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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to learn from an attempt to form a community of practice consisting of local teachers and an art museum educator. Research goals included teacher professional development and museum educator professional development. The evolution of the educator group was studied over 16 months, during which time several events and collaborations took place in local schools and in the museum, including four teacher workshops. Over time strengthened relationships between the museum educator and local teachers led to new initiatives and partnerships to utilize museum resources in schools. These relationships also led to new understandings of one another’s professional practice.

The significance of the study is that it documents the beginning stages of a museum-teacher group and issues encountered in art museum-school collaborations. This study answers the question: What are the difficulties involved in, and the conditions necessary for, forming a community of practice among a group of teachers and a museum educator? Further, it addresses challenges of keeping the group connected, educational benefits for the group members and how the group changed over time. Themes that emerged through the data included: 1) creating a shared vision; 2) museum and school priorities; 3) administrative support; 4) border crossing; 5) curriculum development. It was realized that it is difficult to form a community of practice between formal and nonformal educators in a short amount of time and that the group is unlikely to survive without a dedicated facilitator with understanding of both institutions.
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I first became interested in teacher professional development workshops at museums when I attended a workshop on the art of Jacob Lawrence at the Phillips Collection in 2002. I was a practicing middle school art teacher and eagerly took advantage of living so close to the Washington, D.C. art museums and the teacher workshops that were offered. A colleague from my school who taught social studies also attended the workshop at the Phillips Collection. Our common experience and the outstanding instructional resources (in print and online formats) that were provided us inspired a collaborative team-taught unit between the two of us and our students. This was my first taste of interdisciplinary teaching and the power of incorporating museum resources into school curriculum. The professional development and amount of supportive resources given ignited a passion within me to connect others to these possibilities and to seek out similar experiences for my own personal growth and development.

I was fortunate to teach in a large suburban public school district that emphasized participation in a community of practice amongst PK-12 art teachers. Professional development was available in many forms: district inservices; courses taught by county teachers to other county teachers; and strong connections with several local universities. Those universities offered off-campus courses at county schools with credit available to count toward graduate degrees. This time in my life was when I began to feel empowered through belonging to a community of practice.

After moving from the east coast to the Midwest in 2006, I began teaching art education and studio art courses at the college level. One of the colleges where I taught had a contemporary art museum connected to the art building. Upon meeting the museum educator, without hesitation I sought ways to forge connections with the museum. These connections began with
integrating museum resources through the curriculum I designed and delivered to pre-service elementary educators and studio art students. I also became very interested in learning more about museum education, encouraged by this particular museum educator’s openness to collaboration.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This purpose of this study was to learn from an attempt to form a community of practice consisting of local teachers and an art museum educator. A community of practice consists of practitioners who come together with a common purpose and a desire to share work-related knowledge and experience (Wenger, 1998; 2007). Communication and collaboration naturally occur within a community of practice. Membership is elective, depends upon acceptance, and requires participation. Institutional boundaries are often crossed in a community of practice. Therefore it is possible for formal and nonformal educators to form a community of practice for the purpose of utilizing art museum resources in teaching.

Professional development workshops and events at museums were one way used to form a community of practice. These workshops served initially to draw local teachers into the museum to explore its resources and to imagine new resources that would benefit them. The teachers benefitted from meeting together in the museum space to dialogue with colleagues who shared the same interests. They learned content information from museum staff (and other presenters) and strategies for using these resources. Griffin (2007) asserts that developing closer collaboration between teachers and museum educators might assist in lowering the stress that teachers feel toward the organizational and management issues involved in using museum resources, and improving their lack of understanding pedagogical approaches appropriate in museums.

There are many reasons why teachers may not engage in professional development opportunities that local museums provide. Likewise, there are many reasons why museum staff may be challenged to provide educational opportunities for teachers. Clark (1996) recognized the unfamiliarity of both teachers and museum educators with one another’s environments and
constraints of time. Though this effort could not solve issues of time, it did address issues of mutual understanding and familiarity with one another’s environments.

Other concerns that affect teachers’ abilities to use museum resources include lack of training opportunities, the accountability systems within school systems, and limitations based on the school calendar. Henry (2004) articulated the need by pre-service teachers for training early in their career on how to effectively use museums. Such initial training might make it less intimidating for teachers to think about using museum resources or teaching in museum spaces. Pressure to teach to the standardized tests and a rigorous accountability system also often takes away motivation for teachers to collaborate and engage in professional development opportunities. Restraints of the school calendar make it difficult for teachers and museum staff to interact with each other.

Art museums have become increasingly more visitor-oriented (see Simon, 2010); as a result museum staffs are under pressure to meet the needs of a growing number of stakeholders (Ebitz, 2005). Additionally, the role of the museum educator is constantly changing (see Wetterlund & Sayre, 2010), especially in smaller museums with less staff where the museum educator is asked to wear many hats. It has been found that there is discrepancy between programs offered for teachers in large and small museums. In a 2009 art museums program survey (Wetterlund & Sayre, 2010), 100% of large museums surveyed offered classes for teachers, while only 50% of smaller museums offered similar type classes. In the particular small museum where this study occurred (8 employees), the museum educator has several job responsibilities that take precedence over attending to a particular audience such as teachers.

Pedagogical challenges are different for art museum educators and teachers, due to the structure of school learning and its focus on a particular age range, which can lead to a theory-
practice divide (Mayer, 2005). Understanding how to teach diverse audiences and age levels within an art museum setting—each having their own specialized needs—can be an overwhelming task for museum educators. Issues identified by museum educators related to developing school-museum relationships include: different teaching styles of teachers and museum educators, diversity of the learning environment, and the need to identify the role of each institution in relation to the other (Harrison & Naef, 1985).

Often there is a lack of understanding on the part of museum educators of PK-12 educators. For example, Lisa, the museum educator participant stated:

I need educators to buy in and think that the [museum] is the cool place to be. I can’t figure out what it is that gets them excited about the museum. I don’t know what is of service to them. I can’t figure out how to figure that out. I don’t feel like I’m connected to them. I don’t know if the teachers know what would be of service to them [from the museum]. It could be so diverse that we [the museum] couldn’t do it all. Maybe they’re not interested in getting to meet artists—I don’t know. That’s why it’s problematic. If we’re going to create an on-going program, we need to know how it will benefit the teachers (personal communication, July 3, 2010).

Such a lack of understanding of each other makes it more difficult to collaborate and solve problems together. Berry (1998) asserted that fostering understanding and communication between museum educators and teachers is the first step toward establishing collaborative efforts.

In the last few decades, museum professionals have begun to re-evaluate the relationship between museums and their visitors, as well as the educational role of museums (Hein, 1998). Teacher professional development within museums can be approached as collaborative program development, in an effort to bridge the gaps that exist between both sets of stakeholders (Marcus, 2008). And if this collaborative program development is sought by a community of practice, it may be more sustainable.
Sustainability aside, teacher collaboration and engagement in professional development at museums have potential to build both collegial and community relationships. Utilization of museum resources (creation or use of existing curriculum, fieldtrips, event programming, teacher workshops) is one way to approach community building and collaboration. Local museums with resources that can easily connect to state standards can provide a space for this dialogue and collaboration. Museum staffs hold the key for facilitating this interaction. However, they need to be familiar and up to date with the state standards and understand practical strategies to address those standards through museum resources and activities.

When striving to strengthen relationships, it is important for museum educators and teachers to check their assumptions about the roles and responsibilities of each another (Tran, 2006). The differences between formal and nonformal educational practice must be recognized. Since teachers usually know their students’ capabilities more fully, and museum educators know more about the artwork in their museum, they have much to learn from each other (Sheppard, 1993).

Museums offer nonformal learning spaces which can serve as ideal settings for dialogue to take place. They afford a space where a community of practice interested in professional development opportunities can take place. In a museum, teachers can remove themselves from the immediate pressures that exist within the walls of the school, while interacting and sharing stories about teaching with other practitioners. In this setting, teachers can explore and experiment, and imagine possibilities for personal and professional growth.

The national guiding organization of museums, American Association of Museums (AAM, which recently underwent a name change to American Alliance of Museums), advocates for museums to engage with their communities, which includes offering professional
development for educators. Ebitz (2008a) recognized that “education has been part of the mission of art museums since the 19th century, yet education and museum educators do not receive support as an institutional priority in most American art museums” (p. 3). There is a need for the museum community to focus research on teachers and how they learn (Falk & Dierking, 2000; Hein, 1998). For this to happen, practicing museum educators need to better understand the teacher audience in their communities (Marcus, 2008).

Museums aim to promote educational initiatives to local audiences and school groups often represent a significant portion of yearly attendance. It may benefit museums to focus on local teachers and to understand what they need in terms of professional development applicable to the classroom. Interest and attention given to local teachers has potential to raise attendance rates at museums and teachers then might persuade other teachers that fieldtrips to the museum are a beneficial use of instructional time. Even in schools where fieldtrips are not possible, teachers who are able to make connections between museum resources and school curriculum may find other ways to use museum resources in the classroom.

Statement of the Problem

This purpose of this study was to learn from an attempt to form a community of practice consisting of local teachers and an art museum educator. The project included establishment of an educator group and a series of professional development workshops and events at the museum.

Statement of Need

There is a gap between PK-12 teachers and museum educators that hinders effective communication and collaboration (Ebitz, 2008a; Zeller, 1985). Professional development for both teachers and museum educators is needed to bridge the gap between them. Forming a
community of practice with a sustainable group that meets together for workshops and events may be one way to strengthen relationships between museum educators and the local teachers. The venues where group members convened included teacher workshops and events at the museum, events at local schools and a closed social networking site customized for the group.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What are the difficulties involved in, and the conditions necessary for, forming a community of practice among a particular group of teachers and a museum educator?
2. What are the challenges of keeping this group connected?
3. What are the educational benefits for the group members?
4. How does the group change over time?

Methodology

This study employed action research methodology using case study methods to offer insights about how relationships develop between a museum educator and local teachers and the educational implications that arose as a result. Five cycles of planning, implementing, observing and reflecting took place throughout the study. These action research cycles were important in the development and direction of the group.

Through documentation and analysis of the five cycles in this research, an account is provided that may be useful to other museums or teacher communities towards strengthening relationships for improved teaching practice. The point is not to generalize but to know the case well and enable others to make sense of situations (Stake, 1995).

Rationale
There are gaps in the field of museum studies related to pedagogical impacts that museums have in their local communities (Kirchberg, 2003). In 1998, the AAM devoted a task force to the issues related to community engagement, culminating in a series of community meetings in six cities around the country.

A decade has passed since the AAM Museums and Community meetings. It is relevant to revisit the historical data and reassess values and realities, as determined by participants in this study. In the case of this particular museum, renovation to the museum galleries began in late November 2011. While the physical museum is closed to the public during this time, the 76 artworks in the public sculpture collection affiliated with the museum are still accessible to the community. It seems pressing that the museum focus attention on local educators to maintain community participation and presence with the collection during the time of renovation. It also seems relevant for the museum to gain perspective of what educators desire in terms of resources, particular to this museum, to provide resources and outreach while the building is closed.

Significance of the Study

The significance of the study is that it documents the beginning stages of a museum-teacher group and issues encountered in art museum-school collaborations. It offers perspectives on developing relationships between local teachers and museum staff at a small art museum. The study provides perceptions and experiences of educators interested in utilizing museum resources in local schools and curriculum.

To be able to address the needs of the community, and particularly the audience of local educators within it, it is important for museum staff and local PK-12 educators to dialogue about one another’s professional practice. It is difficult for a museum educator to be able to gain
insider knowledge from practicing teachers without continuous interaction. Through description of the museum educator and teacher interactions, the larger community where the museum is situated, as well as the museum and teaching communities in the area may gain information about collaborative efforts.

Connecting to this, social networking may facilitate merging personal and professional efforts for a museum. Teachers can connect with friends and colleagues online, while searching for content related to teaching goals within a professional development activity. The growing field of museum informatics recognizes that embracing technological applications and social networking is yet another way to connect with audiences and expand meaning-making related to the objects the museum hosts (Trant & Bearman, 2010).

Creating spaces for engaging in dialogue among local teachers and museum educators has potential to strengthen art education in both museums and schools, and the impact both have in their communities. Art museum education may benefit from looking at emerging methodological approaches in schools and schools may benefit from looking at contemporary approaches in the field of art museum education.

Limitations of the Study

This research was limited to one contemporary art museum and the local urban public school district. It must be noted that though all communications with local teachers and administrators occurred in the local school district, there was one teacher participant that taught in a neighboring smaller school district. Though the museum is on a university campus, attention was primarily given to the art museum rather than the particularities of university art museums. However, this was a distinguishing feature of the museum and became significant in the analysis of the data. Since focus was given to one museum setting and (mostly) one school district, the
findings from this research cannot necessarily be generalized for other museums or school districts.

The sample size of participants was another limitation. The number of participants in the study is small, which makes the outcomes highly qualitative and non-generalizable. Change or improvement of teacher participants’ curricula was not studied over the span of this research, but there was documentation of how the participants verbalized changes in their own practice because of the experiences affiliated with the group.

Time and scheduling issues were another limitation associated with this research. The calendar of the public schools affected the timing of the workshops at the museum that brought together the group of educators. Likewise, the museum calendar of events and exhibits affected topics covered and available dates for the educators to meet in the museum space. Aligning school and museum calendars were significant in arranging for field trips to the museum and scheduling museum-sponsored guest speakers for assemblies at selected schools.

Additionally, researcher limitations played a role in this study. Background and social experiences have contributed to what was chosen for observation, analysis and understanding. The study was limited by the researcher’s personal experience as a former middle school art teacher interested in learning more about communities of practice and professional development opportunities offered by art museums. As a current university art educator, there is also interest in ways to connect pre-service teacher education and museum education. Along with the time factor, travel presented another limitation since the research site was not in close proximity. Digital communication and multiple visits assisted in forging relationships complicated by distance limitations.

Definition of Terms
Closed social network: a private online group, one that participants have to be invited to join, or request to join. The benefit is that discussions and documents posted are not viewable by the public.

Community of practice: a group of practitioners that are brought together by a domain of interest, develop shared resources, and build relationships that enable learning from one another (Wenger, 2007).

Learning: a dynamic process of meaning-making that involves “constructing new ideas and understandings through interactions with physical, social, cultural, and epistemological aspects of the environment” (Tishman, McKinney, & Straughn, 2007, p. 2).

Nonformal learning context: an intentional learning setting or environment that can enhance quality of life (Heimlich, 1995).

Museum informatics: a term related to the museum field that includes “the interdisciplinary study of information content, representation, technology and applications, and the methods and strategies by which information is used in organizations, networks, cultures and societies” (Archimuse, 2010).

Professional development: a comprehensive and sustained approach to improving teachers’ effectiveness (Learning Forward, 2012). Representative of efforts towards the growth and learning of teachers as professionals over time (Miles, 1995), this definition applies equally to museum educators.

Social networking: an act of engagement using social media tools, which invite collaboration and participation, to connect to others.

Situated learning: a social process of knowledge construction that takes place in the context in which it is applied (Lave & Wenger, 1991).
Summary

In many cases, communication and collaboration between local PK-12 teachers and museum staff are difficult but there is great potential for relationship building between them. This action research study illustrates an effort to forge partnerships and strengthen relationships between museum staff and local PK-12 teachers through an effort to form a community of practice. The group of educators was centered on utilizing one art museum’s resources in local schools. Gathering places included professional development workshops and other events sponsored by the museum, and a closed social networking site devoted to the educator group. Dialogue about the utilization of objects within the museum’s collection made personal and professional connections possible. These experiences, as well as participation among the group of teachers strengthened relationships and expanded knowledge and applications of the museum’s resources for teaching.

Organization of Chapters

Following the introduction, chapter two consists of a review of historical and current literature in the areas of: a) constructivist learning theory; b) integrated learning theory; c) communities of practice; d) intellectual entrepreneurship; e) professional development for educators; f) the role of education in art museums; g) partnerships between museum staff and teachers; h) museums and relationships with local communities. Chapter three explains the qualitative research methods that were used and describes the logistics and procedure of the research. Chapter four consists of the data, including character sketches of the main participants and a description of events that occurred during the time of data collection. Chapter five is an analysis of data through the themes that emerged from the research, including: 1) museum and
school priorities; 2) administrative support; 3) border crossing; 4) curriculum development; 5) creating shared vision. Conclusions and recommendations are provided in Chapter six.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter explores what the literature reveals about how a group of educators might bridge the gap between PK-12 teachers and museum educators. Communities of practice are a specific form of learning group that approach goals through a social-constructivist framework. This chapter begins by introducing constructivist learning theory, which leads into integrated learning theory. Then the literature about how communities of practice function is discussed, including their benefits and challenges. Ways that communities of practice have been approached in educational settings with PK-12 teachers is reviewed, along with challenges that may arise. Literature about intellectual entrepreneurship is reviewed to show relevance to the study of crossing borders and facilitating dialogue between institutions towards improved relations.

In addition, the literature about professional development for educators is reviewed. Historical background is provided to show how the role of education within art museums is changing. In this section, ways that social media are relevant to museum education are introduced.

Finally, literature pertaining to museum and teacher collaborations is examined. Relationships between museums and local communities, a goal and a product of museum and teacher collaborations is investigated, and the AAM Museums and Community initiative is described.

Constructivist Learning Theory

Constructivist theory informs the approach to this research. This learning theory is interested in the construction and re-construction of knowledge in the mind of the knower, rather
than in the acquisition of knowledge (Delacruz, 1997). The constructivist approach to teaching and learning posits the goal of teaching to be understanding and construction of knowledge, not the simple reproduction of established knowledge (Walker, 2001). Prater (2001) says that a key feature of constructivism is that the content is less important than the connections between concepts. Curriculum should reflect the inquiry process of the learner, with content introduced as encountered or requested by the learner. Another key feature is that learners determine their own objectives and tasks, with the instructor’s guidance.

Walker (2001) elaborated on the characteristics of constructivist teaching in practice, including: authentic activities (instruction that has strong connections to the real world), learner collaboration, active learning, deep knowledge of a topic or discipline, the use of prior knowledge, an increasing complexity of understanding, and access to content experts. A democratic climate sets the stage for self-discovery and leads to learner empowerment.

Constructivist theory is based on the notion that the individual actively builds and adapts experiences into a broader perspective. “Constructivism emphasizes the experience of the learner as integral to the making of meaning and problem solving” (Simpson, 1996, p. 54). According to Prater (2001), as part of the learning process “we continually add to or revise our understanding based on subsequent experiences” (p. 45). When new experiences are related to past experiences, a process results in which knowledge and beliefs are constantly modified and seen as interconnected. Prater states, “In this way, an individual’s understanding of content is more holistic and personally meaningful” (p. 44). Change is seen as necessary, but the process of making connections through common threads remains constant.

Walker (2001) stressed the importance of using big ideas to provide a conceptual focus for curriculum. These are themes and ideas that extend beyond the study of a particular medium,
technique, design problem, or subject matter. For Walker, these ideas take on more significance when connected to other components of the artmaking process, such as personal connections, problem solving, knowledge base, and aesthetic choices. Big ideas without personal investment lack passion and depth of understanding. Personal experiences disconnected from larger ideas “lack the dimension they have when perceived as common human experience” (p. 34). When learners incorporate a big idea or theme into more than one subject, they are encouraged to investigate in greater depth.

The educator’s primary function within constructivist theory is to guide and facilitate the inquiries of the learner. Prater (2001) stated, “The instructor becomes a facilitator of exploration and provider of experiences that help students form meaning for the concepts and ideas they choose to pursue” (p. 45). When an educator asks open-ended questions for learner exploration of an idea, more emphasis is placed on forming meaning than if an educator simply imparts facts without the opportunity for students to make their own connections. An environment is provided for learners conducive to look inside oneself for answers, and they may become eager to know more.

The implementation of constructivist curriculum is often linked to integrated thematic units of learning across the curriculum (Simpson, 1996). Meaningful connections can aid in understanding phenomena outside the art discipline. Simpson wrote that art teachers may become better prepared for strong organizational collaboration with interdisciplinary teams once they begin planning lessons that connect art and the learner’s world. Educators practicing constructivist theory might ask their students to speak or write about their completed work, revealing the pattern of connections made from one task to another or from one subject area to another. Constructivism challenges educators to re-conceptualize their practice and role, “not as
mere distributors of information or trainers of skills, but as connection-makers who ‘weave’ nets between disparate areas of knowledge” (Marshall, 2005, p. 240). As teachers realize the numerous ways of ‘weaving’ together subject areas in constructing meaning, there is potential for invigoration, both personally and professionally.

Applications of constructivism occur in both formal and nonformal settings. According to Lankford (2002), engagement with art is “most fulfilling when it actively challenges, builds, and extends the knowledge, aptitudes, and abilities of the museum visitor” (p. 141). While formal and nonformal art educators agree that constructivist theory is crucial to methodological approaches, they may interpret the theory in practice in different ways, leading to misunderstandings and misperceptions. It is possible that some of this might be due to the context or setting in which the learning occurs, comfort levels of the educator in the setting and the expectations of the institutions. Schools and art museums have different educational goals and ways of achieving them. Although both adhere to principles of constructivism, formal and nonformal teaching and learning often require different pedagogical approaches.

Integrated Curriculum Theory

In the same way that theorists of constructivist curriculum suggest parallels of their approach to integrated curriculum, theorists who write about integrated curriculum share the view that the theories are complimentary of one another. Marshall (2005) claimed dovetailing between the two theories. Those who support an integrated curriculum approach, according to Marshall, “find a strong theoretical rationale for these claims in constructivist theories of learning and some of the new thinking in cognitive science that addresses learning and creativity” (p. 229). Furthermore, Beane (1995) posited that integrated curriculum concerns the “active construction of meanings rather than the passive assimilation of others’ meanings” (p.
620). In addition, “The student is usually thought of as actively constructing the meanings of what is learned, inquiring into topics of interest, relating what is learned with what is already known” (Parsons, 2004, p. 782). In an integrated approach, art is not used to merely reinforce factual knowledge (Chapman, 1978).

In practice, curriculum integration begins with the identifying an organizing theme for learning experiences (Beane, 1995). Parsons (2004) noted that curricular activities “can only be integrated by promoting thought about a common idea” (p. 788). He also wrote that “students should grapple with the problems first and learn how to use the tools as they find them helpful” (p. 778). After an overarching theme is chosen for the curriculum, planning should progress to identify big ideas or concepts related to the theme. Once those topics are settled upon, activities are chosen that might be used to explore them.

