offers a valid and supportive structure that supports my student’s needs. To be specific, let me discuss what some of those needs might be, simply from my own observations. Some of my students see me less than others (those that we call “focus” see me twice per week and every day during a focus schedule. These students get plenty of art.) The other students need a “big bang for the buck” so to speak, so I must bring in many things to

the smaller timeline I have them. Also, positive feedback has been offered on the student artwork I actively display throughout our buildings and district. This has been wonderful to validate the hard work of the students and my program's growth and must continue. Up to this point, I have displayed a collection of work surrounding the media and school's center, grouped by grade level. Student commentary is available for their body of work. I overhear students exclaiming, statements similar to "see, this is why I love art!" or staff marveling on what and how we created work, even outside sources such as *Arts Now* excitedly commenting on the professional nature of the work and inclusion of student statements. Such endeavors allow my program to constantly connect with others outside of my classroom.

Another item I have noticed is that I might need to create a class strictly for improving the portfolio of my 5<sup>th</sup> graders and their soon-to-be auditions at the Middle School Magnet. For example, I have parents and students alike, some who are of my focus students and others who are not, seeking extra help to develop their portfolios for an art audition. This being my first year in this setting, I determine that extra emphasis should be placed upon this endeavor. Expectations, instructions, and perhaps an added course on developing a portfolio at this level would encourage lateral planning and development with the oncoming middle school. My district leaders and administrators have high expectations, where student success must be achieved. While my student's art post-assessments have yet to be conducted this year, this is simply one method which district leaders and administrators will evaluate the success of my students and program.

As mentioned before, the professional development at my school is certainly covered, but it would be nice to provide more opportunities for faculty to input better meet needs. I notice communication between classroom teachers and those teaching fine arts should be developed and encouraged. More than simply asking to borrow a material we need to consider how we may

best support each other within our building. I suggested to our administration this week, that we open next school year with a staff art lesson. My goal would be to open lines of communication, and perhaps collaborate with teachers in other disciplines (as in joining efforts with a math teacher). This would be my way to establish comfort, partnerships, and good will within the building. Yes, we already integrate the arts and support in cross-curricular methods, but further development between staff or in depth conversations might lead to amazing things. Currently, all grade levels have daily grade level planning, but it is during the times when arts instruction is taking place for their students. Another alternative would need to be developed to allow for planning between fine arts teachers and classroom teachers. I would suggest that the rotating planning time allotted for the fine arts staff be occasionally utilized for this endeavor.

### **Conclusions and Implications**

With what I have learned, I have determined the curriculum guideline I will follow for upcoming lesson considerations will be similar to the CETA model. By using CETA's curriculum as a guideline for my own, I can successfully apply all the important tidbits into my instruction, without getting lost in the chaos of curriculum, and focusing on what is *really* important. Knowing that, so often, new requirements are demanded of teachers, perhaps I can direct my vision to the specifics that will assure my students are successful and that my stakeholders are satisfied. Recall, their art curriculum is devised into three portions: Process, Product, and Understanding. The Process portion supports my students' ability to plan and produce and connect to other disciplines is a skill that all educators should be teaching, no matter the subject. It is through this that I bring in the arts, where teaching skills to students shows them how to learn anything they so choose. Through Product, I cover the standards of teaching the aesthetics of the medium as well as craftsmanship. Through CETA's incorporation of Understanding, I can cover

art history, further cross-curricular considerations, culture, and vocabulary. Perhaps this method allows for more quality vs. quantity that this age of modern Internet access requires. Factoids are at the touch of our fingers, and hands-on learning, process, product, and understanding is the new wave of learning. This found model, borrowed from CETA, would certainly allow my program to grow as I include such important considerations.