The teacher assumes the role of facilitator and team player in this approach to learning. Krug and Cohen-Evron (2000) suggested that the planning of curriculum integration should involve many people, including students, teachers, and community members. Beane (1995) explained that, “In curriculum integration, teachers work first as generalists on integrative themes and secondary as content specialists” (p. 620). Teaching is a practice of making connections or helping students to make connections (Marshall, 2005). Projects do not automatically promote an integration of self, of course. Everything depends on details of the project (Parsons, 2004), which the teacher carefully and thoughtfully arranges.

The framework of integrated curriculum purposefully blends subject areas to organically construct meaning. Beane (1997) wrote that students are more likely to learn subject matter if it is organized into generalized concepts that cut across the fragmenting boundaries of separate subjects. Different bodies of knowledge are connected, while enhancing the integrity of each
field of study (Krug & Cohen-Evron, 2000). Marshall (2005) added that curriculum integration breaks down the barriers of categorization that tend to limit understanding within a discipline. According to Beane (1995), “Curriculum integration, in theory and practice, transcends subject-area and disciplinary identifications; the goal is integrative activities that use knowledge without regard for subject or discipline lines” (p. 619). When students combine thinking about a relevant topic within society with ideas and techniques of expression, and are able to coordinate into one enterprise, the curriculum is integrated (Parsons, 2004).

According to Marshall (2005), “Connections are at the core of cognition and consciousness” (p. 229). When thinking about any subject, connections are made within the brain. Thoughts are not compartmentalized and feelings are not separate pieces of life experience. According to Parsons (2004), artworks can serve as organizers of an integrated understanding of complex situations. He remarked that if students are to study art, they must think about meanings behind the work, which come from other areas of study. Beane (1995) claimed that the central focus of curriculum integration is the search for self and social meaning. Parsons (2004) wrote, “The art world is to be understood as much in social as in intellectual terms, and to understand it requires more than a knowledge of the art disciplines” (p. 786). Art is put into a larger social context in an attempt to obliterate the disconnection of art from society.

Within an integrated curriculum, there is hope and intention that integration occurs not only externally in how planning and activities are organized, but internally as well. Curriculum integration can become a potentially transformative instance of practice. Krug and Cohen-Evron (2000) stated that, “Teachers and students can participate in active inquiry about their own experiences and engage in reflective capacities to become the author of those experiences” (p. 272). Parsons (2004) suggested that personal wholeness is the fundamental goal of curriculum
integration. He wrote that this can be achieved “only by students relating together their thoughts, feelings, and attitudes in a more comprehensive understanding.” Furthermore, he added, “The goal is for students through their learning to construct a consistent picture of their world and their place in it, especially by making sense of their own experience and life-world” (p. 782).

Beane (1995) declared a similar notion, “As teachers facilitate the search for self and social meaning, students are encouraged to integrate learning experiences into their schemes of meaning to broaden and understand themselves and their world” (p. 616). In the classroom, Parsons (2004) asserted that art should be presented as part of students’ life, something not to be found only in museums and galleries. When students are able to internalize their own sense of place and connect art with daily life, they realize that art is all around them, not only contained in formal, designated spaces.

Lessons centered on life issues provide students a way to construct their own informed perspectives. Curricular practices and learning experiences become more meaningful when knowledge is integrated within a student’s life-world and “contextually situated within community, regional, national, and global dialogue” (Krug & Cohen-Evron, 2000, p. 272). It is also suggested that “meaningful learning experiences occur more readily when students explore life-centered issues from multiple perspectives” (p. 272). Beane (1997) wrote that “when we understand knowledge as integrated, we are free to define problems as broadly as they are in real life and to use a wide range of knowledge to address them” (p. 8). He charged that an integrated curriculum approach “serves the young people for whom the curriculum is intended rather than the specialized interests of adults” (Beane, 1995, p. 620). It is recognized that teachers sometimes approach subject matter because they themselves are interested in it, not necessarily
addressing interests or concerns of the students. To base lessons on life issues relevant to students’ experiences engages their attention and commands their participation.

Vars (1991) pointed out that the continuing challenge in education is to design curriculum that simultaneously takes into account solid subject matter, the needs of the learner, and society’s problems. Krug and Cohen-Evron (2000) added that the arts can be a means for students to learn more about community conditions and concerns. This notion expands on life-centered issues more directly related to the individual and challenges students to concern themselves with becoming responsible members of society. Parsons (2004) said that a topic commonly suggested for integrated study is the local community. He commented that the reason for the study of social problems is not to make students feel liable to solve the problems but to provide a meaningful context for this integrated understanding. Gude (2007) posited, “Students whose work investigates issues of real concern to them are more engaged in the learning process” (p. 8). If students consider actual challenges within their communities in the artwork they create, they add layers of meaning to their work, and provoke others to give attention to the matter.

Krug & Cohen-Evron (2000) wrote that curriculum integration can assist students with identifying and reflecting on how their interpretations of ideas are connected to a larger community and global dialogue. Since interpretations vary based on the individual and the context, it is appropriate to disregard discipline boundaries when addressing issues of society in the art classroom. According to Parsons (2004), “Our society has become increasingly complex and is in constant change, and students should study these changes, and their problems, to prepare them to participate well in society” (p. 778). Further, he stated, “This requires integrated
studies, because the issues involved transcend disciplinary boundaries” (p. 778). It is not realistic to think that the complexities of most social problems are limited to single disciplines.

Contemporary art transcends disciplinary boundaries. Much of the content of contemporary art is based on themes, societal issues and multiple perspectives. It lends itself to integrated curriculum. When a group of local teachers of different subject areas join together at a museum to discuss contemporary art, they each bring their own content knowledge to share. Development of integrated curriculum is an appropriate goal for making meaningful connections between teachers in a museum workshop. When teachers of different subject areas come together to develop integrated curriculum based on contemporary art that they experience together in a museum, they are transcending disciplinary and institutional boundaries. Integrated curriculum used in the classroom or museum settings based on contemporary art can transform learning experiences for students (and teachers). Through discussion of art and coordinated learning activities, learners may come to better understand societal issues and complexities of how different subject areas approach problem solving.

Communities of Practice

A “community of practice” is a specific human organizational system, described by Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger. Not all communities are communities of practice. Three dimensions are necessary in a community of practice: mutual engagement, joint enterprise and shared repertoire (Wenger, 1998). The distinguishing dimensions were later simplified as the domain, the community, and the practice (Wenger, 2006); but though the wording was simplified, the characteristics of a community of practice remain the same.

The domain must be shared by members of a community of practice. This is a shared understanding of what brings members together, guides learning and gives meaning to actions of
the group (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002). Schmoker (2006) wrote that members “recognize and share the best of what they already know” and work together to meet shared goals (p. 109). In formal and nonformal education settings, this shared knowledge involves strategies for providing relevant content and helping others to interpret and understand material. Creation and utilization of learning resources for a given audience is common to all educators. Both formal and nonformal educators are interested in improving learning for PK-12 students in the local community.

Through the community, collaborative relationships are formed. Relationships are important over time and across contexts, and each community has its own characteristics and social context that affect the relationships. The activity that occurs within the community should be of interest to members, possibly establishing and maintaining relationships between them (Wenger et al., 2002). The community should encourage members to share ideas with each other and the group. The nature of the social interaction is what is significant. According to Innes and Booher (2004),

When an inclusive set of citizens can engage in authentic dialogue where all are equally empowered and informed and where they listen and are heard respectfully and when they are working on a task of interest to all, following their own agendas, everyone is changed (p. 428).

This suggests that being part of a community of practice has potential to change the perspectives of members. This is important to the study. Is it possible for relationships and perspectives of group members towards each other and the museum to change through being a part of a community of practice of educators? Membership in a community of practice is elective, requires acceptance and is characterized by participation (Herne, 2006). Members can come and go and have varying levels of participation.
The practice (or shared repertoire) is the third component of a community of practice. Skills, techniques and strategies can be created and shared between members of the community of practice. The practice is typically the specific focus of the development of a community of practice, even though the domain provides initial interest (Wenger, 2007). Initially the educators in this study were brought together by the fact that they are local PK-12 teachers or museum staff. However, the specific focus within the group was on utilizing resources of the museum.

Rogoff and Lave (1984) suggested that knowledge is constructed and shared within communities of knowers. Since knowledge is constructed and dialogical, learning spaces in which these encounters can happen are places of possibility. Within the group of educators interested in utilizing museum resources, resources created and shared included: content and scripts for sculpture tours of the permanent collection; information about school fieldtrips; and pre-visit, during and post-visit activities for a fieldtrip. The museum served as the primary space where encounters among the group occurred. However, there were events outside of the museum that brought together particular members of the group; and there were school visits to meet with individual teachers.

There is emphasis on collaboration between members of a community of practice, and the facilitator acts as a guide or coach (Johnson, 2001). Knowledge is seen as “always incomplete, evolving, contextually shaped and influenced” (Taylor, 2006). The role of the facilitator within a community of practice is to listen, summarize ideas and issues of the group, make suggestions, and allow the group to make decisions that will guide the direction the group takes.

Herne (2006) asserted that the facilitator of a community of practice involving teachers and museum staff is an important role. It involves crossing boundaries between institutions, and between subject and pedagogical content knowledge. The facilitator should be able to negotiate
constructive partnerships, coordinate, and align perspectives of both teachers and museum staff. A successful facilitator is open to all participants, can organize participative space and promote engagement (Wenger, 1998). Vallance (2007a) defined an important goal of art education as having learners become lifelong participants in the arts resources available in their communities; this requires convergence between formal learning institutions and art museums.

Communities of Practice among Teachers

The potential for educators to learn with and from one another in efforts to improve instruction is a central reason to advocate communities of practice (Little, 2002). Grossman, Wineburg, and Woolworth (2001) suggested that teachers cannot be expected to create a community of learners among their students if they are not personally part of a community of learners. Teachers that become part of a community of learners with colleagues can better understand the benefits and issues that may arise in student communities.

Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) identified three concepts as relevant to teacher learning in communities. Knowledge-for-practice is concerned with content and strategies and is individualistic in nature. The focus is on what, not how to learn. Knowledge-in-practice consists of learning from the act of teaching, including learning from reflecting on teaching. This includes learning content and strategies for delivering content. Teachers need opportunities to articulate this together (p. 263). In this study, Hirst Educators provided a place for this to happen. Lastly, knowledge-of-practice assumes that teachers play an important role in creating knowledge by connecting their work to larger issues. Since contemporary art addresses societal issues, participants in this study contemplated and discussed connections between teaching and issues presented by various artworks.
Eisner (1979) pointed out connections between the artistry of teaching and the artistry of learning. Irwin and Reynolds (2010; see also Irwin, 2003) extended Eisner’s claim, asserting that the relationship between the two “could expand our understanding of the power and impact of artistic inquiry in communities of practice. This relationship needs exploration if we are to understand the power of working through ideas artistically and aesthetically” (p. 163).

Potential Challenges of Communities of Practice

Wenger et al. (2002) claim that what makes a community of practice successful over time is its “ability to generate enough excitement, relevance, and value to attract and engage members” (p. 50). They also say that communities of practice can evoke a sense of aliveness. This aliveness has potential to energize members and rejuvenate passion for their chosen field. However, along with the benefits of a community of practice, there are also potential downfalls.

It cannot be expected that communities of practice will solve problems without creating others, and it is dangerous to romanticize them. Potential disorders that can occur within communities of practice include: dependence, stratification, disconnectedness and localism (Wenger et al., 2002, p. 146). For example, if members become dependent on a coordinator within a community of practice, it is possible for a community of practice to become vulnerable, especially if the coordinator departs from the group. Spreading leadership within a community of practice may help sustain it.

It is important to be aware of such issues with a community of educators. In this study, group members were empowered to take leadership roles within group activities. The researcher acted as a guide or coach whenever possible and promoted connectedness through digital means. Invitations were continually extended for new members to join the group, through museum
marketing and encouraging members to include their colleagues. However, there were disorders in the group—most prominently, dependence—which made sustainability of the group uncertain.

Intellectual Entrepreneurship

Intellectual entrepreneurs are individuals in higher education who position themselves to be agents of change. Cherwitz (2000) is credited for coining the term “intellectual entrepreneurship,” which he proclaimed as a process of cultural innovation. The goal of the intellectual entrepreneur is to educate citizen-scholars, those who are accountable for their education, utilizing their knowledge to contribute toward social good. Intellectual entrepreneurship crosses discipline boundaries, shifting the contents of academia, expanding audiences, and enabling experimentation and usage of new information technologies (Bresler, 2009).

Carving one’s own path to develop programs to meet the needs of multiple audiences within the typically rigid boundaries of academia is vital to the intellectual entrepreneur. Intellectual entrepreneurs improve on particular services or ways of doing something to better a condition for others. There are some who would claim that entrepreneurs change values (Drucker, 1985). Having the ability to envision a service or product that will change values or at least change a way of thinking takes drive and strong will.

Spinosa, Flores, and Dreyfus (1997) posited that coordinating human activity is at the heart of entrepreneurial work. They develop identities within communities. To do this, sincere intentions to nurture human relationships are key. A shared vision should cross boundaries, going beyond the conventional understanding of knowledge related to a discipline (Bresler, 2009). Collaborations between those in disciplines that are different from one another encourage
deeper understanding of a topic from a viewpoint other than one’s own, as well as strengthening understanding of one’s own discipline.

Once a vision is realized, Bresler (2009) posited that a challenge among intellectual entrepreneurs is in “combining the deeper thinking involved in a vision, with multitasking involved in working with others, allocating time and spaces for both” (p. 13). Bringing a vision to fruition requires a balance of continuous reflective practice and a dedication to meaningful collaboration with others. Lavoie (1991) wrote that an entrepreneur “shifts interpretive frameworks,” reappropriating traditions into new situations. Cherwitz and Beckman (2006) emphasized the need to unite disconnected communities, the arts, the academy, and public university funding.

Conducting research that is socially relevant, in addition to making a contribution to one’s academic field as an intellectual entrepreneur requires creativity and innovation. To be socially relevant, it is evident that one must break through intellectual and organizational boundaries (Bresler, 2009), as well as cultural boundaries, and develop sensitivities in oneself and others. Intellectual entrepreneurs are vested in the significance of building relationships and establishing connections between human networks that will continue to advance after they have moved on. They invite others to join their mission, viewing outreach to others as socially relevant toward positive change. This concern and drive toward the betterment of society (and individuals within) affords a source of constant regeneration for intellectual entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurs articulate a positive change by means that will create impact and make a difference. They are diffusers of information and weavers of networks. They make mistakes, but learn from the process, and never back away from challenges that come their way.
Research, teaching, and service can be conceptualized as highly entrepreneurial activities (Bresler, 2009), and Jeffery (2005) suggested understanding creativity as agency within learning institutions. Jeffery implied that creativity takes place as a result of problem solving and conflict. Settings where learning occurs should provide contexts to promote spaces for this creativity to take place. In the context of schooling, someone that exhibits entrepreneurial qualities might be referred to as an educational entrepreneur (Bresler, 2011). These qualities might expand the roles of teachers, “enhancing their satisfaction, ownership and impact” (p. 11).

Qualities shared by entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial teachers include: (i) vision, and creativity in exploring, identifying and creating educational opportunities; (ii) ability to listen to others, teachers and students, to construct a shared, relevant mission, and to collaborate and team-lead a project; and (iii) persistence in a process of experiential learning within their classroom settings and from interactions with colleagues (Bresler, 2011, p. 11).

Entrepreneurs can be thought of as animators (Bresler, 2009), “working with others to render a vision into an entity that interacts with others’ experiences” (p. 13). This concept, which originated from Miller and Boud (1996), connotes working with others in learning situations, assisting in the activation or inspiration process. Educators take on the role of animators with students as well as with colleagues in collaborative and leadership ventures. Entrepreneurs work with others, serving as animator, establishing connections and dialogue between others, enabling and empowering others to add to the narrative in which they collectively contribute. The entrepreneur as animator organizes and provides opportunities for interactions among human participants. The release of self-imposed boundaries (Bresler, 2009) affords opportunity for continuous transformation of the individual, enabling subsequent entrepreneurial visions through a new lens of meaning.

In this study, theory of intellectual entrepreneurship could be applied to the role of a facilitator (from higher education) of a teacher program in a museum setting. The facilitator
could be deemed an intellectual (or educational) entrepreneur if he or she expands audiences, crosses boundaries, and builds relationships between different groups of learners, working toward social good and improved communications. Border crossing between institutions (museums and schools) within a community is complex work that requires listening and understanding conditions of both contexts. The facilitator enables networking between individuals from the different institutions, takes calculated risks towards improving communications and learns from failure. This type of facilitator revises plans constantly and implements new approaches, tailored for building relationships between the different groups of people. The goal in this study was to improve relationships between a museum educator and local teachers. At the conclusion of the study, intent is that networks between the museum and local teachers will continue to grow.

Professional Development for Educators

The literature about professional development for educators seems to reinforce three big ideas. To be effective, professional development efforts should be sustained over time, rather than isolated events (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; National Staff Development Council, 2001). The most common way to improve professional practice is for educators to create activities and resources that are useful, practical in nature, and connected to context and curricular goals (Grossman et al., 2001). And finally, educators need to support one another, using colleagues for mutual assistance (Darling-Hammond, 1998).

Teacher learning takes place over time and not just in isolated moments. Active learning requires opportunities to link previous knowledge with new understandings (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999). Teacher learning can happen during many aspects of teaching, including classrooms, school communities, and professional development initiatives (Borko, 2004).
Participants are usually teachers who volunteer, motivated to try new ideas (Fishman et al., 2003).

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) requires that states ensure availability of high-quality professional development for all teachers, but it does not define what high-quality entails or how this should be made available (Borko, 2004). The inadequacy of the national policy challenges teachers to take on roles of both teacher and learner, yet Fishman et al. (2003) claimed there is little evidence on which to base decisions regarding design or implementation. However, there are research-driven documents that can advise the field (see Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Jaquith, Mindich, Wei, et al., 2010; Learning Forward, 2012; National Staff Development Council, 2001; Wei, Darling-Hammond, & Adamson, 2010).

Approaching professional development from a situated perspective (Greeno, 2003; Greeno, Collins, & Resnick, 1996) can frame ideas about the nature of thinking, learning and knowledge in a socio-cultural context. Putnam and Borko (2000) stated “three conceptual themes are central to the situated perspective—that cognition is a) situated in particular physical and social contexts; b) social in nature; and c) distributed across the individual, other persons, and tools” (p. 4). In this study, new understandings for participants occurred within the settings of schools and one art museum through workshops and social events, professional in nature.

Resources were distributed between individual participants, throughout the group, and through using tools such as dialogue, curriculum and social media.

Learning is seen in a situated perspective as changes in participation in activities that are organized based on social components, and knowledge displayed by an individual is rooted in social engagement (Greeno, 2003; Lave & Wenger, 1991). This approach to learning is more
than just experiential learning; it involves being a full participant in meaning-making (Tennant, 1997). Situated learning is connected closely to concepts of learning in communities of practice.

From a situated perspective, professional development efforts must be relevant to the practitioners. Professional expertise comes in great part from the teaching profession itself (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999). Teachers understand what other teachers find practical; those outside the teaching profession often do not. At times, teachers can become critical of facilitators of professional development—and their ideas—if they believe that their teaching context is not understood. Forming teacher communities to highlight teachers’ continuing intellectual development to keep up with changes in their disciplines recognizes that teachers are lifelong students of their subjects (Grossman, Wineburg, & Woolworth, 2001).

Teachers’ support for one another can take different forms. Simply taking time to join colleagues in conversations about teaching and learning is one way to support others and to find support. Opportunities are needed for teachers to share what they know, discuss what they want to learn, and connect strategies and new concepts to the unique contexts in which they teach (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995). They need to be able to see how ideas connect across fields and to everyday life (Darling-Hammond, 1998). This suggests that teachers from various disciplines coming together to participate in professional development opportunities can learn from one another (Grossman et al., 2001), no matter if their expertise lies in different subject areas.

Reflective practice is another way that teachers can support one another. Schön (1987) proposed that teachers should learn to reflect together, reflecting on classroom actions and during teaching. Aiding one another to articulate successes and failures and to consider new approaches may promote growth. Developing new ideas or changing viewpoints depends on supportive
conversations with respected colleagues (Brody, 1994). Reflection on practice through dialogue can promote awareness and understanding. The facilitator collected reflections from participants through written evaluations at the end of each workshop as well as through interviews with individual participants. The focus group meeting that took place near the end of the study with main participants was yet another form of reflection from the group.

According to Borko (2004), “To understand teacher learning, we must study it within multiple contexts, taking into account both the individual teacher-learners and the social systems in which they are participants” (p. 4). In this study, teacher participants were engaged in multiple contexts. The group met in the space of the museum for workshops and events but I also visited individual teachers in their regular teaching spaces, to better understand them as a part of their school communities. Partnerships evolved between individual group members and the museum, in addition to group interactions at the workshops.

The Changing Role of Education in Art Museums

Historically, the field of museum education has been perceived as uncertain (Eisner & Dobbs, 1986), with discrepancies evident between museum educators and local educators. Art museums were criticized in the 1970s – 1990s as being irrelevant to social issues by academics (Oberhardt, 2001). However, in recent years education in art museums is taking new forms. Most art museums have changed their focus from intense study of objects in their collections to serving the public (Anderson, 2004) and promoting meaningful experiences (Henry, 2007; 2010). Themes in the literature related to the changing role of education in art museums include: learner-centered constructivist strategies (Barrett, 2008); active and participatory learning (Simon, 2010); and an interest in merging physical and digital experiences inside and outside a museum.
Ebitz (2008a) wrote, “Museum educators working in art museums may have more in common with museum educators and professionals working in other types of museums than they do with school and university art educators” (p. 2). As guest editor for a special edition of *Visual Arts Research* dedicated to museum education, Ebitz recognized a ‘benign neglect’ of art museum education on the part of most art educators. It is important for educators to acknowledge the work of one another and to intentionally step out of comfort zones to realize how practice can become enriched through collaborative efforts with one another.

This benign neglect on the part of most art educators towards practices of art museum educators may stem from cultural assumptions about one another. Eisner and Dobb’s (1986) report entitled, *The uncertain profession: Observations on the state of museum education in twenty American art museums*, created controversy because of the critical slant toward the art museum education profession in general (Williams, 1996).

They found that there was no consensus on aims, an absence of standards for preparation, an inadequate network of communications, insufficient staffing and resources, limited career opportunities, the perception of little political power among museum educators, and a lack of a sufficient intellectual base for the field (p. 34).

Williams addressed the generalizations from the Eisner and Dobbs report in 1996, and described changes and improvements that had been made over time, but still recognized distinctions separating art museum education from the rest of the field of art education.

Perhaps also in response to the Eisner and Dobbs report, in 1992 AAM distributed the landmark report, *Excellence and Equity* (AAM, 1992). This document stated that the basis of teaching should be to provide educational programs that elucidate and illuminate the works of art in the collection. Art museum educators were expected to disseminate to the public historical information provided to them by the museum’s researchers, the curatorial staff (Mayer, 2005).
Ebitz (2008b) surveyed museum educators about theories they use in practice. From results of his study, museum educators are interested in using theory that develops knowledge and skills about objects in the collection. Museum educators also use theories of psychology that focus on the individual and the social and physical contexts in which an individual learns. Though discrepancies remain in theory and tactics, museums are becoming more learner-centered institutions (Falk, Dierking, & Foutz, 2007).

The educational function of art museums, which includes PK-12 education and teacher professional development efforts, is no longer a mere benefit but is central to their mission. Emphasis on access and equity found in the literature (AAM, 1992) is representative of John Dewey’s commitment to democracy in education (Constantino, 2004; Dewey, 1934). Theories of constructivist learning are prominent in educational frameworks that are popular among museum educators (see Ebitz, 2008b), including Housen and Yenawine’s Visual Thinking Strategies (VTS) (Visual Thinking Strategies, n.d.), and Falk and Dierking’s (2000) contextual model of learning. Constructivist approaches within an art museum encourages visitors to build their own meanings relevant to their own lives (Barrett, 2008).

Museums have recognized that visitors are not passive audiences, and that the role of museums should be to actively listen and respond to visitor audiences (Marstine, 2006). Rather than delivering the same content to all audiences, a museum that aims to be participatory in nature involves visitors with content production, changing to fit visitor needs (Simon, 2010). As museums become more participatory in nature, visitors may be encouraged to continue to explore museum resources over time. An active learning experience at a museum might promote multiple visits or engagement with museum programming.
Garoian (2001) expanded on Falk and Dierking’s (1992) “interactive museum experience model” and argued for a performative museum pedagogy to include personal and social knowledge and experiences. Five performative strategies are offered by Garoian: the perceptual, autobiographical, cultural, interdisciplinary, and institutional (p. 239). These strategies are dialogic and promote critical inquiry. Part of the curriculum for the first workshop included performative activities.

Knowledge gained in the context of use has immediate prominence to be remembered and understood (Lave, 1998). Contemporary society views institutional school settings as almost the primary site where learning takes place, but in reality much, if not more, learning occurs in nonformal social and cultural contexts outside of school (Osborne & Dillon, 2007). Contemporary museum education is dependent on visitors becoming responsible for their own learning (Vallance, 2003).

Falk, Dierking and Adams (2006) claimed that in the new learning society in which we now live, free-choice (nonformal) learning that is intrinsically motivated has become of more importance, with more time being devoted to it. These experiences are “motivated by a desire to gain information, enhance understanding, and satisfy one’s curiosity about the world” (p. 324). The authors assert that museums have an important role to play and that museums must rethink how this new vision of learning can be facilitated and documented.

According to Davis and Phelps (2007), “Education is nearing a new crossroads as it faces another shift in emphasis, away from individuals who pass on established knowledge and toward collectives who elaborate emergent knowings” (p. 4). This sentiment is echoed in the articulation of successful partnerships between museum educators and teachers.
Rudman, Sharples, Lonsdale, Vavoula, and Meek (2008) advocate looking at museum learning from a new angle, related to learner mobility and how learning occurs across digital and physical daily activity. This allows for exploration into how knowledge and skills can be transferred across contexts, and how “new technologies can be designed to support a society in which people on the move try to cram learning into the gaps of daily life” (p. 147). Rudman et al. suggest that a key issue is to understand how people create impromptu contexts for learning.

The obvious role for technology in collaborative learning environments is to afford a channel for communication (Rudman et al., 2008). Social media can allow for continuous dialogue to further engagement between participants. Hsi (2007) promoted the concept of “digital fluency” that can be fostered in complex naturalistic settings and online socially constructed worlds. Many museums are devoting resources to creating more avenues for audiences to learn about their collections through online interactive databases and activities (Rayward & Twidale, 2000), as well as mobile interfaces (see Wasserman, 2011).

Astor-Jack, Whaley, Dierking, Perry, and Garibay (2007) argued that “understanding the role of the social process of learning is essential to understanding the nature of learning in museums” (p. 217). And complexity thinking (or the study and support of learning systems) in education (Davis & Sumara, 2006) leads to learning through adapting and anticipating new environments (Castro, 2009). Formal and nonformal education can merge in the space of social media online. The format of online learning puts the responsibility in the hands of the learner. In many ways it combines aspects of both formal and nonformal learning.

Trant and Bearman (1997) emphasized the uniqueness of individual museums and their processes. They stated, “It is likely that values will be as different as the collections we provide and the contexts in which they are encountered. So we may not be able to learn outcomes from
others, only methods” (p. 8). Museums can learn from one another but cannot expect that a program that is effective one place will have the same impact at another; the same is true in classrooms. A program that is effective in one school may not have the same results in another school.

Shirky (2008) said that “activities that are enabled or improved by social tools are sharing, cooperation and collective action” (p. 49). Sharing is the easiest of these activities and has the fewest demands on the participants, while cooperation always involves negotiation of some kind due to tension between individuals and group goals (p. 50). Collective action is said to be the most difficult, since it “requires the group to undertake a particular effort together,” and “creates shared responsibility” (p. 51). Castro (2009) furthered this by stating that “complex systems do not learn in isolation but in relation” (p. 36). In addition, Shirky argued that for a collective action effort, “cohesion of the group is critical to its success” and user identity becomes tied to the identity of the group (p. 51).

Research about learning in nonformal settings has been formative and mainly descriptive in nature (Anderson, Lucas, & Ginns, 2003). There has been change in the role, status and value of museum educators in recent years (Villeneuve, 2007). Though the research has progressed, there is still much that is not known about learning in museums (Rennie & Johnston, 2004).

Partnerships between Museum Staff and Teachers

There is emphasis on the need for communication and teamwork to create and sustain meaningful museum-teacher partnerships. Within these partnerships, it is important that museum staff and teachers are actively learning together. It is also important that museum staff and teachers are able to recognize differences in educational means in their teaching contexts
Partnerships between museums and teachers require teamwork and communication to ensure both stakeholders benefit from the venture. Moisan (2009) described forming a strong learning community between teachers and museum staff through three key principles: allowing for individual choice, mastering new skills together, and implementing peer review. “These three elements build team unity and fully invest all members in the collective process and in working toward project goals” (p. 32). Museum staff and teachers may benefit from an attitude that they will learn together as the partnership grows, and that they can contribute equally to a relationship. In a collective process, they have much to offer one another.

Moisan (2009) advises museums and teachers to avoid over planning in collaborative efforts. “The joy of collaboration lies in the unanticipated opportunities that grow from bringing a group of people together” (p. 34). It is suggested to avoid predetermining results in order to allow for emergent pieces to occur within the partnership. It seems that, when partnerships begin with lofty predetermined goals in mind, there can be pressure for unrealistic goals to be met. Maintaining open communication between museum and teacher partners can keep goals realistic and leave room for opportunities to arise.

When multiple leaders are involved in a museum-teacher partnership, care must be taken to stay away from a narrow focus or petty details. “A collaborative process involving a variety of partners mandates leadership that is both attuned to details and capable of seeing the big picture” (Moisan, 2009, p. 36). Project leaders need to be able to recognize success and build on emerging strengths, and must bring issues to the table to be addressed. Partnership challenges
may include coping with varying expectations from the differences between formal and nonformal educational cultures (Bailey, 1998).

Griffin (2007) stated, “The issue that stands out in regard to relationships between museum educators and teachers is that the pedagogy is uncertain on both sides. There is considerable room for more work both in research and in professional development” (p. 42). Though schools and museums have diverse roles and vary between formal and nonformal contexts, they also correspond with one another; stronger alliances are needed between them. A community of practice made up of PK-12 teachers and museum educators could initiate professional development opportunities at the museum, a space to listen to one another and understand appropriate contexts for pedagogical choices.

Moisan (2009) described a teacher-museum partnership as a model to examine challenges and benefits of shared projects. In the three-year collaborative project described in the article, teachers wrote unit plans based on museum resources and implemented them in their local classrooms. The strongest curricula were then published on the museum website for other teachers to use. An important part of this partnership was gaining mutual respect for one another’s teaching contexts. Since the teachers spent considerable time at the museum, the museum educators spent time in the schools, so that the other equally understood both environments.

Bode (2010) also claimed the significance of understanding each other’s environments for strengthening relationships between museum educators and practicing teachers. In the collaboration she described, the museum partnered with the local university to mentor pre-service and support in-service teachers. This focus allows museum and school staff the
opportunity to work together on shared goals to benefit the educators, and ultimately to improve student outcomes.

Sometimes museums form partnerships with entire schools, rather than just individual teachers. Many of the principles remain the same for partnering, but there are differences because of the organizational rather than individual commitment. Hirzy (1996) described conditions for partnerships between museums and schools to succeed. During early phases of collaboration, it is necessary to obtain commitment from school and museum administrators. It is also essential to create a shared vision for the partnership and to determine clear expectations for what both stakeholders hope to achieve through the partnership. Cohesive planning and communication from the beginning enables program facilitators to be on the same page, which may provide a better experience for all involved.

McLeod and Kilpatrick (2002) stated, “When the centers [museums] and the school districts work together to develop inquiry based learning opportunities linked to the school curriculum, the window of opportunity for making students’ learning more meaningful, more connected and therefore more permanent, opens wider” (p. 62). These relationships take effort to organize. “Ultimately, collaboration is not just about the joint delivery of a product; it is about sharing and shaping an essential experience in concert with the very community and audience we wish to serve” (Sheppard, 1993, p. 182).

Burchenal and Grohe (2008) proposed an approach to PK-12 school museum visits that includes a multiple visit program, extending typical single visit trips into more of a collaborative partnership. When museum educators and teachers collaborate to plan learning activities that combine activities at the school as well as the museum, communications may aid in understanding how the partnership can best benefit one another in the different work spaces.
Building long-term relationships with schools and teachers may both advance museum education programming and benefit curricular goals of schools.

Larson (2004) described a successful long-term program to foster sustained relationships between museum educators and teachers. The program reinforces that one-shot workshops will not change minds or habits, since it is structured around four all-day workshops throughout the year. Larson advocated a “continuing conversation” between those within and outside the museum community, to acquire knowledge and skills to create meaningful museum visits for all learners.

“With a shared vision, committed partners, and solid planning, museum educators and classroom teachers can work together to enrich student learning in a much more impactful way than schools and museums can accomplish on their own” (Moisan, 2009, p. 39). However, the potential remains underutilized by much of public and formal education (Larson, 2004).

In the same way that museum-teacher partnerships benefit each other, museums benefit from establishing and sustaining meaningful relationships with their local communities (Igoe & Russo, 2002). Building community connections beyond the museum and schools seems to extend the potential for a larger community of practice interested in utilizing museum resources.

*Museums and Relationships with Local Communities*

Museums have great potential for creating connections with surrounding community members—to garner lasting relationships and meaning-making with those who live in close proximity and affect (and are affected by) the culture of the museum. When museums take an active interest in their local community members, shared knowledge may become articulated and represented by different stakeholders.
Museum-community relationships must be nurtured; they take time to develop and are based on trust (Conwill & Roosa, 2003). Museum staff should give attention to needs and issues of the community and incorporate local voices into educational programming. Igoe & Roosa (2002) suggested that museum staff must be mindful of the community they serve as their number one priority, and Kadoyama (2007) acknowledged the necessary difficult work involved in museums actively listening to their communities. It is often not a simple task for museum staff to actualize ideas within the museum brought forth by community members. Commitment is needed from museum staff and community members to bring shared goals to fruition.

Worts (2006a) suggested the need for a cultural shift, towards shaping “individual and collective values and consciousness, as well as directing our personal and societal actions” (p. 153). He proposed that “conducting cultural scans and needs assessments within our cities in order to inform new programmatic directions might be another step forward for museums” (p. 168). This indicates that museum educators may attract audiences by listening to the needs of the surrounding community.

What is needed to deepen community and museum collaboration is a format that can encourage both community and museum people to reflect upon strengths and weaknesses (Thelen, 2001). These efforts may lead to surprising discoveries when museums and their local communities attempt to move beyond networking. There is potential to build sustained collaborations, to co-create, to empower each other, and even to envision how such collaborations might provide a greater civic purpose within a museum.

Worts (2006b) wrote that although museums are normally categorized as cultural organizations, they rarely plan major events or evaluate success of their public programming related to the interests of their communities. It seems that being in sync with community interests
would draw more visitors to the museum, and vested interest from community members. Recognizing these interests through participatory programming (Simon, 2010) and other means of public display may create more visible connections between a museum and its local community.

Museums are making efforts to revitalize relationships towards positively contributing to localized community life. With thoughtful effort and careful planning, museums can “transform themselves into places of dialogue, advocates of inclusion, and places of value” when they listen and respond to the voices in their community (Igoe & Roosa, 2002, p. 16). Janes (2010) echoed this, and called for museums to transform into “locally-embedded problem-solver,” actively listening and responding to challenges and aspirations of their communities (p. 325). Meaningful relationships can be forged between a museum and its community, but it takes constant evaluation of practice on the part of the museum, efforts toward adjustment of programming from feedback received, and continuous reflective practice on the part of the museum staff.

AAM Museums and Community Initiative

Organizations like AAM have invested research into facilitating local discussions. AAM established its Museums and Community Initiative in 1998 “to support and assist the museum field as it works to strengthen its relationships with its communities” (Igoe & Roosa, 2002, p. 17). Phase one of the initiative was a local focus. There were six community dialogues held in 2000 and 2001, taking place in Providence, RI; Tampa, FL; Los Angeles, CA; Detroit, MI; Wichita, KS; and Bellingham, WA. This was the first time AAM convened a series of meetings in which professionals outside the museum field were the main participants. The dialogues confirmed that “every museum shapes its own civic role” and that “communities would like that role to expand” (AAM, 2002, p. 59).
There was an attempt to locate documents from the Wichita AAM Museums and Community Initiative meeting, since the research site is in the Midwest, for the purposes of better understanding issues affecting the community in the past decade. Some of the issues that were raised at that meeting could have been incorporated into discussions with research participants, in order to gauge how relevant those issues are to educators and the local community almost a decade later. It is interesting that the museum educator in this study had never heard of the meeting; she has been with the museum for eight years. This is an indication that there was not sustained dialogue between the Wichita AAM committee that organized the meeting in 2001 with their community following the meeting. It might also possibly signal lack of collaboration and exchange between the art museums in the city.

Summary

The review of literature reveals overlap between the topics discussed. Overlaps in recommendations include: sustainability of programming over time; communication and establishing shared goals; and active listening and responding in communities.

Prevalent ideas of communities of practice overlap with ideas current in professional development and museum education. The need for long-term contact and relationship building comes through as necessary for successful initiatives in all of the areas studied. A community cannot be considered a community of practice if it is not sustained over time. The literature does not find professional development for educators effective if it is a one-time event. Partnerships between museums and teachers cannot be sustained if there are not shared goals and commitment from both stakeholders to collaborate over time.

Collaborative efforts to promote learning in communities of practice, professional development and museum partnerships require communication and focus on shared goals. Clear
identification of goals that will benefit the stakeholders involved should be articulated at the beginning of any partnership. However, there is agreement that the group should also be open to emerging ideas and directions.

A common agreement is that museums should listen to their communities (AAM, 2002; Igoe & Roosa, 2003; Marstine, 2006) and develop educational programming informed by audiences in their local communities. PK-12 teachers represent one important audience within the local community that has potential to influence and promote museums and their resources within school communities.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Action research methodology through case study methods was used in this study to document educational implications that arose between local PK-12 teachers and museum staff. The group interacted through teacher professional development workshops and events held in a small contemporary art museum, through a closed social networking site and other forms of digital messaging. The group revolved around museum events and a series of teacher workshops at the museum over the span of 16 months, beginning in July 2010 with a four-day long workshop. Follow up workshops took place on two Saturdays: September 11, 2010, January 22, 2011; and on Friday, June 10, 2012. The closed social networking site commenced during the first teacher workshop.

Members of the educator group consisted of local PK-12 teachers, museum staff, and other educational players in higher education and local school district administration. These participants contributed to an evolving dialogue about how museum resources might be used by the local teaching community. This dialogue increased engagement and connections between the museum and local teachers, while strengthening relationships between members in the group.

Research Goals

*Formation of a Community of Practice*

This study attempted to form a community of practice among the participant group members, representing the museum and local school district. Personal and group interactions were documented over time to identify emergent issues and directions. Data was examined critically, in an effort to shed light on how both formal and nonformal educators make attempts to bridge gaps between one another, moving towards formation of a community of practice.
Teacher Professional Development

Two levels of professional development were of most interest in this study: teachers coming to an understanding art on a personal level, and teachers thinking about how to incorporate art into their school curriculum. Both of these areas of teacher professional development rely on using resources provided by the museum. Ways museum resources were used by the individual teachers and by the group are discussed. This study documented how the participants articulated changes in their own practice because of the experiences affiliated with the group.

As in any community, there were varying levels of participation among members. It is also important to recognize that while some members of the group demonstrated leadership, others were more comfortable in peripheral roles. Participants who were inclined to embark in leadership roles became more involved in planning and could direct future workshops. Effects of the group and its activities on the individual members are discussed.

Museum Educator Professional Development

In addition to teacher professional development, the museum educator at this small art museum became more interested and invested in local teachers and their needs. The museum educator’s involvement in the professional development was examined, and changes over time included: 1) a better understanding of the needs of local teachers; 2) assisting with implementation of professional development opportunities at the museum for local teachers and; 3) increase in outreach programs with the schools. This has potential to impact priorities of the museum, as well as to strengthen relationships with local teachers and school administrators, which might lead to heightened visibility of the museum in the local area.

Action Research Methodology
The research methodology for this study was action research (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988; Lewin, 1948; Stenhouse, 1975; Stringer, 1996). This methodology aims to study a system and collaborate with members of that system in changing it towards deeper understanding of their own practices in a direction the members deem desirable (Noffke, 1997; Simon, 2011). In order to accomplish this goal, active collaboration between the researcher and participants is required; co-learning is a primary aspect of the research process (Oja & Smulyan, 1989; Zuber-Skerritt, 1996). This study required joining together with others in a social setting (the museum) to better understand how things work in particular situations (Stake, 2010).

The notion of action research was first characterized by Lewin (1948) as “comparative research on the conditions and effects of various forms of social action, and research leading to social action” (p. 202-203). According to Noffke (1997), action research bridges the traditional theory-practice, knowledge-action gap. The three aims of action research include: staff development, improved school practice, and modification and elaboration of teaching and learning theories (Oja & Smulyan, 1989).

Professional development of teachers and production of situation specific knowledge that is of immediate use has been noted as a focus of action research (Schaefer, 1967). Additionally, a goal of action research is to assist teachers in becoming self-reflective researchers who critically and systematically examine their own practice (Stenhouse, 1975). In this research, participant reflections and observations that occurred before, during and after teacher workshops at the museum were utilized to inform the subsequent workshop or event. Additionally, the teachers and museum educator reflected on their practice related to curricular inclusion of museum resources with each other and through multiple interviews with me. Since the nature of teacher
workshops is social and collaborative, teachers had the opportunity to reflect on their practice individually and collectively.

The spiral nature of action research consists of observing, reflecting and acting (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988; Stringer, 1996). The actions of participants were observed as they interacted with one another and the artwork. A social networking site and other digital communication were used to promote reflections and new actions. The actions took the form of subsequent teacher workshops at the museum and new partnerships between particular teachers and the museum educator.

Noffke (1997) suggested that the multiple roles of action researchers are minimally discussed. In this study, the researcher’s two roles were integrated, yet distinguished. The first role was that of the workshop facilitator, where concepts and techniques were introduced to participants. The second role, as the principal researcher, looked at how the group evolved as they participated in the workshops. Through participant logs (see Appendix D), teachers contributed to evaluation of the workshops by addressing what they were learning about content, instructional strategies, collaboration and community. Each activity informed and built upon previous ones. Through providing structure for the workshops and consistently asking for participant feedback, communication was promoted between the teachers, museum educators and local district curriculum specialists.

Throughout the study, participants interacted with one another in a spiral fashion. Teachers were able to make observations from their experiences during the workshops. They reflected on what could be different, and actively engaged in collaborations with Lisa. At the meetings that followed, participants gave updates to one another about their actions. Some teachers began taking on leadership roles within the workshops and other museum-teacher
collaborations. These actions were then reflected on during interviews. Throughout the workshops and over time, participants continued to observe, reflect and act through dialogue and interactions with one another, and interviews related to the study.

In addition to affecting individual teaching situations, teacher participants aided and assisted in action research related to development of a program for teachers at the museum. As teacher participants made observations about their teaching experiences, reflected on what could be different, and actively engaged in writing curriculum, the museum was given the opportunity to become closer aligned with needs of their local teacher audience. When teachers have an active role in constructing materials for one another, it can be an empowering act of service for the involved teachers, as well as for the museum.

Collaboration within communities and across disciplines, as well as direct connection to social action for improvement is an important element in action research (Noffke, 1989). The willingness of the museum educator to embark in a collaborator role was essential to obtain access to museum resources and valuable information about cross-disciplinary and cross-institutional relations. One of the strengths of the Hirst Educator group is that it consisted of teachers of various subjects and grade levels. This diversity added an important layer to the group and allowed for new museum-school partnerships to occur.

Case Study Method

“Research is inquiry, deliberate study, a seeking to understand” (Stake, 2010, p. 13). Of most interest was seeking to understand the complexities of how a particular group of educators works—within the boundaries of the museum, the schools to which the teacher participants belong, and the participants’ social networking site. Subjective experiences of participants, and the interactions between them will be identified and described in the following chapter. The
focus was on understanding the experience and the need to describe the meaning of a lived phenomenon. Multiple realities of the participants are acknowledged. According to Flyvbjerg (2001), an advantage of case study method is that it can “close in on real-life situations and test views directly in relation to phenomenon as they unfold in practice” (p. 82).

The development of the group and ways that relationships formed between them over time are described through a narrative approach. Brief character sketches of individual participants provide background and are expanded through description of the professional development program and related events. This study will contribute an exemplar through narrative. It involved an in depth look at how this community works, illustrating through rich description, analyzing and understanding particular episodes, while allowing the reader to draw some of his or her own conclusions.