The discovery of this CETA curriculum, which I will keep as a guideline for the future of my program is helpful. Almost as important as this outline are the many unique strategies the other arts integrated school curriculums utilize, and the opportunity to reflect upon them. As for the future of my program? I continually learn new facts everyday simply by observing and fulfilling my job requirements; i.e. policies of the program, audition processes for the insider, and how others before me worked together to create a better opportunity for students. We look toward to the real possibility of joining in with A+ Schools. This would be an outside factor upon future curriculum changes or scaffolding beyond my control or knowledge. Should we succeed in joining the group, we would be the first in the state of Georgia. Our partner in this is *Arts Now*, a helpful non-profit foundation who creates a strong and respected presence in our building; offering professional development sessions in arts integration, bringing other outside schools to visit and see our model, as well as assisting in arts integration strategies in our classrooms. This, as well as the guest artists that visit my classroom, about 6 visits per year, provides outside connection for students and teachers alike. All are strong connections to the surrounding Atlanta community that remains essential to our growth.

Finally, I would add that so much of what works for one school system or entity may or may not work for another. Each situation is unique, and while we can learn from each other, we must ultimately use trial and error to establish our own culture; not just in our classrooms but

within our buildings. In an effort to further propel my findings into a reality, I could share my study with others in my own building in order to heighten their own awareness of our curricula. I would be interested in their perspective of my possible model, as well as conducting my own trial and error system in order to establish if the CETA model implemented at my own school would be actually successful. On all counts, I would want to open a dialog with my esteemed colleagues in order to learn if we share the same interests, concerns, and or conclusions regarding my found models and their intersecting similarities, which other arts integration models have already put into practice. Yes, certainly exploration within my own classroom is needed; but to incorporate a partnership with the others of my team and of my school would be exponentially more satisfactory for the building's progression as a whole.

In order to reiterate the changes in my program that I am currently implementing as well as hopeful to initiate, I will provide a re-cap of my narrative to summarize my findings gleaned from other arts integrated models. Please see Appendix A.

- Extension of professional development opportunities to offer personal choice for educators, similar to HOT schools, allowing for personal investment in the school site
- Creation of lesson plans and curriculum instruction based upon CETA's model: Process, Product, and Understanding
- School site to offer allotted planning times where fine arts AND classroom teachers can collaboratively plan (A+ Schools)

From my own observations of my school site's needs in consideration of other models, I also have determined:

- To develop *collaborative* planning and teamwork between the fine arts and academic teachers
- Continue keeping tabs on the possibility of my school merging with A+ schools and offer any assistance/input needed for a smooth transition
- Pursue an aligned curriculum throughout the school site through arts integration, establishing open communication and peer support
- Continue validating our programs to others through written evidence (lesson plans): outlining standards, learning objectives, etc. by all staff
- Offer a “Portfolio” class for upper grades, this would allow for lateral growth between elementary and middle school programs while providing smoother transition to graduating students their and families
- Continue professional art displays of work with student commentary, especially in showcases, inside the building as well as outside the school site- work must be seen
- Consider the need for achievement and expectations regarding student success
- Resume partnerships with fine arts team, continuing growth and a culture of trust

Overall, I submit that my findings over the past months have not only have assisted me in discovering what I am doing correctly or similarly to other programs, but what other arts integrated programs are currently doing that I would like to attempt. I believe that through current and future implementation of trial, error, and strategy assessment that I will be able to further investigate whether these suggested changes will succeed for my own school’s curricula and culture. To facilitate this, I have included an Appendix with my recommended adaptations. Fur-



ther, I look forward to our possible merge with A+ Schools and the continued growth and possibility of what that program, as well as my own, may hopefully propel us forward.

## APPENDIX A

Applicable	Checklist for Evaluating Arts Integration Implementation
Y/N	Have professional development opportunities been extended to offer personal choice for educators, allowing for personal investment in the school site? (HOT Schools)
Y/N	Are lesson plans and curriculum instruction based upon CETA's model: Process, Product, and Understanding?
Y/N	Does the school site to offer allotted planning times where fine arts AND classroom teachers can collaboratively plan? (A+ Schools)
Y/N	Has collaborative planning and teamwork between the fine arts and academic teachers been established?
Y/N	Have tabs been kept with the future development growth of the school site? (In this case, the future possibilities of school merging with A+ schools.)
Y/N	Has an aligned curriculum been pursued throughout the school site, using arts integration, while establishing open communication and peer support?
Y/N	Can the art program be validated to others through written evidence: lesson plans, outlining standards, learning objectives, etc.?
Y/N	What classes can be offered to enhance the art program for students that may allow for a smoother transition to upper grades?
Y/N	Are professional art displays of student work, with commentary, being displayed inside the building as well as outside of the school site?
Y/N	Are the needs for achievement and expectations regarding student success being considered?