Settings

Simultaneous attention is given to question, method and place when conceptualizing a study using case study method (Stake, 2010). As the research questions were refined for the study and it became apparent that it was important to meet with a sustained group of educators in an art museum setting on multiple occasions, places were considered that would afford this opportunity. Site selection criteria included an art museum that would allow time and space to cultivate relationships between educators at an art museum, to better understand how formal and nonformal educators collaborate in creation and distribution of educational resources. An art museum with strong educational programming for the public audience was sought, with minimal training opportunities specifically designed for teachers.

In addition, a site was needed where participating teachers could be met in their schools. It was a desire to glimpse into the particular school cultures, and the teacher within his or her
school culture. These meetings offered contextual background information about the individual members of the group. Note, however, that changes in the teachers’ actual teaching and curriculum was not being studied, only their changing ideas.

There were three data collection sites. Data was collected on and around the museum premises—within the museum and the outdoor sculpture collection, on the campus of a university. Visits to schools of main teacher participants took place, which provided glimpses of the teachers in their typical settings, continued dialogue in their worksites, and advanced one-on-one relationships. Additionally, participants contributed to a closed social networking site designed for the group.

Museum

The Hirst Museum of Art (pseudonym) is a contemporary art museum situated in an urban setting within the campus of Diller University (pseudonym). It is one of four museums in the particular midwestern city accredited by AAM, and one of two art museums. The outdoor sculpture collection affiliated with the museum and university includes 76 artworks spread across the 330-acre campus.

Local Public Schools

The museum is surrounded by a public school district that hosts just over 50,000 students in the 2010-11 school year, the largest public school district in the state (Wichita Public Schools, 2010). Of the 100 schools in the district, 26 host magnet programs. Nearly 4,100 teachers are employed in the district. During the time of data collection, there were 96 PK-12 art teachers. Data collected on school premises included interviews with teacher participants in the group. Interviews took place in the teachers’ home school environment, and during times when no students were in the classroom. Contact with students was not a part of this research.
**Hirst Educators Social Networking Site**

It was originally envisioned that a main data collection site would occur digitally over the password-protected Hirst Educators social networking site, created specifically for participants. However, this site proved to be one of minimal contribution to the data due to lack of participant use. Individual participants were able to connect with the group between teacher workshops and other museum events through the Hirst Educators social networking site. It was of interest what this technology could offer the community and if digital participation would affect relationships between members. Inevitably, members use the technology for different purposes, which was difficult to ascertain.

On the closed password-protected Hirst Educators social networking site, members were able to provide one another with resources. Participants posted pictures representing their experiences with the artwork, reflections, responses, web links, and curriculum-related documents but the facilitator posted the majority of resources. The goal of collecting written comments and posting digital pictures, video and transcripts of audio recorded tours on the site was to be able to refer to patterns in participants’ actions and social interactions during the workshops and on the Hirst Educators social networking site. This site was utilized by teachers mainly during times the group came together during workshops, and not as much in the months between events, as anticipated.

**Participants**

**Participant Recruitment**

Initial participants were invited to participate in the study after submission of an application to the July 2010 professional development workshop program. Criteria for teacher participants for the July 2010 four-day workshop included being a local educator, willingness to
engage in collaborative curriculum writing, and openness to actively participate in the accompanying closed social networking site. Interested teachers filled out a written application (Appendix A) that provided initial information about them.

Participants for the research study were also recruited from teacher participants at the September 11, 2010 professional development workshop. On both occasions, within the first hour of the workshop, the research was introduced and they were invited to join the study. The consent form was reviewed and time was allotted for questions. Since it was an aim to sustain participation over time, most participants were recruited in the first two workshops. However, the study was introduced, and consent forms were given to new teacher participants at the January 2011 and June 2011 workshops. At the last two workshops, new teachers were also invited into the group. It was hoped that all teachers in attendance would feel welcome and comfortable, regardless if it was the forth workshop they had participated in or the first.

Several marketing tactics were employed to attract local area teachers to participate in the workshops. Advertisements were posted on the museum website and through the National Art Education Association (NAEA) and the state-affiliated NAEA websites. Since the initial targeted audience involved teachers who actively use social media, advertisements were also presented through the venues of Facebook and Twitter. In addition, mass emails were sent out to all local district teachers (through the secondary social studies specialist and the art specialist), with notification about the opportunities, and personal emails were sent to teachers recommended by the museum educator and Diller University’s professor of art education. Teacher participants were asked to invite colleagues to the workshops through various communicative avenues.

Local Teachers
Participants in the study were a combination of local educators (formal and nonformal) interested in using museum resources in classroom settings. The first events to bring the group of educators together were a series of professional development workshops held at the art museum. Teachers of all subjects and grade levels (PK-12) were invited to apply to the workshops. It was hoped to have a balance of art and non-art teachers. There were no minors participating in the study, and no one from a vulnerable population was subjected to the study. All participants either possessed a teaching license or were in advanced stages of a local pre-service teaching program. The pre-service teacher that participated had taken an arts-integration course, and at the beginning of the study was enrolled in her student teaching placement.

Different perspectives can be obtained through the range of experience of participants (Creswell, 1998). Typical to a community of practice, participants will enter and exit, and take part at various levels of engagement (Wenger, 2000; Wenger et al., 2002). The participants that remained active throughout the project are referred to as the main participants or core group and included: Kelly, a pre-service elementary generalist teacher, student teaching fall 2010; Irene, a May 2010 art education graduate, actively seeking an art teaching job in the local district; Marshall, a middle school social studies teacher in his third year of teaching; Addison, a fourth grade elementary generalist teacher in her 15th year of teaching; Marcella, an elementary art teacher in her 17th year who also served as past president of the state-affiliated NAEA chapter; Bronwyn, a high school art teacher employed in the neighboring public school district in her third year of teaching; and Cynthia, an art teacher who taught primarily at a nearby art magnet high school, but also taught at the elementary and college levels in her third year of teaching.

_Museum Staff_
Two research participants were employed as museum staff: the museum educator (Lisa); and the special projects coordinator (Robin), who previously filled the role of education intern. The museum educator had been in her position for nine years at the museum, with a background in art history and sales. The special projects coordinator also has a background in art history. Prior to the temporary role currently held, she had been teaching art classes at a local community center. The special projects coordinator served in a smaller role in the study. Other staff members at the small contemporary art museum include: the director; curator; public relations manager; assistant director of finance and management; designer/preparator; and an education intern. The director, curator, public relations manager and education intern were involved with the programming in minor ways.

*Researcher as Participant Observer*

Flyvbjerg (2001) said that understanding the viewpoints and behaviors of social actors in a situation are possible when the researcher is immersed within the context being studied. I served in many roles within the group, including initiation and marketing of the workshops, facilitation and organization of the content and practical details of the workshops, and direction and leadership of the closed social networking site. My own academic training in the area of art education, and my experience as a public school art teacher in a large school district has influenced my approach to this study. When I was teaching in PK-12, I had frequent access to teacher professional development workshop at museums. My background experiences have informed the choice to apply a social-constructivist perspective to this research design.

I situated myself in relation to the other participants as both an insider and an outsider. I was an insider with the teachers because I taught middle school art for six years in a large public school district, and understand much of the daily expectations of teaching. Curriculum writing
for standards-based lessons in a high-stakes testing climate is familiar to me. In my position teaching pre-service art teachers, I guide development of cross-curricular standards-based art lessons. I had experience writing curriculum for nonformal educational programs, which positions me as an insider with the museum, and have led pre-service and in-service teachers through learning activities in museums.

It is worth mentioning that I could be viewed as an outsider by the teachers because I have not been a full-time teacher in a public school in six years, and there are initiatives and programs that vary among schools and regions that I am not familiar with. My experience was in an urban east coast school district, whereas this is an urban midwestern school district. The majority of my teaching experience is in formal education methods. It would be naive for me to claim full understanding of the politics and pressures within the institutional system of this museum, though I learned about these issues through the study.

Informed Consent

According to Glesne (1999), informed consent “can contribute to the empowering of research participants” (p. 116). Through the IRB approved consent form (Appendix B), potential research participants were made aware that their participation is voluntary, and of potential risks and benefits related to participation. Benefits far outweighed the risks in this study. Through explanation of the research and written consent form, the participants committed to involvement in the research project. The timeline of the study was not defined in the consent form since the form was given out at each new workshop but participants were provided with the option of leaving the study at anytime. However, teachers who applied to the July 2010 workshop also committed to coming to the September 2010 workshop.
Prior to collecting data, the research application was submitted separately to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at UIUC and Diller University. Approval was granted from Diller University on June 15, 2010 and from UIUC on June 28, 2010. The required online UIUC Human Subjects Research Education Module (May 24, 2009) was completed, as well as the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) Course (August 10, 2009).

Potential Benefits

Professional benefits came from the nature of the project. These benefits will be discussed in detail later in the paper but generally included: a support system of local educators; new curricular and pedagogical ideas and resources, designed for classroom use and in museum settings; and access to museum staff and resources at the Hirst Museum of Art. In addition, the intended objective of forming and maintaining a community of practice could have long-term benefits for relationships between participants and the museum.

For the January 2011 and June 2011 workshops, teacher participants were able to apply for state professional development points towards recertification for participating in the workshops through the school district’s professional development portal, My Learning Plan. Participants employed by the local school district were eligible to receive one point for each hour of the workshop(s) attended. It was clearly indicated that receiving recertification points had no connection with whether or not teachers decided to be participants in the study.

The district’s art curriculum specialist aided in posting advertisements on My Learning Plan for the January 2011 and June 2011 in advance of the workshops. This made it easy for teachers from all subject areas to know about the opportunity, and to record their attendance in the online portal.

Privacy, Confidentiality and Anonymity
Participants were assured personal privacy, confidentiality and anonymity. Pseudonyms are used for all participants and locations. Each of the participants was asked to provide his or her pseudonym, so the name would have personal meaning. They were reminded that they could withdrawal from the study at any time, which would not affect their access to participation in the workshops.

There were informants interviewed that were not participants in the workshops. These people gave valuable insights that contributed different perspectives within the context of the study. They included: the art curriculum specialist and secondary social studies curriculum specialist for local public school district; the director of the museum; the special projects coordinator at the museum; and the art education professor at Diller University.

Data Collection

Various processes were used to capture representation of participant experience in the group: leading up to, during and following the professional development workshops, as well as other museum events and online in the closed social networking site. The data included group dialogue and one-on-one interviews captured through audio recordings, which primarily sought to gain participant reflection and experience of the process. Written comments were collected through participant logs (Appendix D) and evaluations at the workshops, and through digital communications. Images through digital pictures and video were captured during events. Through these means, patterns in participants’ actions and social interactions could be referred to in the context of the group during the workshops, events and online through the closed social networking site. Participants had access to all images and recordings at any time.

*Digital Image and Video Data*
Glesne (1999) stated that videotaping is very useful for microanalysis, when the goal is to hone in on one particular interaction. However, when the researcher is actively videotaping interactions of participants, it becomes impossible to be engaged with the participants at that time. During times of the workshops that were focused on presentations in the conference room, a video camera was set up in a fixed location. Having the videotape running continuously from a fixed position allowed me as the researcher and workshop facilitator to interact with the participants and better understand the context of their dialogue and non-verbal communications. However, during tours of exhibits and the outdoor sculpture collection, when it was impossible to have a fixed camera, I videotaped to capture the interactions and collaborative moments of the participants.

Photographs were taken throughout the various activities with participants. Participants were asked to bring their own digital cameras to the workshops. The same experience was documented from multiple perspectives and participants were asked to upload images to the Hirst Educators social networking site, where they were able to comment in written form on one another’s images. This was mainly done in the July 2010 and September 2010 workshops. Participant photographs provoked dialogue, and provided an opportunity to clarify personal experiences, which sometimes led to richer data.

**Online Data Collection**

Messages to the group were initiated through the Hirst Educators site, in hopes to increase use of the site by the participants. However, some participants preferred to communicate in written form through email or private Facebook messages, in which case those communications became part of the data. Eventually, at the request of participants, a closed Facebook group for Hirst Educators was created, which seemed to be a more sustainable form of
digital communication for the group. There was less need for a facilitator to encourage participation on Facebook.

Participant Observations

A significant role I took on during data collection was that of participant observer. Glesne (1999) pointed out that through immersion, multi-sensory observations can be considered for connection to the phenomenon. I interacted with the teacher participants and museum educator on various formal and informal levels simultaneously throughout the time in the field. I recorded notes of my observations throughout the study in my research journal.

It was important that I aimed for teacher participants to perceive me as a nonjudgmental researcher. I realized this would be a challenge during my role as workshop facilitator. Instead of lecturing to teachers, I facilitated discussion: I introduced concepts and sought advice and identification of problems and issues from the teacher participants. Because of my past teaching experience, I felt like I was able to communicate and relate to the teacher participants with ease, and was intentional about interacting with participants with openness, honesty, and respect (Glesne, 1999).

Frequently during the workshops, I had participants reflect on what they were experiencing relative to their professional practice. This came in the form of a participant log (Appendix D), inspired by Penna’s (2007) design. These observations related to professional practice do not necessarily correlate with gathering information about how participants were coming together as a group. However, it was beneficial for the teachers to share their opinions about teaching and learning within the particular setting with one another in order to strengthen relationships. The participant logs served as a basis for personal reflection and reflective group discussion, in addition to data collection for the research.
Interviews and Audio Data

Qualitative research reveals how things happen and how things are working (Stake, 2010). “Happenings are experienced, and the researcher needs to probe the assertions until the experience is credible” (p. 63). Initial semi-structured interview questions asked to participants were approved by IRB (Appendix E). Those initial interviews with participants were collected soon after the first workshop in July 2010. Further interview questions emerged throughout the course of the research. Informal interviews took place on a continuous basis and were audio recorded and transcribed, or communicated in written form through email. I organized interviews around interpretive data, mining for quotes from individual participants based on their experiences. Though I always began interviews by asking participants similar questions, variations in questions followed in response to answers provided.

Data collected through interviewing and verbal dialogue captured through audio recordings were transcribed, and segments of significance were member checked. This process of allowing participants to correct or comment on data representative of them in the study was to “seek accuracy, possible insensitivity, and new meanings” (Stake, 2010, p. 126). As a way to expand potential new meanings, transcripts of group brainstorming sessions during workshops were distributed to participants. Inquiry can become a more participative and dialogical activity through member checking; it is another opportunity for generating data and insight (Schwandt, 2007). And in some cases, participants used information within the transcripts of sculpture tours with students.

To gain validity and trustworthiness of an assertion, triangulation of data was used. Triangulation reveals multiple constructed realities of an occurrence (Seale, 1999). It offers a way of explaining how actions in one setting are influenced or constrained by those in another
(Dingwall, 1997). It is a procedure to examine a conclusion from more than one vantage point (Schwandt, 2007), which can involve multiple data sources.

Denzin (1970) asserted four types of triangulation: data triangulation, investigator triangulation, theoretical triangulation and methodological triangulation. My study involved data triangulation and methodological triangulation. I gathered data from participants at different times and in various social situations. I used various methods of gathering data, including observations, audio transcriptions, digital still and video images, participant logs and written evaluations from participants, and online digital contributions from participants. Validity was established in this investigation through use of triangulation of data collection method and sources, in addition to use of a reflexive research journal, and body of evidence from the literature.

Observation Notes and Reflections

During and after observations, analytic notes (Glesne, 1999) were written for the purpose of “problem identification, to question development, to understand the patterns and themes” in my work (p. 53). The analytic notes often took the form of contact summary sheets (Miles & Huberman, 1984) at the end of each observation day to “locate the essence of the data in the contact” (p. 50). Since analytic notes move beyond description and into interpretation, this constant reflection between what was seen and how patterns were processed in what may have assisted in meaning-making throughout the sequence of the data collection. Another reason for keeping these notes was to become aware of researcher subjectivity (Glesne, 1999) and to determine how it was related or unrelated to the study.

Data Analysis
In order to begin the data analysis, an organization system was set up for the data (Glesne, 1999) which included transcripts of each interview, transcripts of workshop content, documents related to the workshops and digital folders for each of the literature categories. These digital folders served as spaces to categorize and store thoughts on the topics as they occurred, to be able to constantly revisit and analyze for meaning and connections. They assisted in visualizing the manuscript.

Charmaz (2006) stated that “through coding, you define what is happening in the data and begin to grapple with what it means” (p. 46). Several rounds of coding were needed to properly identify the main themes in the data. A constructivist approach and an emergent coding system (Charmaz, 2006) were used. A list of eight themes became evident in the first twenty transcripts. Sub-themes were identified related to each of the larger themes. Those themes were then used to code the rest of the transcripts that came about in data collection. Some codes were applicable to several themes, often fitting multiple subthemes. Separate documents were created for each main theme, which included the associated subthemes. The eight initial themes that emerged from observation and interview transcripts included: motivation for attending; views on professional development; administrative support; level of involvement; relationships between participants; benefits of museum resources to schools; sustainability of workshops; and challenges / learning from failures.

Data was sorted by the themes mentioned above and patterns were recognized. These patterns aided in making sense of the data, to represent the group. Focused coding (Charmaz, 2006) was then used to contrive follow up interview questions for participants. The three most relevant themes that moved towards addressing the research questions were chosen. Those themes were: the importance of administrative support; developing relationships between
participants; and the benefits of museum resources for local schools. Data maps were created for each theme, which aided in discussion and development of data analysis. Although analysis was progressing, these themes lacked a critical tone and adequate presentation of the issues and required revision.

It was necessary to further clarify the themes, based on the issues presented and after major revisions to the data chapter. The finalized data was then coded, which greatly helped in organization and presentation of the analysis. After it was digitally color-coded, data was organized into separate files to coordinate with each theme and then additionally categorized by subthemes. The main themes became clear: 1) creating a shared vision; 2) museum and school priorities; 3) administrative support; 4) border crossing; 5) curriculum development. Within each of the themes, issues were presented and discussed.

Summary

This research explored educational processes at work, rather than long-term outcomes of these processes. Since professional knowledge is contingent on understanding that how things work is dependent on the situation (Stake, 2010), it was appropriate for my inquiry to apply action research methodology through case study methods. Interactions between the group were documented through data collected at the times when participants were physically together, through participant interviews, and online through the Hirst Educators social networking site. The attempt to establish programming specific for a teacher audience through this museum aided in identifying issues related to communication between a museum and local teachers.
CHAPTER 4: DATA

Introduction

In this chapter, I will present my data in narrative form. First, I will introduce the main participants through description of their background and participation in the Hirst Educators group. Then I will present a description of the sequence of events. Within the description of events, there is notation of five action research cycles.

Eight participants played key roles in the study: Lisa, the museum educator; Addison and Kelly, elementary generalist teachers; Marshall, a middle school social studies teacher; Irene and Marcella, elementary art teachers; Bronwyn, a high school art teacher; and Cynthia, an art teacher who teaches at the elementary, high school and college levels. Other participants in the study include: Louise, art curriculum specialist for the local school district; Jack, secondary social studies curriculum specialist for the local district; Diane, art education professor at Diller University; Constance, director of the Hirst Museum; and Robin, special projects coordinator at the museum.

Hirst Educator Participants

Lisa

Since 2003, Lisa has been employed as the only museum educator at the Hirst Museum, which has a staff of eight. She has a background in art history and had worked in sales prior to employment at the museum. Lisa has served on the state-affiliated NAEA board as the museum representative. She was asked to represent museum educators across the state as a board member in 2008, and has served in that role ever since.

I first met Lisa in the summer of 2006 (I had an adjunct instructor position at Diller University in art education). I met as regularly as possible with her and integrated museum
resources into my classes. I first learned about the benefits and logistics of collaborations between museum educators and art educators through that experience. I moved away from the area in 2008 but remained in touch with Lisa.

Kelly

Kelly had been a pre-service student of mine in the art methods for elementary education course at Diller University a few years prior, and entered her semester of student teaching in the fall of 2010. Kelly joined the group and, along with Addison, provided the perspective of elementary generalists interested in learning ways to incorporate art into the classroom.

Over the course of the research, Kelly was open minded, enthusiastic and participated in all but one Hirst Educators workshops (absence due to a car accident). Her relationships with Addison and Irene seemed particularly strong because of the time they shared in the initial July 2010 workshop and subsequent events. I was able to meet with Kelly on every research trip and we shared several experiences that strengthened our personal relationship, including visits to several museums around the city. Every time we met, our conversation led back to relationships with Lisa and the museum. With Cynthia, Kelly co-led the Summer Youth Program at the museum in 2011. Though she was not in a position to integrate the curricular resources into her teaching in practical ways during the time of the research, she continued to gather resources for when it becomes possible.

Irene

Irene was one of the teacher participants in the July 2010 Hirst Educators workshop and she proudly referred to herself as a “founding member” of the group. She graduated from the art education program at Diller University in May 2010 and was determined to obtain a position teaching art in the local school district. Her family was established there and her daughter
attended a local middle school. She applied for positions as they came available but was not employed as a public school art teacher for the 2010-2011 school year.

For the first two days of the July workshop, she was the only art educator (besides me) in the group. During the 2010-2011 school year, Irene kept very busy and involved with the school system through substitute teaching and serving as the chairwoman for the school district’s Title VI Native American Parent Advisory Committee. Through this program, she provided tutoring for four assigned elementary schools and served as a liaison between the schools and the local Native Center.

Irene had student taught in Cynthia’s school, and when Cynthia went on maternity leave in the spring of 2011 she requested that Irene be given the long-term substitute position for her high school art classes. Irene got a job in the local district for the 2011-2012 school year as an elementary art teacher split between two schools. She and Cynthia went on to collaborate on a presentation for Hirst Educators that they then presented at the state-affiliated NAEA conference. As a new teacher, Irene values non-mandated professional development in her community and felt that supplementing required district inservices with an opportunity like Hirst Educators worked well for her.

Marshall

Marshall attended the July 2010 workshop after his second year of teaching middle school social studies in the local school district. He had originally received a bachelor’s degree in political science but took additional coursework to become certified to teach secondary social studies. In his application, he referred to himself as being highly skilled in the use of technology, having taken many online courses and looking for more opportunities to teach with technology. He used contemporary art in his classroom to teach about cultures and current events. Marshall
expressed interest in connecting with other teachers about how to incorporate their ideas about teaching with contemporary art into his classroom. His grandmother had been an art teacher, which gave him inspiration.

Marshall’s perspective as a middle school social studies teacher gave a lot of energy to the group. The other teachers listened carefully to his suggestions and were interested in his opinions. I was inspired to create standards-based curriculum for the Terry Evans exhibit through reflecting on what I had learned from Marshall’s contributions to the group. His ideas and perspectives also inspired the June 2011 workshop content. Unfortunately, Marshall’s participation in Hirst Educators ended when he moved out of state in the summer of 2011.

Addison

Addison had been an elementary generalist teacher in the local school district for 16 years. She taught all levels of K-5, with the exception of first grade. Prior to August 2010 she taught Kindergarten for 3 years. In August 2010 she voluntarily changed schools. She was placed at a science and technology magnet school. Along with the school change, she was assigned to teach fourth grade, which she had not taught for many years. When I met her at the July 2010 Hirst Educators workshop she was excited and nervous about teaching a different grade level and navigating a new school community.

Addison projected a positive attitude from the very beginning and related well to the others. In the first couple days of the workshop, she seemed slightly uncomfortable voicing her interpretations of contemporary art in front of others and she admitted that public speaking was not one of her strengths. By the end of the workshop, she seemed to enjoy sharing her research about her chosen sculpture with the others and expressed a desire to become more confident in content knowledge and pedagogical approach. The Hirst Educators workshops provided a safe
space for Addison to try new strategies in a relaxed atmosphere, and contributed to building her confidence with incorporating art into her curriculum.

When I visited Addison on several occasions at her school, she referenced current mandated initiatives being implemented in her school and district. She brought in books and pacing guides and explained the new teacher evaluation system in place in the district. Addison had served as a teacher representative for one of the local teacher unions and, after her first year of teaching in her new school, her principal asked her to join the leadership committee.

Marcella

As an elementary art teacher of 17 years in the local school district, Marcella participated in many Hirst Educators activities. Throughout the time of the study, her schedule was continually double-booked with professional development opportunities, for both personal and professional purposes. Within the past couple of years, Marcella had embraced learning about printmaking and developing her own artistic body of work. It seemed that the Hirst Educators workshops almost always fell on the same day as a printmaking class she was enrolled in, but somehow Marcella usually managed to attend both.

I first met Marcella during the last part of the July 2010 workshop. She obviously enjoyed catching up with her art teacher friends and museum staff. She had previously served as president of the state-affiliated NAEA chapter and was still actively serving on the board as co-chair of the 2012 fall conference. Marcella is well networked within the local arts community and has a longstanding friendship and working relationship with Louise, the art curriculum specialist.

I was able to visit Marcella at her elementary school and interview her on multiple occasions about her involvement with the museum and her views on professional development.
This gave me an insider’s perspective on current and evolving challenges facing elementary art teachers. Through her words and actions, Marcella proved to be fully committed to lifelong learning and passionate about transferring her own love of art to her students.

*Bronwyn*

Bronwyn has taught high school art in the neighboring school district for six years. She mainly teaches Art I, but also teaches course sections of art appreciation, portfolio development and sculpture. Every year she has been at her high school, she has taught different classes, which she viewed as both good and bad. She had made strong relationships with teachers in other departments at her school and tried to tie in with what other teachers were doing in their classes. She uses teachers in other departments as resources. As head of the social committee at the large high school, Bronwyn makes a point to know teachers outside of the art department. She includes other teachers when she finds out about interdisciplinary ideas she thinks they would be interested in.

The first Hirst Educators event that Bronwyn attended was the September 2010 workshop. She was consistently involved in organized group activities from then on. Bronwyn really valued the fact that there were non-art teachers involved in the workshops, and thought it important to the success of the program to continue recruiting teachers of other subject areas to participate. In November 2010, she assisted in coordination for Buz Carpenter (museum-sponsored guest speaker) to visit a physics class at her high school. She presented to other Hirst Educators at the June 2011 workshop on Outsider artists from the state. As Lisa chose schools to participate in the Art21 project for April 2012, it was no question that Bronwyn’s school would be one selected because of their established relationship and the outstanding reputation of the art department at her school.
Cynthia

I first met Cynthia at the January 2011 Hirst Educators workshop. She was in her second year of teaching. Cynthia seemed deeply introspective; she reflected on concepts presented and internalized possibilities for practical applications with students. She has a MFA degree, where she was able to gain two years of experience teaching at the college level, with her TA assignment, prior to coming to the district. Cynthia is an art educator who fills her professional time working in many different institutional teaching arrangements with a multitude of age levels. In the local public school district, she is placed at two elementary schools one day each week and at an arts magnet high school in the mornings. She teaches online art appreciation courses at two local community colleges. She is always looking for inventive ways to get art out to the community. She also stated that the online teaching allows more flexibility in her teaching, since she now has a young child at home. Cynthia acknowledged that her favorite teaching projects had been with the Hirst Museum, which only started in 2011. She was able to incorporate physical visits to the museum into the online college classes she taught during the spring 2011 and fall 2011 semesters.

Since January 2011, over the course of two semesters, Cynthia led several visits to the museum with her high school and college students. When bringing both the high school and college students, Cynthia coordinated with Lisa and provided pre-visit and post-visit activities to her students, related to the exhibits. She was able to utilize resources that were created for the Hirst Educators workshops and events with her students. Cynthia was the participant in the Hirst Educators group who seemed to most fully utilize the resources created for the teacher workshops with her students. Her high school was invited by Lisa to participate in the Art21 program. Beyond that, Cynthia co-led the Summer Youth Program with Kelly in 2011 and
returned to lead the program in 2012. She also was asked by Lisa to lead the museum’s initiatives with programming for the local Girl Scouts.

Description of Events

In the following sections, I will describe the events during my research intervention: events that I planned for the museum and museum-teacher collaborations that occurred between participants. Each action research cycle is discussed in the sequence of events. I begin with what I refer to as action research cycle zero. This cycle sets the stage for the study.

*Action Research Cycle Zero*

I will describe the context of the study, how I approached planning and what I chose to include in the first workshop.

*Contextual Background*

I noticed an obvious disconnection between the museum and the local school district. Lisa did not have much experience working with local teachers outside of when they initiated fieldtrips with the museum or contact with her. She did not have time to devote, nor a firm grasp on how to form curricular connections that would align with school standards for artwork at the museum. Besides information on how to schedule a fieldtrip, there was no information or resources on the website or in the museum specifically for educators. It seemed to me that the schools and the museum merely co-existed in the community and did not fully utilize the other as a resource. There appeared to be much educational potential in collaborating with one another.

Lisa was connected with the local school district’s art specialist, Louise, but there did not seem to be an understanding of how they could benefit one another. It was unclear how the museum would go about offering a professional development opportunity for teachers. For example, it was difficult to discover how to offer professional development points to teachers (to
count towards state recertification) or how to advertise a museum program specifically to local teachers. After contacting representatives from the education department at Diller University, the state’s department of education and the state-affiliated chapter of NAEA, I found that the local content area curriculum specialists hold the key to approving professional development opportunities. But this took me months of inquiries and research to figure out, so when Lisa told me that other museum educators in town said that the local school district was “a hard nut to crack,” I was not surprised. There were obvious institutional tensions, which revolve around different priorities and goals.

Teacher workshops were not a priority for Lisa and she did not emphasize the audience of teachers in general over other groups in the community. In fact, she admitted that programming for teachers was an area of weakness for the museum. My bias as a former teacher and higher educator influenced my view of teaching teachers about how to use the museum’s collection. In my mind, teacher workshops spread knowledge about the collection throughout the community, with potential to impact a greater audience than Lisa could personally serve, while creating connections between the museum and schools. I set out to create a series of workshops with intent to sustain participation from a group of teachers. I wanted to create a community of practice between the teachers and Lisa, so that once I was no longer leading the workshops, efforts of the group could continue. Our motivations were not well aligned from the beginning. Lisa was skeptical of the time and attention that would need to be devoted to an audience that was not a high priority for the institution, but she was open to my contributions.

_Influence from John Dewey_

John Dewey influenced me as I started my planning. Dewey argues that the meaning of artistic products is related to experiences not typically deemed to be simply aesthetic (Dewey,
1934). He asserts that art serves a social purpose: it reflects emotions and ideas associated with social life. He also says that aesthetic experiences involve interchanges with one’s environment and that these moments are ones of “living consciousness” (p. 15) and “heightened vitality” (p. 19).

Dewey also distinguishes between theory and appreciation: theory differs from appreciation because it is concerned with understanding and insight, not just admiration (p. 4). He states that museums compartmentalize and remove art from the everyday. Objects in museums are disconnected from other modes of experiencing and this is problematic.

I think Dewey’s ideas are essential for school and museum educators. He called for them to connect their students’ encounters to their everyday experiences. Dewey was an advocate of integrated curriculum, establishing meaningful connections between art and culture and studies in other subject areas. He advocated dialogical encounters between the viewer and the artwork and the viewer with others. These encounters with art have great potential to aid in understanding and participation in community life. Dewey called for museums to be integrated into everyday experience and not separated or viewed as elite in the community.

Dewey’s ideas are relevant to promoting reflective practice and professional development within art education. Educators are continuously developing as practitioners. Methods of teaching from past experiences, woven together with reflections on them, combine to form new approaches to facilitating content delivery to students. When teachers are given time and space to reflect on their practice with colleagues and provided with stimulation to engage in their own aesthetic experiences, they might become better able to perceive further curricular possibilities.

These ideas influenced my plans for the July 2010 workshop. I knew from the beginning that it was important to have a mix of art and teachers of subjects other than art in the workshop.
This would allow for encounters between teachers of various subject areas that could lead to greater understandings for connecting the artwork to everyday life. It might also form community around interpreting the meanings of the artworks in the museum space. In a planning document shared with Lisa and the museum, dated April 27, 2010, I outlined logistics and components to be included in the July workshop (see Appendix F).

Contemporary Influences

I also drew inspiration from my own previous experiences. As a teacher participant in a weeklong workshop at a contemporary art museum (sponsored by a university) in the summer of 2002, I had lived knowledge of what I found educational about a teacher workshop in a museum. I learned most through discussions with other teachers in front of the artworks. Through hearing other teachers’ interpretations, and those of the museum educator and university professors, I gained multiple perspectives for looking at an artwork and for considering curricular applications with students.

I was also inspired by other program examples. I studied the application materials and program description of Art21 Educators (see Art21, 2012). My decision to name the group Hirst Educators (with approval by the museum) was inspired by Art21 Educators. I adapted a few questions from their 2010 program application to fit my context. Content was inspired by successful university-museum collaborations for teachers (see Kalin, Grauer, Baird & Meszaros, 2007; Sandell, 2006) and by my own teaching experiences. From the Kalin et al. (2007) article, I decided to discuss and implement performative pedagogy (Garoian, 2001) in the learning activities. I decided to use Renee Sandell’s (2006) Form + Theme + Content (F+T+C) framework as a way to structure research as teachers explored sculptures during the workshop. And I knew that I wanted to include an activity in the first workshop based around the blog,
Jumping in Art Museums (Reimus, n.d.), which I perceived as joining together performative pedagogy, art museums and social media.

In the beginning, I did not have a clear vision of how the workshops would be organized or themed as a coordinated series; each one built on the last but each was different. I set out to elicit participation from local teachers to attend the weeklong workshop in July 2010. As part of that commitment, they agreed to participate in a Saturday morning follow-up workshop in September 2010. Beyond that, workshops were initiated with the museum educator as needed: in January 2011, June 2011, and a focus group in September 2011.

The Museum and its Staff

The mission statement of the museum is simple, yet bold: Expand human experience through encounters with the art of our time. This mission statement speaks to the contemporary art focus of the collection but does not mention anything about being a university museum or its affiliation with Diller University. There is a staff of eight, including the positions of: director; assistant director of finance and management; curator (modern and contemporary art); designer/preparator; museum educator (curator of education); education intern; special projects coordinator; and public relations manager. There are three gallery spaces in the museum, with hallway and entry space also used for display purposes. Exhibits of work from the permanent collection and temporary traveling exhibits are featured at the museum; a large part of the museum educator’s position is to coordinate programming for the exhibits. I did not realize until I was further into the study the tension between museum and school priorities related to what art (from the permanent collection or temporary exhibits) should be the focus of curriculum building.
This is a university museum but at the beginning I was not considering the different roles that university educators could have in teacher professional development workshops at the museum. The museum has a link to the university and more attention was given to the university community than to the local schools. The curator and public relations manager have both taught courses in adjunct roles for the Art History department at Diller University in the past five years. No one on the staff has a degree in art education.

The museum prides itself on free admission and most all of their programs and events are free to the public. Donors provide 100% bus reimbursement for school groups that visit the museum. Bus reimbursement used to be 70% but the director demonstrated a priority by committing fundraising efforts to make local school visits free of charge.

*Hirst Educators Social Networking Site*

I created the password-protected Hirst Educators social networking site specifically for participants in the workshops—teachers and museum staff. I chose Ning as the format because of my familiarity with using it as a student, and also from experience facilitating a closed Ning class site for pre-service art education classes. The main purpose of the site was to provide a digital place to upload teaching resources, lesson plans, videos, website links and images of artwork. It provided a common area where participants could blog about their experiences at the workshops and respond to one another in a password-protected virtual space. It also served as a host site for participants to upload photographs from our times together. Inevitably, members used the technology for their own purposes but it was integrated into selected workshop activities in the physical space of the museum. Members had the ability to provide one another with resources through this site for the duration of the research.

*Action Research Cycle 1*
The first action research cycle encompassed planning, implementation, observation and reflection on the initial four-day Hirst Educators workshop in July 2010. The workshop was designed for teacher participants to develop curriculum tied to the museum’s permanent collection that was to be interdisciplinary in nature, thematic and contain connections to local issues or areas of interest. I also hoped that the workshop setting would promote collaboration between teachers. I envisioned that teachers could share their curricular ideas with others through presentations they designed and delivered at following workshops. I hoped that they would continue collaborating on the social networking site.

The July workshop focused on two bodies of artwork, both from the permanent collection, during the four-day workshop: the outdoor sculpture collection and the new exhibit of work in the museum. The outdoor sculpture collection was chosen because it is expansive (76 artworks) and is always accessible to teachers and school groups, even when the museum is closed. The exhibit that opened on the third day of the workshop consisted completely of work from the permanent collection, including pieces by internationally acclaimed artists and works by contemporary artists from the state. Studying works that are part of the permanent collection fits the goal of developing curriculum well because the curriculum can still be available and useful to other teachers at a later time.

*July Workshop*

At the time that I approached Lisa, the museum educator, about conducting my dissertation research with her at the museum, we had already established a strong personal and working relationship. However, from the initial planning stages for the first workshop, I started to realize just how busy and multi-faceted Lisa’s job responsibilities were. There were staffing issues at the museum that consumed more of her time than usual. Through conversations and
emails, I glimpsed how far out (into the next year or more) a museum educator has to schedule programming for upcoming exhibits. And the summer months certainly do not provide downtime for museum educators in the way that they do for teachers, students and many university educators.

The original dates that I proposed for the July workshop became problematic, since the new exhibit at the museum was not to open until the following week. However, Lisa proposed moving the opening date of the exhibit two days earlier to the museum director, curator and staff. Since it is a small museum and the director and staff were open to the idea, this became a reality.

I began plans for a group of educators associated with the museum in March of 2010. I called the group “Hirst Educators.” The name became an organizing structure for relationship building between participants. I worked with Lisa to plan the itinerary for the workshop, mainly through email and phone conversations.

The initial workshop was for four days, 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. each day, July 27-30, 2010. The title was Exploring Place and Space, linked to the museum exhibit that opened during the workshop. The goals were: a) to create a sense of community between teachers; b) to explore the museum collection together and to talk about resources relevant to practice; c) to introduce the teachers to the Hirst Educator social networking site, and incorporate it into some activities in the gallery; d) to provide content and strategies for teaching in a museum setting; e) to facilitate discussion between teachers and for them to contribute to goals and planning for the follow up workshop in September. Four local teachers were in attendance for all four days of the workshop: Kelly, Irene, Addison and Marshall. On the third day of the workshop, two veteran art educators, Diane and Marcella, joined the group.
Within the first half hour of the workshop, Lisa introduced herself. After discussing details of the collection, she said:

Lisa: One of the things that I have been noticing here in the last few years is that the Hirst Museum has a disconnection with the local teachers. The bulk of my tours—people booking them—are actually coming from outside of the city. I found that kind of disturbing and sad. I was told by other museum educators in the city that [the local school district] was a tough nut to crack: ‘good luck…you will beat your head against the wall’ (laughter from teachers). And I thought, ‘woo, all right, sounds like a challenge’ (laughter). Working with Stephanie, I see this as our opportunity. Many museums are beginning to build teacher boards or teacher committees, where they work with teachers to formulate curriculum, to find out ways that they can be of service. We’re not at that stage yet. We’re at the stage where we want to make friends—better friends with [local school district] teachers—to discover…what are the services that we can provide for the district, for you, for your students? A good education is about creating experiences, not only for the teacher to walk away and be like, ‘yeah, I want to come back tomorrow,’ but also for the students. How can we help you more with positive learning experiences? And then allow you to go to your principal and say, ‘look, I did good.’ (laughter) So this is the beginning. We’re going to talk with Stephanie over the next few days, practice some social networking tools, build some of these lesson plans, but in the end I’ll circle back around to you and say, ‘we want to build these bridges’ (personal communication, July 27, 2010).

Lisa’s observation about the disconnection between the museum and local teachers was not exaggerated. She saw it as a problem that most of her fieldtrips and tours were coming from outside the local school district. She mentioned in her comments that she saw this as her opportunity to build relationships with not only local teachers but the school district. This demonstrates that she was thinking about institutional relationships the entire time of the study, though she found them difficult. She was clearly concerned about strengthening relationships and the administrative support necessary from principals and district administrators. The ‘hard nut to crack’ analogy was humorous to teachers but it recognized the difference in priorities between museums and the schools.
After getting to know the participants, I started a discussion on integrated learning and curriculum, showing a PowerPoint that contained several quotes from John Dewey. I asked the teachers what they thought about the idea of integrated learning.

Marshall: We need to integrate. I think sometimes we’re shying away from that. Like at our school, we have such regimented programs in language arts and math. I think the opportunities for integration for language arts, math, science and social studies is kind of slipping away—based on all of the testing and everything.

Stephanie: And with art, my perspective is that our jobs are getting cut so quickly because a lot of people higher up—administrators that have background in science and math—sometimes think that art and music are frills. Integrating curriculum is a way to make administrators and other teachers in your school understand that you are very important to what they are teaching as well. You can help make those connections to all the disciplines. It just reinforces everyone’s instruction and learning and it may be easier for students to understand. If you think about them going to all of these different classes everyday, and all the subjects are separate. If instruction was based on a theme…

Marshall: it makes sense then and they can picture what it is going to look like or a practical reason for learning about or doing it.

Stephanie: Right, and then when it comes to testing, they remember those concepts because they’ve had real experiences with it (personal communication, July 27, 2010).

Nobody dissented from the general idea of integrated curriculum. It was introduced at the beginning of the first workshop and carried throughout all of the subsequent workshops.

Outdoor sculptures. The focus of the first two days of the July workshop was on the outdoor sculpture collection. The teachers toured together outside and discussed ways to approach the work through the particular subject areas and developmental levels of their students. Lisa invited teachers to use research materials in the museum’s artist files to find out more about pieces of interest. These artist files were actual file folders stored in a series of file cabinets that contained brochures, pictures, articles and primary documents of interactions with the artists. Participants enjoyed being able to explore the artist files in the museum’s archives to learn more about the sculptures in the collection.
On the first morning of the workshop, I introduced Renee Sandell’s F+T+C worksheet after discussion of Sydney Walker’s list of big ideas (Walker, 2001). Teachers each chose a sculpture from the outdoor permanent collection to focus on. They each researched their sculpture using the museum’s artist files and also worked on filling out information as they discussed the work with the other teachers in front of the work. The teachers mentioned many connections to other subjects as we talked about each sculpture. The sculptures that they were initially drawn to seemed to be more of personal interest to them, but they quickly found ways that they could connect the pieces to their students. Three of the sculptures chosen by the teachers are presented next.

Figure 1. Skylark by Theodore Roszak

Kelly chose Skylark because of its connection to Greek mythology. Greek mythology is addressed in the fourth grade reading standards for the state. Big ideas that Kelly recognized in

---

1 Image used with permission: Skylark (Icarus), 1950 by Theodore Roszak, Collection of the Ulrich Museum of Art, Wichita State University, Museum Purchase with Student Government Association Funds, 1978.0007
the work were: utopia; suffering or struggle; and disillusionment with technology. She connected learning in other subject areas to the work; study of the sun in science; study of Greece in social studies; and study of the Olympics in physical education. Contextual significance she found was that the piece was constructed in 1950-51 as a response to the chaos of World War II and the artist’s disillusionment with technology. She imagined that going along with the Greek myth of Icarus (subject matter of the piece) might stimulate students to discuss differences in viewpoints on technological progress over time.

Figure 2. *Tres Mujeres Caminando* (Three Women Walking) by Francisco Zuniga

Irene chose this piece because it had personal meaning to her. She had visited the sculpture many times throughout her undergraduate studies at Diller University. It made her think of the women family members in her life. Perhaps because she was an art teacher, Irene

---

2 Image used with permission: *Tres Mujeres Caminando* (Three Women Walking), 1981 by Francisco Zuniga, Collection of the Ulrich Museum of Art, Wichita State University, Gift of George and Virginia Ablah: 1986.0006
was detailed in her analysis of the formal details of the work in her F+T+C worksheet. Big ideas that she found in the piece included: social norms, aging, uncertainty and family. Studies in other subject areas that Irene connected with the sculpture were: creating poetry for mothers (or other female family members) in language arts; study of aging in science; study of family structure in social studies; and roles of women in vocational education. Topics to discuss with students that Irene identified were tied to personal, social, and cultural dimensions. She thought it would be relevant to discuss women’s roles in families: daughter, mother, and grandmother. Socially, the work could connect to ideas of youth compared to mid-life and old age. Culturally, the women portrayed in the sculpture are barefoot and represent working women; this could provoke discussion of roles of women in different cultures.

![Image](Personnages-Oiseaux-by-Joan-Miro.jpg)

**Figure 3. Personnages Oiseaux by Joan Miró[^3]**

Marshall chose to focus on *Personnages Oiseaux* because he was drawn to the medium of mosaic and how the medium originated in the Roman Empire. This mural, completed in 1977, is the only one that Miró designed in the medium of glass and marble (Wichita State University, 2012). The big ideas that he found from his research were spirituality and kinship. Connections to other subject areas that he envisioned were: study of Roman theater; narrative writing in

[^3]: Image used with permission: *Personnages Oiseaux*, 1977 by Joan Miró, Collection of the Ulrich Museum of Art, Wichita State University, Museum Commission with Funds from the Student Government Association and Private Donors: 1978.0009
language arts; and study of angles and geometry in math. The significance of the artwork in its present context on the façade of the museum was what Marshall focused on the most in his F+T+C worksheet. He could imagine discussion with students about relationships and celebrations in community when looking at the work. Culturally, there could be discussions of different notions of spirituality, since the piece was inspired by Egyptian spirituality. Historically, ideas of community could be discussed.