<b>Y/N</b>	Are partnerships with the fine arts team being cultivated to create growth and a culture of trust?
------------	--

## REFERENCES

- A+ Schools Program of the North Carolina Arts Council. (n.d.). *Become A+ Sharing Leadership*. Retrieved January 21, 2014, from <http://aplus-schools.ncdcr.gov/inside-a-schools-2>
- Burger, K., & Winner, F. (2000). Instruction to visual art: Can it help children learn to read? *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 34(3/4), 277-93.
- Butzlaff, R. (2000). Can music be used to teach reading? *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 34(3/4), 167-78.
- Chappell, J. A. (2005). The efficacy of an arts integrated approach to teaching and learning. *The National Art Education Association*, 0(2005) 31-43.
- Charland, W. (2001). Art integration as school culture change: A cultural ecosystem approach to faculty development. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 12(8), 2-16.
- Ellis, D. (n.d.). Designing a Learning Community: A Handbook for K-12 Professional Development Planners. *Designing a Learning Community*. Retrieved February 1, 2014, from <http://handbook.laartsed.org/home/index.aspx>
- Fairfax County School District & The Kennedy Center: Changing Education Through the Arts. (n.d.). *Fairfax County School District & The Kennedy Center: Changing Education Through the Arts*. Retrieved February 1, 2014, from <http://handbook.laartsed.org/models/index.aspx?md=26>
- Hetland, I., & Winner, E. (2001). Arts and Education Policy Review. *The arts and academic achievement: What the evidence shows*, 102(5), 3-6.
- Lackey, L. (2005). Elementary classroom teachers, Arts integration, and socially progressive curricula. *The National Art Education Association*, 0(2005), 199-210.
- Lajevic, L. (2013). The lost and found space of the arts in education. *International Journal of Education Through Art*, 9(1), 41-54.
- Liggins, M. (n.d.). Jackson Elementary. Retrieved February 1, 2014, from <http://clayton.136.schooldesk.net/Home/tabid/2735/Default.aspx>
- Podlozny, A. (2000). Strengthening verbal skills through the use of classroom drama: A clear link. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 34(3/4), 239-76.
- Robelen, E. (2012). A+ schools infusing the arts, Other principles into study. *Education Week*, 32(13), 10.
- Robinson, H. (2013). Arts Integration and the Success of Disadvantaged Students: A Research Evaluation. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 114(4), 191-204.

Smilan, C., & Miraglia, M. (2009). Art Teachers As Leaders of Authentic Art Integration. *Art Education*, 62(6), 39-45.

Stokrocki, M. (2005). Models of Integration in Elementary And Secondary Schools: A Short History. *The National Art Education Association*, 0(2005), 6-16.

Transforming Through the Arts Challenge. (n.d.). *North Texas Institute For Educators On The Visual Arts*. Retrieved February 1, 2014, from [http://www.art.unt.edu/ntieva/pages/programs/pro\\_research\\_TETAC.html](http://www.art.unt.edu/ntieva/pages/programs/pro_research_TETAC.html)

Vaughn, K. (2000). Music and mathematics: Modest support for the oft-claimed relationship. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 34(3/4), 149-66.

Vaughn, K., & Winner, E. (2000). SAT scores of students who study the arts: What we can and cannot conclude about the association. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 34(3/4), 149-66.

Visual Art. (n.d.). *Fairfax County Public Schools*. Retrieved February 1, 2014, from <http://www.fcps.edu/is/finearts/visualart.shtml>

Waddell, J. (2010). Fostering relationships to increase teacher retention in urban schools. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction* , 4(1), 70-85.

Winner, F., & Cooper, M. (2000). ). Mute those claims: No evidence (yet) for a casual link between arts study and academic achievement. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 34(3/4), 11-75.