Several observations and thoughts were evoked by this first day. The teachers were willing to contribute knowledge from their experiences related to teaching and practical issues in the classroom. Often they went off topic but I did not stop them from talking. They mentioned friends they knew at one another’s schools and compared working situations. During lunch, when given the option to spend the time individually or with the group, they chose to eat together. The group talked about personal experiences right from the beginning. I was not intent on sticking to the time schedule and was flexible with the order of events. At the conclusion of the first day of the July workshop, Lisa took me to one of the galleries to preview the new exhibit. The curator and museum director were in the gallery; this was my first introduction to the director.

New thoughts on the second day of the workshop mainly had to do with connecting teachers to resources. Lisa mentioned that the museum would be bringing in a pilot, Buz Carpenter, in connection with the Art on Speed exhibit in late October or early November 2010. He agreed to talk to a few school groups. The city is known for its aircraft manufacturing industry, so there is a strong local connection with flight. Lisa offered the speaker, who would talk about his experiences as a pilot, to the teachers at the workshop. The fact that Addison was going to be teaching at a science and technology school caught the attention of Lisa.
was interested in bringing Hirst resources into her new school. Lisa talked to Addison to gauge her interest in hosting Buz Carpenter.

The teachers were the first public audience to see the *Exploring Place and Space* exhibit and were given an exclusive detailed informational session by the curator in the morning of the third day of the workshop. This was a special privilege; I made sure that the teachers realized that Lisa and the museum staff had opened the exhibit early for them. Several museum staff members were introduced to the teachers and they explained their roles within the museum, giving the teachers an insider’s look at the workings of a small contemporary art museum.

*Jumping with art activity.* Performative pedagogy can give viewers agency, making museum culture more personally relevant. Garoian (2001) suggests five areas of performative pedagogical strategies in museums: performing perception, autobiography, museum culture, interdisciplinarity, and performing the institution. By performing, viewers “are able to imagine and create new possibilities for museums and their artifacts within their contemporary cultural lives” (p. 236). When performing a personal interpretation or narrative of an artwork, the viewer is constructing knowledge in a playful (and sometimes critical) way, while actively engaging with the art. The performative activities that I enacted with teachers during the workshop were loosely inspired by this theory, oriented mostly to the latter kind.

One activity the group embarked in was “jumping inside” the artwork (that is to say, imaginatively projecting themselves as part of the work in some way), creating a narrative about it and then explaining or performing it in front of others. I had first experienced this activity at the intensive weeklong museum teacher workshop that I had attended for my own professional development. Since then I had used the strategy many times with middle school art students and with college students. It enables individuals to think deeper about an artwork by “jumping inside
it,” while using imagination and stream of consciousness writing techniques to create a narrative from first-person perspective. It could involve other forms of presentation beyond writing but this is what I was used to. The purpose was to have teachers spend time concentrating and identifying with a piece of art, becoming aesthetically aware of the work, interpreting it through writing, and then reading or performing their narrative for others.

Each teacher chose a different piece of artwork to focus on inside the gallery. They sat and typed in a first person narrative, as if they were within the artwork. Marshall chose to write about *Lil’ Ake* by Sigrid Sandström (Figure 4).

![Figure 4. Lil’ Ake by Sigrid Sandström](image)

He typed his story directly into a blog post on the Hirst Educators social networking site:

Mission Control, we have touchdown! Golden Retriever, I successfully landed on Alpha Centuri, at 21:31 on July 4th, 2051 A.D. All systems check, motion in 10 seconds, scanners on full. Visuals are streaming in at 10 to the 100th power tetraviggs and thermal imaging is dialing to full. WARNING! WARNING! WARNING! Thermal event detected, course correction is strongly recommended or module destruction is imminent in T-minus 54 seconds. Alert! Life Form detected in quadrant Zulu, full biological report in 20 seconds, navigation redirected for life form interception. Report Complete. Diagnostic Requested, Mission Control Override, Report streaming now! Biology identifies the life form as humanoid with several genetic markers indicating an Earth origin. Secondary scanners detect intelligent design alloys in close proximity to the

---

humanoid. Propulsion increase requested, engines to redline, new element detected, power reduction, event in progress, Nova detect…TRANSMISSION ENDED! (personal communication, July 29, 2010)

Marshall read his story to the group, representing various parts in different voices in front of the large-scale painting (9’ x 18’). As he presented and immediately following, participants had the opportunity to post questions and comments to him on his blog post. The teachers were amused by his interpretation, which depicted space travel within the environment created by the artist and would appeal to his middle school students.

After all of the teachers read their narratives in front of their selected artworks, we made expressive movements with our bodies complementary to the artwork and captured them in photographs. Next to Lil’ Ake, for example, the teachers attempted to capture themselves looking as if they were flying in outer space. I encouraged the teachers to connect their physical actions with the narrative they got from the artworks. The intention was to enact some degree of performative pedagogy, while also trying to capture photographs of our experience together. We talked about the fact that I had asked and received permission from the museum to be able to do this activity. Figure 5 shows two teachers emulating a tornado with Hong Zhang’s Twister. In this instance, insights were gained due to the teachers empathizing with the artwork and, on a more indirect level, with the artist who created the image.
Marcella wrote about *Twister* as part of the jumping inside an artwork activity and everyone had the chance to jump and emulate his or her body in a twisting motion next to it. I asked the teachers to bring their digital cameras this day to ensure that we captured some good pictures as we physically interacted with the art. Participants uploaded their pictures to the Hirst Educators social networking site and we digitally commented on the pictures that we liked on the site. The pictures with the most responses were then emailed for consideration of inclusion on the Jumping in Art Museums blog.

We also went outside and interacted with sculptures in close proximity to the entrance of the museum. Outdoor pieces that the teachers were particularly interested in physically interacting with were Tom Otterness’ *Millipede* and Joan Miró’s *Personnages Oiseaux*. These pieces are large-scale and popular with school groups. Here the purpose of finding meaning in the work through physical performance became intertwined with the purpose of submitting images to the Jumping in Art Museums blog. This meant that some of the images were focused more on the act of jumping with the artwork than on its interpretation. At times, the teachers...
were so enjoying the jumping and attempting to get the perfect action photograph that the intellectual aspect of the activity was lessened. If performative pedagogy had been the focus of the engagement with the sculpture in Figure 6, teachers might have been crawling beside it rather than jumping.

This was a characteristic tension. On the one hand, we could have focused more on meaning and interpretation. More discussion about critical inquiry in museums relative to performance could have been introduced. Performative pedagogy gives voice to the viewer by including their personal and social knowledge and experiences while challenging traditional historical notions of knowledge. I gave Garoian’s (2001) article to the teachers as a guide, but I could not require the reading, since they were not receiving credit for the workshop. On the other hand, it was also important that the teachers enjoyed their time in the workshop and wanted more. Our physical activities interacting with the art and photographing the acts provided an experience that the teachers enjoyed for its own sake.

Figure 6. Jumping with art: Millipede by Tom Otterness

This activity was mainly to assist teachers approach art through extended contact and dialogue in new ways. They were encouraged to play and physically interact with art in the galleries, challenging ideas of museums being elitist and disconnected from everyday life. They
learned a strategy of narrative writing that they could implement with their students and a strategy of using social media to respond to presentations in real time. The teachers of subjects other than art in the group had not tried incorporating museum resources into their curriculum, so they needed a comfortable entry point.

All of the teachers gained confidence in talking about art with other teachers. One comment that surprised me was when Irene mentioned that there had been times when she did not feel confident talking about art with other art teachers. She felt quite comfortable and confident speaking about art with the teachers of subjects other than art in the group. She was a new teacher; perhaps the subjectivity involved when interpreting artwork coupled with personalities of seasoned veteran art teachers could be intimidating to a less-experienced art teacher. This points to the significance of pre-service and in-service trainings for teachers in art museums.

_Sculpture tour for teachers created by teachers._ One of my goals was for the teachers to contribute to goals and planning for the September workshop. The teachers began to show interest in taking a collective leadership role in future workshops. They decided to create a sculpture tour for an audience of their peers—other teachers—that they would present at the next workshop. This idea came about through an online discussion on the Hirst Educators social networking site after the second day of the workshop, and was Kelly’s idea.

**Reply by Kelly on July 28, 2010 at 10:44am**

Museums and education go hand in hand, or at least they should. I am looking forward to the possibility of bringing my first graders to the Hirst. Museums have the possibility of providing fantastic education opportunities regarding all sorts of subjects.

I think creating a tour for teachers of PK-12 would be a great thing. I think some teachers are not familiar with the Hirst and thus don’t realize the fantastic resource that is right in their own back yard.
The final day of the workshop had both focused group discussion and individual work time. Time was spent choosing and researching outdoor sculptures for the September workshop, and learning from Lisa about logistics of bringing school groups on fieldtrips to the museum. I also introduced many online technology resources for teaching and how to find lessons that combine art with other subjects.

The outdoor sculptures that the group decided would be most appropriate (in the September workshop) for leading teachers through were: Theodore Roszak’s *Skylark*, Arman’s *Accord Final*, Andy Goldsworthy’s *Wichita Arch*, Tom Otterness’ *Millipede*, and Chaim Gross’ *Happy Mother* (presented on the tour in this order). They considered their personal preference, what they thought other teachers would like to talk about with students and the proximity of the sculptures to the museum. I created a worksheet entitled, “Discussing Sculpture with Teachers” (Appendix G), inspired by Sandell’s F+T+C worksheet that we had used earlier in the week but adapted to our goal.

Teachers agreed that they wanted to discuss cross-curricular implications of the individual sculptures but they thought that associating one theme with all sculptures on the tour might be too limiting (research journal, July 29, 2010). I suggested that the first questions on the worksheet (Appendix G) could be addressed by looking at the artwork, referring to the
museum’s book on the sculpture collection (each teacher was given a copy), the museum’s artist files and other research. Each teacher researched one of the pieces and spent personal time with the work reflecting, considering discussion questions to explore with students and possible learning activities for students.

![Figure 7. Accord Final by Arman](image)

One of the sculptures was *Accord Final* by Arman (Figure 7). Themes included: frustration, destruction and brokenness. Irene focused on researching this piece. Pre-visit activities that she envisioned were showing students a video of a short performance on a baby grand piano or exposure to one in person, possibly in music class. She suggested that students see a baby grand piano, hear it played, talk about how the sound is made, and see one being made in a factory. Discussion questions Irene created were: 1) Discuss the frustration involved in learning something new and feeling unable to accomplish it. 2) How do you think the artist created this piece? 3) If we had this piano before it was cast, just like this, could we play it? Would it make sound? Could we tune it? Could we actually play a tune on it? She said that the second question could be explored further with more advanced students, explaining the bronze

---

5 Image used with permission: *Accord Final*, 1981 by Arman, Collection of the Ulrich Museum of Art, Wichita State University, Museum Purchase with Student Government Association Funds and Gift of the Scaler Foundation: 1985.0006
casting process in detail. The third question was geared toward elementary level, fourth or fifth graders. She said that the topic related to sound leads into the realm of science, about sound frequencies, tone, pitch, and how to create sound.

Robin added what she and other docents typically address with children when looking at this piece:

Robin: We can’t assume students have all had background about the music when we talk about this piece. We talk about things that are broken, and how frustrating that is: if you have a toy that is broken, or if you get a box in the mail and you know you’ve ordered something new, and then you open it and it’s broken, how that makes you feel. We often talk about the concept of broken when we talk about this piece, because we can’t assume they’ve had that musical experience before they come (personal communication, July 30, 2010).

Institutional differences were evident in this exchange. Robin spoke from her perspective as a museum employee who is unable to know much about student experience prior to or following a museum visit. Her script for addressing with students would appeal to students at any age level but the conversation would not provide strong educational connections. The interdisciplinary and contextual information that Irene talked about would extend learning about the artwork beyond the museum, as pre- or post-visit instruction. Both Irene and Robin’s scripts encourage student understanding, but Irene’s discussion yields more educational value for school learning.

Figure 8. Hirst Educator practice sculpture tour (July 2010)
Teachers were encouraged to create meaningful transitions between their sculpture and the previous and the following ones on the tour. For example, Irene and Robin shared ideas about a meaningful transition from discussion of *Accord Final* to Andy Goldsworthy’s *Wichita Arch* (Figure 9). One suggestion was the theme of rhythm and patterns: Goldsworthy’s inspirations are rhythm and patterns from nature. Further, both sculptures portray the element of time. There is timing involved in playing music. And passage of time in nature was an artistic choice in *Wichita Arch*, as Goldsworthy planted a tree beneath the arch he constructed from local stone; tension exists between man and nature through the element of time.

![Figure 9. Preparing to present to Hirst Educators about *Wichita Arch* by Andy Goldsworthy](image)

The group went to a local restaurant together for lunch and returned to the museum to practice their presentations for the group (Figure 8). There was time for reflection and evaluation at the end of the day, and discussion about resources on the Hirst Educators site. Participants were invited to use the site as a place to share ideas between the end of this workshop and the beginning of the next.

I also introduced the agenda for the September workshop and mapped out chunks of time dedicated to particular activities during the three-hour workshop. I wanted to get the teachers to assist with the planning and decision-making. We planned for their individual sculpture
discussions to take between 8-10 minutes each and for a total of one hour and 15 minutes, with walk time between sculptures built in; then to devote another hour to talking about the new exhibits that Lisa had been promoting during the week.

The focus on the temporary exhibits in September marked a change in the choice of artwork for discussion. It is part of Lisa’s responsibilities to plan and promote programming for temporary exhibits, so she would naturally promote to the teachers. The issue of what art to focus on at teacher workshops presents a tension between the museum’s goals and the schools’ educational goals. As stated earlier, studying works from the permanent collection fits schools’ goals because the curriculum can be available and useful to teachers at a later time. During this workshop, we managed to satisfy both to some degree. Going with the temporary exhibition was a way to involve Lisa in a leadership role within the workshop and the teachers expressed interest in seeing the new work and learning about ways to apply content into their curriculum. Several mentioned that they were interested in scheduling fieldtrips for the fall exhibits.

Feedback from teachers. Each teacher filled out a participant log (see Appendix D) based on his or her three favorite activities from the week. Altogether, they filled out several types of evaluations, including an overall workshop evaluation form at the conclusion of the week’s activities.

Interdisciplinary curriculum. Feedback indicated progress toward the goal of developing interdisciplinary curriculum around an artwork. Participants said they had gained ideas about how to integrate art across grade levels and content areas. Several commented how invigorating it was to work with teachers from other disciplines. Marshall said he learned a new strategy (the jumping inside an artwork writing activity) that he could apply in his history classroom: “jumping inside” historical buildings to write about interactions that might have been occurring
within the buildings. Kelly also discussed the jumping inside an artwork interpretive writing activity. She did not realize the effects of the tornado captured by photographer Larry Schwarm (the piece she chose to write about) had impacted her as much until reflecting during the activity. She said that she will use the writing strategy in her elementary classroom, and that she could have more outgoing students read or perform the narratives of shyer students. Addison took away a new strategy for students to learn to write from a different point of view by imagining themselves as a part of an artwork and new ways of looking, thinking about and physically being with art.

Every teacher wrote about the physical jumping with art activity on his or her participant log. From teacher responses, it seemed that they understood the activity to be concerned with both entertainment and appreciation of art with possibilities for interpreting learning goals in creative ways. If critical responses had been more emphasized, we would have elaborated further educational applications.

Marshall said that the F+T+C worksheet helped him understand how contemporary art connects across the content areas and makes for engaging interdisciplinary units that he could share with his colleagues. Kelly said that the worksheet helped her learn about her own feelings related to the artwork and suggested strategies for asking students questions in a more cross-disciplinary manner. Irene commented how excited she was to learn how teachers of other disciplines perceive contemporary art. She said she learned instructional strategies for pre-visit lessons to prepare for seeing art outside of the classroom. Addison said that before these activities, she hadn’t realized how study of art could include academic writing, science and math integration.
Social media. The feedback also indicated learning about connecting social media to classroom activities and museum resources. Irene said that she learned instructional strategies about ways to use Ning, Facebook and Glogster for classroom and professional use. She said that, being less tech-savvy, she appreciated the opportunity to experiment and learn from peers. Kelly said she hadn’t realized that social media could be used for educational purposes in so many ways and how tagging can aid with categorizing for future use. Addison wrote about appreciating the resources provided on the Hirst Educators site and said she planned to share some of the new resources with her colleagues.

Use of Hirst Educators site. One of the goals during this workshop was to introduce the teachers to the Hirst Educator social networking site, and incorporate it into some activities in the gallery. This goal was met. Though teachers said they learned about benefits of using social media in the classroom and for professional development purposes, teachers did not use it frequently, outside of activities in the workshop. The July workshop was when the social networking site was most utilized by participants over the course of the entire study. It provided a space to share ideas and get to know one another. For instance, Marshall wrote his opinion on the site when asked about the need to develop specific programming for local teachers through the museum.

Reply by Marshall on July 28, 2010 at 10:12pm
I think local art museums offer an excellent educational opportunity for our students and this week has put a lot of my own misconceptions to rest. The special programs offered at the Hirst sound very engaging, but yet this is the first time I have ever been made aware of them. I'm glad that Lisa is trying to build bridges with district educators because, in my opinion, the Hirst Museum of Art is the city's best kept secret that needs to be exposed to our students and faculty. I think museums should provide teachers with a basic understanding and hopefully an appreciation for the arts and/or history. In addition, they should provide our students with exciting extra curricular opportunities and capstone field trips guided by people who know how to relate art/history to our students' lives. This isn't an easy task by any stretch of the imagination, so a lot of selling needs to be done both by teachers and by the museums.

In response to Marshall’s post, Lisa told me:
Lisa: Marshall wrote that many of his misconceptions have been laid to rest. He was surprised by the number of programs that we offer, the things that we do. It’s pleasing that he is surprised and pleased, but it shouldn’t be surprising at all to me that he knew nothing about these programs because we have had no presence outside of art teachers. You know, clearly it is worth it. The teachers are surprised and pleased. So yeah, now we have to find another way to pull them in (personal communication, July 30, 2010).

Written thoughts like this one on the Hirst Educators site gave Lisa another direct access line to local teachers. Since she was not able to devote much time to being present during the July workshop and had not worked with teachers of subjects other than art in the past, the site allowed her to see how they responded to questions I posted about incorporating contemporary art into curriculum. The site provided a place where Lisa could observe teachers and their actions, though she did not actively post on it herself.

Participants used resources that were posted on the site in creating their part of the sculpture tour for the September workshop. They accessed videos and other links posted to the site with background information about the artists. The teachers were audio recorded when they presented their information, which also included the collaborative discussion of ideas by the group. Those recordings were then transcribed and posted on the site for group members to access at later times. The transcripts did not prove to be user-friendly to teachers, probably because of their length and the extra time it would take them to simplify the content of the discussion.

Kelly in particular seemed to latch on to the Hirst Educators social networking site. She was one of the most active participants on it. I had encouraged her to use it as a space for reflection, a safe closed space to share her experiences during student teaching with the group of teachers that she had developed relationships with throughout the workshops. She networked with other Hirst Educators (through the social networking site and Facebook) as a way to further develop relationships with them.
There were a few downfalls of the site. The fact that as the site administrator, I had to approve blog posts on the site was annoying. This was because it was the free version of the site. Participants also had to create another username and password to be able to use the site, so it became one more password to remember. If I wanted to send a message to the group through the site, the message went to their email addresses. If they wanted to reply to the email, they would have to log in to the Hirst Educator site, rather than directly replying from the email. The system was not as all encompassing as Facebook, but at that point in time, I thought it was important to have a Ning site called Hirst Educators to start forming the identity of the group. In retrospect, this was probably a mistake. Later I switched to Facebook.

*About Lisa’s participation in the workshop.* During the July 2010 four-day workshop, Lisa popped in and out of activities. She came in when requested and provided plenty of information about artworks in the collection and about museum procedures for field trips and strategies for working with students. On the second day of the workshop, Lisa joined the activities at several different points: she listened, asked the teachers questions, and responded to questions asked of her. She ate lunch with the group and spent time talking to teachers informally, as well as about museum-related topics. However, she seemed to keep some distance between herself and the teachers.

Lisa: During the first workshop we had some staffing difficulties, but I also wanted to distance myself in a way… some people will do and say things differently in front of different people. I thought it was a good thing to be separated a little bit from it, so that people could feel like they could say whatever they needed to say—you know, we don’t come to this museum because…and not worry about perception or hurt feelings. And again, maybe it was a mis-read on my part (personal communication, January 24, 2011).

I feel there was some uncertainty between Lisa and me in July 2010 about expectations and her involvement in the workshop activities. Since I had approached her with the idea for the workshops and forming a group for local teachers, and she had not volunteered to help provide
these services, I did not want to overstep boundaries or take away too much time from her work. I invited her to participate as much as she could but did not expect it. I asked her opinions about the proposed itinerary and invited ideas. She seemed to trust my choices. I kept her informed throughout the workshop, yet I am not sure that she was convinced that it was worth her time. From her quote, it seems that she was expecting that the teachers might have spoken negatively about the museum (they did not).

At the end of the workshop, Lisa and I reflected on how the week went. She said that she was pleased and thanked me for letting her step out to take care of issues that needed her attention. She said that it was good for her “to be an outsider instead of trying to be a participant.” She said that initially she was worried about the size of the group but that she liked it small. I commented that I thought it was easier to establish trust with a small group. She also now realized that attracting a teacher audience to the museum should go beyond art teachers. Prior to these workshops, Lisa focused the majority of attention on a specific art teacher audience, managed by Louise (art curriculum specialist). She now realized that it would be worthwhile to form relationships with other content area specialists in the district, and work on attracting an interdisciplinary teacher audience.

Reflection. As stated in the beginning, the goals for this workshop were: a) to create a sense of community between teachers; b) to explore the museum collection together and to talk about resources relevant to practice; c) to introduce the teachers to the Hirst Educator social networking site, and incorporate it into some activities in the gallery; d) to provide content and strategies for teaching in a museum setting; e) to facilitate discussion between teachers and for them to contribute to goals and planning for the follow up workshop in September. I think that these goals were met.
As I reflected, there were four main areas that I learned about over the week. The first was about my involvement as the facilitator of the workshop and the difficulty of finding an appropriate amount of activities and artwork to focus on in the allotted time. The second was about the performative pedagogy activities. The third area was about tangible curricular products that could be associated with teacher workshops at a museum. And the last was connected to my communications with Lisa at the museum. I realized that within each of these areas institutional tensions exist between the museum and schools.

The first issue was time and focus. In hindsight, I might have planned too many activities for the workshop. The activities allowed for exposure to many different artworks but may have limited deep learning. The teachers seemed both to enjoy and to learn from the activities. If I had limited the amount or variety of activities, they may not have been as enthusiastic or motivated. More critical thought could have come from a focus on fewer pieces of art and spending longer amounts of time on activities, but the teachers may not have enjoyed the activities as much.

I realized how important it is for the facilitator to remain open to ideas emerging from within the group. We revised and readjusted our time schedule daily to meet the needs of the teachers; this was easier to do with a small group. One of the adjustments was to create the Discussing Sculpture with Teachers worksheet (Appendix G) after the third day of the workshop. This form was influenced by Sandell’s (2006) F+T+C form, which teachers had used earlier in the week, but my form was specific to creating our sculpture tour for teachers.

I learned that meaningful transitions between sculptures presented on a tour are just as important as transitions between activities of a structured lesson taught at a school. Weaving together two themes or artists on a tour is just as important as weaving together two learning activities in a classroom. The teachers did not select sculptures based on one theme for the tour.
They preferred sculptures within relatively close proximity to the museum that they felt teachers would be drawn to. This made it even more important to focus on strong transitions that connected one sculpture to the next.

The art that was selected for emphasis in teacher workshops was an issue. The focus of the July workshop was on works from the permanent collection, but Lisa expressed interest throughout the week in discussing the temporary exhibits during the September workshop. Teachers were excited to hear about the upcoming temporary exhibits and the associated programming and Lisa promoted them as relevant for both art and non-art school groups to see. The problem is that the work in temporary exhibits will only be accessible for a short amount of time. Lisa and the museum want to promote these exhibits and programming to local audiences including teachers and schools; it was their priority. However, if sustainable curricular resources are going to be created for local teachers, it makes more sense to focus on pieces that will be accessible for years to come. Resources created for pieces in the permanent collection can be added to over time, while curriculum created for artwork in temporary exhibits will not have potential to affect as many teachers or students.

Second, by expanding on the notion of performative pedagogy with teachers, meaningful kinesthetic activities could have been incorporated it into the sculpture tour. We all enjoyed jumping with art and creating photographs of the experience to submit to the blog. However, critical performative interactions with the artwork may have delivered additional insights. It may have been beneficial to discuss using performative pedagogy activities related to particular artworks to promote critical thinking with students. Discussing the Garoian (2001) article with the teachers could have articulated the theory behind the actions and led to deeper teacher
reflections on the activity. Debriefing the activity by referring back to the theory provides direct association with educational implications. But there did not seem to be time for this.

Third, teachers did not walk away from the four-day workshop with tangible resources or curriculum that they created, other than their completed F+T+C worksheets. If curriculum documents had been produced by the teachers for a few of the artworks in the permanent collection, it would have made for richer professional development. We discussed many curricular ideas and they were given a large number of digital resources on the Hirst Educators site that they could later access, but it did not seem to catch on for them to upload their own curriculum contributions to the site.

If teachers were to (individually or with a partner) focus on one sculpture throughout the week and create a multi-media resource for other teachers, they could address standards from multiple subject areas, pushing it beyond just verbalization of ideas. They might create a final product such as a video that could be uploaded to the museum’s website with an Educators’ Resource—an accompanying lesson plan or worksheet. They could upload these forms or create a digital file following a template, where an image of the sculpture and the information they researched could be added. A digital file could be quickly turned into a PDF and shared as a resource with others. If something like this is not done during the workshop, it cannot be expected to be done later on the participants’ own time. However, it might be over-ambitious to expect all of these activities could be completed in the initial workshop.

I posted transcripts and pictures from the practice tour that the teachers led and information they shared about the sculptures on the Hirst Educator site for them to access. In addition to posting transcripts, digital resource files could have been created with all of the information the teachers had provided. These resources might have been easier for teachers to
use and could have been distributed easier at future workshops. Teachers might have been more likely to use a quick reference or summary sheet than read the transcripts. However, a few of the teachers from the July workshop referred to the transcripts to refresh their memories prior to leading the sculpture tour in the September workshop.

Finally, Lisa and I had not discussed her expectations for the workshop, which also highlighted institutional tensions. My motivations and the museum’s motivations were not always well aligned. Differences in motivation between museums and schools became evident through how we approached curriculum and content choices to discuss on the sculpture tour. Further, I had assumed that the museum would allow time for Lisa to participate in activities of the July workshop and that she would do so. I had expected there to be more time for Lisa and I to collaborate during the time of the workshop. I should not have expected that she would be able to drop other assignments and job responsibilities to participate in the workshop. For a successful collaboration, roles and expectations need to be clearly defined, particularly when crossing institutional boundaries.

**Action Research Cycle 2**

This cycle of research occurred between August 2010 and November 2010. It included planning, implementation, observation and reflection on the September workshop and reflection on museum fieldtrips planned by Marshall and Lisa for his middle school students and by Marcella and Lisa for her elementary students. Additionally, the guest speaker presentations sponsored by the museum at Marcella and Addison’s elementary schools are included. These presentations were associated with the *Art on Speed* temporary exhibit at the museum; Lisa and teachers at the schools coordinated them. I was not present for the fieldtrips or school presentations but have included description and reflection of the events because they are an
interesting part of the development of the Hirst Educators group and indicate increase in use of museum resources due to relationships formed through the group.

*September Workshop*

The second workshop occurred on Saturday, September 11, 2010, from 9 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. I chose the date and time in coordination with Lisa prior to the July workshop. We thought that this time would be far enough after the beginning of the school year that things would have settled down a bit for teachers, but close enough that teachers might be looking for resources and professional development opportunities.

I had previously talked with Lisa about what art to focus on during the workshop. It was only for three hours and we knew that the first part would consist of the teachers leading their sculpture tour. Lisa was excited about the new fall 2010 temporary exhibits: Luke DuBois: *Hindsight is Always 20/20* and *Art on Speed*, and had promoted the exhibits and to the teachers at the workshop in July. At the end of the July workshop, the teachers and I came up with a tentative agenda for the September workshop that included the sculpture tour and the two new exhibits.

The artwork in the Luke DuBois: *Hindsight is Always 20/20* exhibit consisted of text-based prints: word visualizations of the state of the union addresses of the United States Presidents. Lisa and I thought the exhibit fit very well with Marshall’s interests and curriculum as a middle school social studies teacher. Consideration was given to the cross-curricular nature of the exhibit and to promoting it and related programming. Lisa had planned several public programs centered on the Luke DuBois: *Hindsight is Always 20/20* exhibit. One way to encourage Lisa’s involvement in the workshop was to have her give specific context of the
exhibit and introduce strategies to the teachers that she had developed for talking about the two exhibits with students.

The day before the workshop, I visited both exhibits to see the work in person and reflect on particular pieces within the *Art on Speed* exhibit that could have interdisciplinary connections and possibilities for performative pedagogy. Since all of the pieces included in the Luke DuBois: *Hindsight is Always 20/20* exhibit were online (on a site not affiliated with the museum), I had seen the content of the work, but wanted to see how it was organized for the gallery space. I reflected to myself on my audio recorder, transcribed the thoughts that night and came up with discussion questions for the following day.

Participants in the July workshop also committed to attending the September workshop and it was also open to new attendees. Efforts were made towards online advertising on the museum website, through the state-affiliated NAEA website and Facebook page, and through personal emails. The local art curriculum specialist, Louise, sent an email announcement about the workshop to all of the art teachers in the district, but it was not posted on the district’s professional development site, *My Learning Plan*. After all these efforts to attract more teachers, only one new participant attended: Bronwyn, a high school art teacher familiar with Lisa and Diane (she had previously run one of the Summer Youth Programs at the Hirst Museum, had been a student of Diane and knew Lisa personally). Most of the participants from the July workshop returned for this workshop, including Marshall, Irene, Diane and Addison. Kelly was involved in a car accident the evening before and was unable to attend, and Marcella was unable to attend due to a state-affiliated NAEA board meeting.

The goals were: a) for the core group of teachers from the July workshop to lead and discuss their interdisciplinary sculpture tour with other teachers; and b) to discuss content and
potential curricular applications related to new exhibits at the museum. The core group of teachers from the first workshop (Addison, Kelly, Irene and Marshall) and Marcella had each researched one piece in the outdoor sculpture collection, utilizing the museum’s artist files and the Hirst Educators’ site for background information.

The Hirst Educators site was not used between the July and September workshops as I had hoped it would be. At the beginning of the workshop, it was introduced again as a place to build community between participants and for posting resources. These resources included video clips and articles about the artists in the new exhibits at the museum, as well as resources for teaching.

_Sculpture tour._ The tour started with Irene’s presentation to the group in the museum’s conference room. Prior to the workshop, Irene told me that she had put together a short PowerPoint presentation as a pre-tour discussion of the sculpture, _Accord Final_ by Arman (Figure 7). She did voluntary extra work to create this presentation, which was about 15 minutes long. She began by telling the teachers that if she was leading the tour, she would create a presentation for each sculpture, because she likes to prepare them for what they will see before they get to the museum. The presentation included content about music, science, visual art and discussion questions. She showed a video about a piano being deconstructed, then of a classical piano performance. The content about science that she presented was about how sound waves travel, for which she gave a demonstration. She told about when a piano key is struck, a hammer bangs on a string and vibrates on a certain note resulting in the tone of the sound.

She gave technical information about pianos and then transitioned into other works by the artist. They talked about issues of value and function through discussion of Arman’s sculptures, which appear to be of destroyed and reconstructed functional objects. Teachers asked questions
about the technical process of casting with this piece, which Irene outlined and said that she would continue when they were in front of the sculpture. I agreed that it is important to prepare students prior to a fieldtrip visit to a museum and then also to follow up afterwards to ensure meaningful connections. Irene uploaded her presentation and discussion questions to the Hirst Educators site. Afterwards, the group commenced the tour outside. Lisa did not attend but Robin did.

As an example, I will describe the discussion of *Wichita Arch* by Andy Goldsworthy (Figure 10), led by Marshall, because of its strong interdisciplinary and local connections.

![Figure 10. Teacher-led sculpture tour (September 2010)](image)

Marshall started his tour by giving the teachers background information on the piece. He told them that *Wichita Arch* is made from 37 tons of Flint Hill limestone. It is typical for Goldsworthy to use local natural resources in his work, such as this type of limestone and the type of tree planted in the middle of the arch, a Siberian Elm. According to Marshall, big ideas represented through the work include: interaction between humans and nature; the power of arches related to history—how empires were built using arches in their architecture;
spirituality—arches as a doorway; arches used as divisions within cities; and reverence for life represented by the tree. He pointed out several metaphorical uses of the arch.

Marshall provided interdisciplinary connections that were specific to middle school level. In science, sixth graders learn about basic biology, including biomes through study of trees and local habitats. Elements of local stone and the mining of the stone could be discussed in science and social studies. For connections to history, he talked about discussing the uses of arches throughout time and in ancient buildings and architecture. In language arts, students could write about what metaphor they would associate with the arch. The geometry involved in forming the arch could be discussed in math, as well as problems such as calculating the weight of the stones or the growth patterns of the Siberian Elm. The students could be asked why the artist put the sculpture in this particular location: is it a reflection of the architecture, or significant as an entrance into campus?

Discussion questions that Marshall shared with the group were: 1.) Predict what will happen when the tree gets older. Will it push those 37 tons of stone, or will it naturally grow around it? 2.) Evaluate the purpose of arches. Why do we build arches? There are many other construction techniques that could be used, but what is the importance of an arch? 3.) Why is this art? We see it so much in architecture and we see trees in nature, but when you combine the two—how would you defend or argue that this is art and not just a combination of two things from nature that we use functionally? He used Blooms Taxonomy action verbs (see Reagan, 2008) in his discussion questions. He suggested that a post-visit activity could incorporate technology: use Glogster to create a poster combining two functional elements of nature and make their own artwork inspired by Goldsworthy. Students could use a Venn diagram graphic organizer to plan for the work.
Robin said that when she leads student groups in discussions of this sculpture, they talk about arches in man-made structures and in nature, so students understand how it has been replicated. She had two teachers move their bodies together and emulate the form of an arch, a strategy she uses with students to help them understand how the tension of the stones hold it in place. This connected well with the kinesthetic performative strategies of the July workshop. Robin also mentioned another way to bring in science when discussing this sculpture. Each of the limestone pieces of the arch was brought in separately and the arch was constructed on site. The gravity and pressure hold the arch together. As Marshall asked, what will happen with the force of the tree as it grows?

Though we had talked about the importance of strong transitions between sculptures in the July workshop, this was not much emphasized during the tour. Some of the teachers did a better job than others with transitions. I may have been over ambitious with this goal. Perhaps it could have helped for me to put together an outline of the script with the transitions that they had provided in July, giving them photocopies for the tour. This resource could have also benefitted the museum, as a potential resource for docent training.

The teachers responded positively to the tour, but it was anti-climatic, since they were basically revisiting the sculptures with one another, rather than informing other teachers about what they had learned. None of them chose to comment on the sculpture tour that they led for each other in the workshop evaluation. I do not think that this was because they learned nothing from it or that the tour wasn’t interesting to them; but I think they were disappointed that there were not more new teachers in attendance to present their research to. The goal for the core group of teachers from the July workshop to lead and discuss their interdisciplinary sculpture
tour to other teachers was met, since there was one new teacher and discussion did occur, but it was not the kind of lively discussion with several new teachers that we had anticipated.

Discussion of temporary exhibits. Following the teacher-led sculpture tour, Lisa led the group on a tour of the two new exhibits in the galleries and talked about logistics of bringing school groups through them. She discussed related upcoming events and programs at the museum. Since Lisa had been promoting both exhibits to the teachers since the July workshop, there was much anticipation on the part of the teachers to see the work.

We toured and discussed the Luke DuBois exhibit first: *Hindsight is Always 20/20*. The small gallery was filled with 41 prints, in sequential order by historical date: all text-based on white paper, black ink, white frames, white walls.

Lisa: You got a clue downstairs (video clip in conference room) to what Luke is doing. He wrote an algorithm that analyzed each President’s state of the union address for frequency of words used in the speech. He then organized the words like a Snellen eye chart—the eye chart that you use at the optometrist when you get your eyes checked. The title of the exhibition—*Hindsight is Always 20/20*—implies that we are supposed to be taking a new look—perhaps a more objective look—at U.S. History and the Presidents. These works were originally shown at the Democratic convention as light boxes, and then they were shown at the Republican convention. The organization of the words is interesting when you read them through as a sentence: Idea, Kids, Deserve, Tomorrow… Gains, Desert, Mission, Tough… I mean it reads almost like poetry (personal communication, September 11, 2010).
I reminded the teachers about when we talked about tag clouds as a reading strategy for students in the July workshop and how this text algorithm was similar to a tag cloud. We had talked about using tag clouds in the classroom as a preparatory way for students to quickly gather main ideas from an article or story. Lisa said that when the pieces are looked at, one might become curious about what was happening at that time in history. Marshall said that the exhibit also seemed to document a transition of language through time.

Marshall thought the images could be used as an assessment with his middle school social studies students. He said he wished his students were going to see the exhibit at the end of the school year (rather than at the beginning) because it would provide a good assessment of what they had learned throughout the year. By the end of the school year, they would know about most of the major events. Marshall said, “They could know who it was by the words, without seeing the name and go up and say, ‘Ok, it’s that President.’”

---

6 Image used with permission, courtesy of the artist and Bitforms Gallery, New York City
The *Art on Speed* exhibit featured artwork by internationally known artists created from a variety of media showing human interaction and fascination with speed and movement. The exhibit was cross-disciplinary from inception, since it was designed around the photographs of electrical engineering professor Harold Edgerton, who first used a camera to see speed in 1931.

![Figure 12. Paper Planes by Robin Rhode](image)

After initial exploration, I led the teachers to the large wall-piece by South African artist Robin Rhode (Figure 12). I told the teachers that the Robin Rhode series of photographs was documenting a changing mural on the side of a building and asked for their ideas about how it was created. It is a series of photographs and what the artist calls a contemporary flipbook. This piece connects with notions of performative pedagogy discussed in the July workshop. The kids in the photographs are interacting with graffiti-drawn airplanes on an outdoor wall; the planes
appear to be animated, which may depict what the kids imagine in their heads. Each frame seems to be a continuation of the previous drawing on the wall, suggesting narrative and sequence, arranged to imply movement. Lisa had told me about the piece the day before, which helped me prepare discussion questions for the teachers. I asked if teachers were to bring students to see this piece, how they might perform and interact with the artwork to help analyze the performance of the kids within the piece? What could students be asked to do that would be related to performing with the artwork? Can you imagine sound through the texture of the airplane drawings? Lisa said, “I like when the planes are coming down over their heads. I can hear [airplane noises]. It’s like those black and white WWII films or recent movies like GI Joe or Transformers.”

I added that narrative storytelling would be an easy educational component to connect to this piece. While looking at the piece as a class, two students could re-enact conversation that they imagine was taking place between the kids in the photographs. As a post-visit activity, students could be paired and told to dialogue using image and text, through creating images in individual frames similar to a comic book format.

Addison said that the teacher could show students a flipbook before seeing this piece for elementary students to understand the concept. Bronwyn mentioned that high school art students might enjoy this work if they had done stop-motion animation or Claymation before. I mentioned that a simple way for students and teachers with limited budgets to do stop motion drawing is with a white board, easy to draw, photograph, erase and draw over.

Next, Lisa led discussion for the teachers in front of a grouping of Harold Edgerton photographs, which inspired the exhibit. She explained to them how Edgerton was an unlikely artist; he was actually an electrical engineering professor who saw scientists using repeatable
electronic flash (stroboscope) in the laboratory and started using the technique in photography, catching split seconds in the early 1900s. Photographers and photojournalists embraced this technique; this technology is also used in film. There is intermingling between disciplines. The exhibition was timely and would not have worked long ago because the technology of speed is of the 20\textsuperscript{th} and 21\textsuperscript{st} centuries.

Discussion questions I introduced included: 1.) How have new technologies enabled us to capture, visualize and control speed? 2.) How is speed and movement discussed and explored in other subject areas? 3.) What kind of performative or kinesthetic activity could you have students engage in prior to or after viewing the exhibit? 4.) How could you direct or inspire your students to capture speed? Lisa challenged the teachers to think of other ideas. She asked, “We have documentation of a performance in the exhibit. Should there actually be a performance that is ongoing in the galleries?”

\textit{Feedback from teachers.} At the end of the tour, we went back to the conference room where the teachers filled out evaluation forms and participant logs, and we talked about how the group should proceed, since there was not another teacher workshop scheduled at that time. We decided that we would collaborate online (on the Hirst Educators site) in the coming months. In practice, this notion did not catch on with the teachers, perhaps because we did not discuss how it would be done. For reasons obscure to me, the teachers did not utilize the Hirst Educators site, even though when we met in person they seemed excited about using it. There seemed to be insufficient motivation for them to put effort into communicating with one another and creating resources. I suggested to Marshall that as he planned for the fieldtrip (bringing the entire eighth grade to see the \textit{Hindsight is Always 20/20} exhibit), if he had any questions to post them on the
site so the Hirst Educators could respond and assist. I was not able to see that he posted any questions.

I said that a goal was for the Hirst Educators to be resources for one another. I reminded them that Kelly was posting blogs about her student teaching experience on the site, not exactly related to curriculum, but that we could still act as a support for her through engagement with her blog posts. And Irene said that related to individual needs, she would love to help Marshall.

Irene: If Marshall has questions that are more about art, then he can talk to me. Depending on the age level of students, we can be resources to one another because we teach different types of students. We all have different backgrounds and what we are talking about is bringing different backgrounds together (personal communication, September 11, 2010).

Bronwyn mentioned that it would be great to get more cross-curricular people involved in what we were doing. She said she would be contacting the social studies teachers at her high school to let them know about the Luke DuBois: Hindsight is Always 20/20 exhibit and what a great cross-over exhibit it is between social studies and art. She said she would tell the Physics teacher at her high school about possible connections the exhibit might have to his curriculum.

After the workshop, several from the group went out for lunch together at a local restaurant. This was a time to talk informally; some conversations were continued from the workshop and other more personal conversations were shared. The informal restaurant outings became a consistent occurrence at the conclusion of the workshops.

Written feedback. Teachers each filled out a participant log and a workshop evaluation sheet at the conclusion of the workshop. For the participant log, the teachers commented on content knowledge, instructional strategies, collaboration and community that could be elicited from the tour that Lisa led in the gallery space. They commented that they had gained knowledge and perspective from being able to see new work in the museum space (they were particularly
intrigued with the science related to the *Art on Speed* exhibit), and through discussion with Lisa of ways to approach the work with their students.

    Marshall said that he learned about new representations of history through the Luke DuBois: *Hindsight is Always 20/20* exhibit and he learned about science through the *Art on Speed* exhibit. As a social studies teacher, he was able to come to new understandings about the history of Presidential discourse and concepts related to physics and motion through analysis of contemporary art (research journal, October 25, 2010). He was particularly drawn to the Harold Edgerton photographs in the *Art on Speed* exhibit because he had visited the Edgerton Explorit Center in Aurora, Nebraska, and had encountered several of the images. The website for the Edgerton Explorit Center and a linked website about the Edgerton Digital Collections (see Massachusetts Institute of Technology, n.d.) provided further cross-disciplinary content that could be used in classrooms.

    About Lisa’s participation in the workshop. Lisa did not accompany the teachers on the sculpture tour around campus but Robin, another museum staff member, did. I was disappointed that Lisa did not come. It was a missed opportunity for her to experience the work the teachers had put into creating the tour, build community with the teachers, share her strategies and learn new ones from the teachers. However, she did assist with the gallery tours and took advantage of the opportunity to catch up with the teachers socially after the workshop. Several important conversations between Lisa and the teachers took place that led to later partnerships and events.

    No doubt, as happened in the first workshop, Lisa had other museum duties and I may not have clearly communicated my intentions. It was another example of how museum and school priorities do not always coincide. If Lisa would have come on the teachers’ tour, it could have
been a way to work toward shared vision in the group and another way to build community between the group members.

**Reflection.** I tried to not over plan this workshop, as I learned from the July one; but perhaps I should have planned more in terms of tangible standards-based resources for pre- or post-visit activities. This would have encouraged more follow-up teacher activity. The goals were met, but the future of other workshops was left uncertain. I encouraged online communication using the site after the workshop: however, that did not happen beyond a few social postings between individuals. The three-hour time allotment for the workshop was manageable for all involved but did not allow for deep exploration of educational connections.

As I reflected about the workshop, I identified four main areas of concern. The first was lack of interest in it from teachers in the community. It was disappointing to the teachers and museum staff that there was not a better turnout. With more teachers in attendance, there would have been a greater opportunity for leadership from the returning teachers. We had all hoped that there would be an increase in teacher interest within the local community. It made me wonder whether other modes of advertising might have worked.

I also began to think about the reward structure for teachers. No professional development points were given for attending, despite my efforts. I had contacted the local curriculum specialist about being able to give professional development points through My Learning Plan. I had also sent email inquiries about it to the art representative from the state department of education, the education faculty at Diller University and other contacts that Hirst Educators teachers had given me. But I got no definitive answers about how this system worked. Because of this experience, I understand how the logistics of arranging for professional
development points could be challenging for museum educators. It was one reason why the district was “a hard nut to crack.”

Second, after touring the sculptures and the new exhibits with teachers and museum staff, I again realized differences in their approaches to delivering content. Marshall was very specific about topics addressing middle school standards when discussing the Goldsworthy sculpture and suggested ideas that could be implemented as pre- or post-visit educational activities. Robin told of experiences that she had found to be successful dialogue with students in general about the sculpture. She talked about the way that the sculpture was constructed, knowledge that the teachers were less likely to have. I reflected that the museum staff would benefit from the teachers’ knowledge of appropriate standards and of potential pre- or post-visit learning activities. The teachers benefitted from hearing about what has worked well with students in the past and from contextual information about the artists, background on how the artwork came to campus (particularly for commissioned pieces) and how the pieces were installed. I saw this as part of an emerging general theme: the differences in background and priorities between schools and museums. This affects the way that both approach curriculum and its delivery.

Through discussions of the artwork in the sculpture tour and in both temporary exhibits, we made many connections to everyday life. I started to wonder if it was worthwhile to create resources based on temporary exhibits since the work would soon be gone; but the teachers found several ways to use the temporary exhibits in their classrooms. We talked about ideas that local learners could identify with, for example: interactions between man and nature in the Goldsworthy sculpture; the Presidents of the United States and the significant words used by each; experiences with airplanes and movement. There were many ways that subject areas other than art were brought into discussion. Both teachers and museum staff provided thematic,
relevant and meaningful connections to daily living; it was easy for them to find common ground through discussion of themes. I realized that integrated learning instruction was not an issue between museums and schools; both institutions agree that it is a worthwhile method. Both easily connected the artworks with more general themes.

Third, I reflected on the difficulties I had because of living far from the research site. This was especially difficult with the temporary exhibits. It is more difficult to research work in a temporary exhibit, especially of contemporary art, and it is nearly impossible to know from afar how the pieces in an exhibit flow within the gallery space. Some temporary exhibits have more permanent access to work available online, as was the case with the Luke DuBois: *Hindsight is Always 20/20* exhibit. Marshall showed online images of the work (from the artist’s website) to his students before and after they visited the exhibit. This isn’t always possible because often work from temporary exhibits is not available online. For instance, there were only two images from the *Art on Speed* exhibit posted on the Hirst Museum website. This made me wonder why some museums do not link to artists’ websites, which provide images and further background on the work. Is it because museums may not want to put all of the images online for fear it might deter visitors from physically visiting the museum? In any case, living near the museum would have enabled me to visit the Luke DuBois: *Hindsight is Always 20/20* and *Art on Speed* exhibits in advance. It would have enabled me to invite a few of the teachers to the museum the week before the workshop to create pre- and post-visit standards-based activities for the temporary exhibits.

The Luke DuBois: *Hindsight is Always 20/20* exhibit was geared more towards Marshall’s interests and linked well with addressing social studies curriculum. The nature of the exhibit made it easier to create interdisciplinary connections. Comments the art teachers made
were that they would tell the social studies teachers at their school about how well the exhibit would address their content. Because of this, perhaps a group of social studies teachers from the area, including Jack, the social studies curriculum specialist, could have been invited to a special viewing to discuss educational implications and connections to the exhibit. Closer proximity might have allowed for such an event tailored for social studies teachers and the curriculum specialist, which might have attracted more non-art teachers to the workshop.

Lastly, the uncertainty about the next time the group would meet led me to reflect on conditions necessary for collaborative interactions between museums and schools. A challenge that comes with joining together two different learning institutions (museums and schools) is that a common culture must be created (research journal, February 19, 2012). It is important to acknowledge that there are differences in motivations between schools and museums and the approach and components of discussion sometimes vary. At the end of the workshop, Lisa and the teachers showed interest in supporting one another in future museum-related endeavors. Institutions strive to meet their own goals and agendas but it is possible to meet multiple institutions’ educational goals. Perhaps this takes someone with vested interest in both institutions to initiate and facilitate.

Opportunities to weave together knowledge and pedagogical approaches like this are valuable. If different institutional perspectives are heard and valued by the other, knowledge can be combined for deeper learning. More openness to collaboration might come from the individuals involved knowing and trusting one another, which comes from sustained interactions and shared interests. This kind of collaboration is more likely to be successful when people are familiar with one another and understand what the others’ goals are, know how participation can provide benefits to their own institution as well as serve the community and help others. I
recognize that these last reflections are mostly about individuals. I had not yet reflected on the differences in institutional priorities, especially including the district level.

Marshall’s Fieldtrip: October 2010

In October, Marshall planned and implemented a fieldtrip for the entire eighth grade class at his middle school to the Hirst Museum and Diller University. The main purpose was to visit the Hirst Museum to view the Luke DuBois: Hindsight is Always 20/20 exhibit. He coordinated logistics with Lisa. He was able to teach his colleagues about the work and led efforts to prepare students for what they would see at the museum. When he told his colleagues what they would be seeing at the museum and how they could reinforce social studies standards through discussion of the artwork, they realized that all of the eighth grade students (approximately 150) could participate in the trip. Marshall and his social studies colleague both presented museum etiquette guidelines in their classes prior to the visit. The students became intrigued when he told them that the exhibit had to do with American History standards they were addressing in class.

Marshall said that the social studies team and administration at his school bought into the idea when they realized that the busing was paid for by the museum and the experience provided a partnership opportunity for the school with the museum. They benefited from Lisa assisting to coordinate additional parts of the fieldtrip around Diller University. This included a visit to the university’s basketball arena and to the Health and Wellness Center on campus, where students were able to engage in physical activities. In Marshall’s mind, the additional experiences on campus balanced the fieldtrip out for the students.

When I interviewed Marshall in January 2011 about his fieldtrip, he said that he thought it went well because he and his colleagues were able to scaffold instruction and content given to the students before, during and after the visit to the museum. Marshall had offered to preview the
exhibit with his colleagues and Lisa had offered to come to a team meeting at the school to help with preparations, but they were not interested because of the extra time it would take. In terms of debriefing, Marshall said that he discussed the exhibit with his classes in the days after the fieldtrip and suggested the idea to his social studies colleague. He said, “We discussed what we liked and didn’t and how it applied to their lives, what they consider to be art, how to predict what they’ll see with the Presidents we will discuss before the end of the year. They had positive reviews” (personal communication, January 21, 2011).

*Marcella’s Fieldtrips: October and November 2010*

Marcella coordinated with Lisa to bring her entire fourth grade class in October and November over the span of two fieldtrips to view the *Art on Speed* exhibit. Lisa worked out a plan with Marcella to take half of the fourth graders to the local Nature Center on the same day that the other half was at the Hirst Museum. This made student numbers more manageable for both places. Then in November the groups switched and visited the other location. Because of Marcella’s relationship with Lisa and the reputation of her school, Lisa also arranged for a pilot guest speaker to give a large group presentation at Marcella’s school (discussed in the next section). The presentation had interdisciplinary connections to the content of *Art on Speed*, which Marcella’s students saw on their fieldtrip.

In art class, Marcella had the fourth graders create artwork based on *Art on Speed*. She shared with me the online Artsonia gallery where she posted the paintings of fast vehicles they had created. Between the fieldtrips, the museum-sponsored speaker visited Marcella’s school. This provided a museum post-visit connection for half of the fourth graders, and a pre-visit experience for the other half.
As the next school year began (2011-2012), changes in school scheduling impacted Marcella’s ability to take her students on fieldtrips to the Hirst Museum.

Marcella: We can’t feasibly do fieldtrips anymore [at the elementary level] because instead of having one grade level for a morning for 2 ½ hours, now we have two grade levels for only an hour and a half each. Before, all of the specials would take the 100 kids or whatever and go do special things…With the Hirst, Lisa let us take half the kids—they [the museum] paid for the buses—to the Nature Center, half the kids to the Hirst, and then the next month we swapped. So everybody got to do both things. Lisa made that work, but now there is just no way to do it. I just feel really frustrated and depressed. Here are these great things and… It’s not our administration here at [the school], it is a district-wide deal, and really all of the specials are just like, ‘you want us to do what?’ I mean we could conceivably have twelve 30 minute classes in a day. That is ridiculous (personal communication, September 26, 2012).

Marcella expressed frustration with the increased responsibilities and shorter class periods implemented through new scheduling initiatives (an effect of pressures on the district of standardized testing) for the elementary elective teachers. She complained that the school district is making it difficult for teachers to plan fieldtrips. Her school administration, not the district, had been supportive and the museum had been very accommodating and supportive with logistics and funding for the buses. After its success and the many ways that Marcella was able to integrate content from the fieldtrip to address art and science standards, she was excited about planning a future fieldtrip to the museum. However, the changes made by the district to the schedule now make it almost impossible. Meeting mandated testing requirements now takes priority over outside experiential learning trips in the district. Students cannot miss class time that will be used to introduce or review concepts that will be tested. It is possible for carefully planned fieldtrips to address and review content that students will see on standardized tests, but there may be resistance to alternative methods of addressing standardized content in the district.

*Museum-sponsored Guest Speaker Visits to Local Schools: November 2010*
On Thursday, November 4 and Friday, November 5, Lisa took retired pilot Buz Carpenter to speak at three different local schools. Buz Carpenter was speaking at the Hirst Museum on Thursday night, related to the *Art on Speed* exhibit, and agreed to make school visits as part of his honorarium. Lisa had never taken a museum-sponsored speaker into the schools before. She planted the idea with Addison at the July workshop and again at the September workshop: Addison got her principal’s approval.

The first of the three school visits was to Bronwyn’s high school on Thursday morning, where Buz spoke to a combination of physics and art students. Then, on Friday, Lisa took Buz to address elementary students at two different school presentations. In the morning, they traveled to Marcella’s school. The second, third, fourth and fifth grade students were invited to the large-group presentation in the gym. Marcella said that the students were completely fascinated and asked all kinds of questions about flying airplanes and what it is like to travel so fast. In the afternoon, Buz visited Addison’s science and technology elementary school, where he gave another large-group presentation to multiple grade levels. Addison was pleased with how the school community reacted:

Addison: I was lucky enough to be at the workshop this summer, and so I was able to meet Lisa. I was lucky because she spoke about things that she had going on in the future, which I thought would work perfectly with our science and technology focus at our school. I’m part of the science committee here, so we have tied our theme this year around study of airplanes and things of that nature. So when we came back [to school in August] I told my principal there was a chance that I might be able to get Buz Carpenter to come to our school for an assembly. Once we had him here, Lisa was wonderful. The significance of it [the assembly] to me is that since we are a science and technology magnet school, it is absolutely crucial to show the students role models and things that are obtainable, things that they could strive to become—a pilot. The children loved the assembly. They paid attention to everything he said; they were so attentive (personal communication, January 24, 2011).

The presentation fit with the theme at Addison’s school for the year, Flight Extravaganza, (and also at Marcella’s school) so it made for a well-integrated learning experience for students.
The speaker addressed his experiences as a pilot, which connected well with the focus of the schools. An important local connection is that the city has a large aviation industry, which made Buz Carpenter’s talk even more interesting to students, teachers and the community. There were interdisciplinary contents in the presentation, addressing science, technology and art standards. Lisa was able to introduce how contemporary art also deals with these themes, as she briefly described the *Art on Speed* exhibit at the Hirst Museum. Addison was recognized in front of her school community for her relationship with the Hirst Museum.

![Figure 13. Museum-sponsored speaker at local elementary school](image)

*Reflection.* The fieldtrips and school visits that occurred after the September workshop showed that relationships established and knowledge gained from one another motivated both the teachers and Lisa. Both took on leadership roles in the events they coordinated with one another. This was proof that the Hirst Educators group was working. I viewed Lisa’s organization of the speaker at three different schools as very successful in terms of implementing new interdisciplinary connections between the museum and local schools. She wanted the teachers in
the Hirst Educators group to benefit from the opportunity; there was an increasingly sense of common purposes between Lisa and the teachers.

Administrative support started to emerge as an important theme in the data. Lisa had to have support from the museum director to take a guest speaker funded by the museum into the schools. She also needed support to devote some of her work time to school visits. Administrative support from the museum was significant in providing 100% bus reimbursement for school fieldtrips. The teachers had to gain support from their school administration to take fieldtrips to the museum and to plan and implement the school assemblies sponsored by the museum. It seemed that the museum and the individual school administrations were quite willing to support these events. But, as indicated by Marcella’s discussion, a problem was emerging with support from the local school district for fieldtrips at the elementary level. It seemed that the district’s priorities were not aligned with the Hirst Educators’.

Action Research Cycle 3

This cycle of research occurred between November 2010 and March 2011. It included planning, implementation, observation and reflection on the January workshop, and interviews with the teachers from the July and September workshops and Lisa. Lisa and I collaborated to determine a date, time, and content.

After interviews with all of the teachers who attended the July and September workshops and with Lisa, we decided on January for the next workshop. Lisa suggested focusing the curricular exploration around the theme of Teaching Tolerance, because of Alfredo Jaar’s temporary exhibition: We Wish to Inform You That We Didn’t Know. This was decided well in advance of the January workshop, in time to be advertised in the Hirst Museum’s Winter 2011 newsletter. Having it listed in the newsletter made it seem like the museum was taking ownership
in the group and was interested in sustaining it. In addition to the date, time and contact information of the text in the newsletter (which Lisa wrote) read:

Sign up today for the newest educators group in town! Area PK-12 teachers learn from fellow teachers about cross-disciplinary strategies to teach tolerance and empathy based on the Hirst exhibition *We Wish to Inform You That We Didn’t Know*, by artist Alfredo Jaar, which addresses the 1994 Rwandan genocide.

Lisa wanted to promote the programs she had planned around the exhibit: the One Million Bones activism project (see One Million Bones, 2009), a peace essay art and challenge experience that teachers might encourage students to participate in, and Peace Day at the Hirst Museum on March 12. The Hirst Museum’s Peace Day was a culminating event for the community, including artmaking related to the One Million Bones global art installation. The winning essays and art from the contest were shared at the Peace Day event. Kids that created and donated bones to the project at the event could silkscreen their own t-shirt with the One Million Bones logo; Lisa arranged for Diller University Art and Design students to help with the artmaking component. There was also a book club based around themes presented in the exhibit and Alfredo Jaar’s lecture on campus, March 3.

*Social Justice Projects*

In these activities, Lisa demonstrated ways of connecting community audiences with the exhibit through activities to bring awareness to the theme of genocide. I started to recognize similarities in how she approached museum-community connections through promotion of a social justice type project (in this case, One Million Bones) (research journal, October 18, 2011). She had previous success connecting Mel Chin’s visit to campus with the museum’s region-wide sponsorship of Chin’s Fundred project (see Fundred, 2010). The Fundred Dollar Bill Project is a collective artwork of three million original interpretations of the U.S. $100 bill, created by children to obtain funding from Congress for Operation Paydirt. This cause brings awareness and
a potential solution to lead-contaminated soil in the U.S. that negatively affects the health of children. In that effort, Lisa committed the museum as a collection site for Fundred. The museum collected 7,400 Fundred bills from around the city and region in 2009 to donate to the initiative.

As part of promotion for this project, Robin spoke at local school district teacher training events and handed out packets to teachers. Lisa led a Senior Wednesday event to build excitement for Mel Chin’s visit. Museum staff set up a table at the city zoo for community kids to create Fundreds and also had them available at museum’s Family Fun Days. I believe that Lisa and Robin’s experience with the Fundred project led to their confidence with the community wide promotion of One Million Bones.

The goals of the workshop were: a) to introduce new content and strategies for teaching about tolerance through art; b) to provide a hands-on artmaking experience for the teachers related to the One Million Bones project; and c) to create another opportunity for Hirst Educators to come together and invite new teachers to join the group.

Lisa and I decided not to do an application process for this workshop but did require teachers to pre-register. In the end, three new teachers attended this event, in addition to all who had previously attended. I was interested to see if group members (teachers and Lisa) might take more leadership roles within the group if it continued. I felt that relationships were becoming stronger between the teachers in the Hirst Educators group and Lisa after the September workshop and the events that occurred between the schools and museum in the following months.

*Thursday Preview Event with Teachers*

I reflected on my interactions with Lisa throughout the day of Thursday, January 20. She and I had gone for a two-hour lunch meeting, where we planned logistics for the evening and
talked about details for the workshop on Saturday. She talked about how she must consider
different communities for each new exhibit. This was something that I had not fully understood
until that point (research journal, January 20, 2011). I focus on museum programming for local
teachers but realized that Lisa has to learn about different audience groups in the communities
with each new exhibit. Though it would be more work for her, I think a strong teacher group
could help her tailor programs for diverse community audiences; teachers do this on a daily
basis! (research journal, May 11, 2011)

On Thursday evening, January 20, the returning Hirst Educators were invited to a special
preview event at the museum. The purpose was two-fold: to provide time and space to view the
Jaar installation in advance of the workshop on Saturday and to reconnect with one another. The
work is about genocide. I thought that if the teachers were able to view and discuss it briefly on
Thursday evening, it would better prepare them mentally and emotionally for educational
activities on Saturday. Those in attendance were Irene, Marshall, Diane, Marcella, Bronwyn,
Lisa and Robin.

The event ran from 5:00 p.m. - 7:15 p.m. It was scheduled to last until 6:15 p.m. but
teachers lingered for an extra hour. This event included dinner that Lisa and her husband had
prepared and a previewing of the Alfredo Jaar video installation, which would be discussed
during the workshop on Saturday, two days later. It started in the conference room with informal
conversations between teachers and museum staff. After all had eaten, the group gathered
outside the gallery. The curator offered to provide background on the exhibit prior to viewing
Alfredo Jaar’s video installation.

Curator talk. The curator explained that Alfredo Jaar was trained as an architect and is a
photographer who also creates film and video work. She said that the work of art was the video
but the artist controlled the installation as well. The way the gallery space was arranged and the images (or lack of images) in his work were all very particular. Jaar determined where the museum placed the moveable walls for the exhibit space and told them what color to paint them. He instructed how the acoustics should be and the museum was given a blueprint. The curator told the teachers that they would see the dramatic effect when they entered the dark room where the video was (displayed on three screens, connected to cover one wall). The artist intended for viewers to be closed off from the distractions of adjacent galleries. She briefly told how other installation works of his were designed with the architecture of the space in mind.

Jaar started his projects about the Rwandan genocide in 1994, right after the height of the killings. The curator gave a brief history of the ethnic groups and the politically-charged feuds between the groups that led to the genocide. She explained that Jaar’s main body of work came from documentation he took between 1994-2000 and that he was asked to work on some memorial pieces related to the incident. *We Wish to Inform You that We Didn't Know* was the most recent piece in his ongoing dedication to the topic. Lisa added to the curator’s information. The piece is from 2010; he has worked on the Rwanda project more than 15 years, so in addition to advocating for victims, he is looking back and reflecting. She drew connections to the Luke DuBois: *Hindsight is Always 20/20* exhibit: how have things changed or not changed, and how do we approach the concepts presented in the exhibits (Presidential discourse; genocide) looking back at them?

The curator said that, in the earlier projects, he had taken about 3,000 photographs, but began to doubt that images could do anything. Could images in the newspaper actually bring people to act and to do something to stop things like genocide? For most of the earlier work, he did not use images from the violence he had documented. He would bury the images in boxes
and indicate that they were there, but were not able to be viewed. She explained that this piece is an interesting change for him because it is almost all images: 28 minutes worth of images synched to hauntingly beautiful music.

The curator said there have been other variations of this video as he worked on it and it has become more pointed in the argument that it makes. *We Wish to Inform You that We Didn’t Know* is more direct than his other pieces; it is not characteristic of his body of work. She told them that his work is not protest art in the way that people usually think about it. It does not scream at you but it makes you think. In the thinking process, viewers draw their own conclusions. For example, Figure 14 does not show the act of violence but shows the effects of the violence through the images of the victim’s clothing.

Marcella asked if Jaar ever shows his work at film festivals or if it is strictly in art museums, to which the curator responded that to her knowledge, the work was only shown in art museums. She explained how video is only an element of the work and that he wants to control how the video is viewed and the space in which his work is shown. The physical space in which the work is viewed is as much a part of the art as the video. She told Marcella that it would be a good question to ask Jaar when he talked at Diller University on March 3. Lisa reminded them about other programming related to the exhibit and directed them to the essay included in their packets that the curator had written about the Alfredo Jaar piece. The curator said that the video is on a loop, starting every half hour and that the artist recommended viewing from the beginning. She said that if bringing a class to keep in mind that the video builds through the sequence of how it is arranged.
At the conclusion of the video, we sat in the space together and reflected. Most of the teachers were in disbelief that they had not known more about the Rwandan genocide. The images exposed them to unbelievable human acts of violence. Marshall gave more information to the group about the historical and political tensions that existed in Rwanda. Several teachers said that they were appreciative to have the chance to view the piece prior to the Saturday workshop. Before the end of the evening Lisa conducted a door prize drawing, which Marshall won; the prize was an Art21 Season 4 book and DVD, which contained Alfredo Jaar’s segment within the theme of protest.

After this event, I reflected on it. It was evident that Marshall was very knowledgeable about the subject matter of the artwork – about the historical political situation in Rwanda. At the museum and in interviews following, several teachers commented on the important contributions of Marshall and expressed a desire to have more non-art teachers in the group.

I also noticed quite a bit of networking between the participants. Irene invited Kelly to an event at the Native Center and now they are friends on Facebook; Marshall and Irene talked about a possible art teacher job opening at his school where he thought Irene would fit. Bronwyn talked to the group about how a curriculum about Teaching Tolerance (focus for this workshop) might work for encore time (school-wide initiative for character education that happens once a
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month) at her high school. As mentioned, several of the teachers lingered in the museum talking (with one another and Lisa), an hour after the scheduled end of the event.

Another observation from the day included the care that Lisa put into personally preparing food for the teachers at the evening event. This is of note because it was quite different from prior workshop events. Earlier that day, she said to me, “We (she and teachers) needed to communicate in a less formal way [in the beginning]” (personal communication, January 20, 2011). It makes sense that Lisa would be more confident with less formal educational delivery methods compared to the formal structure and language of schools, which may have affected her initial interactions with the teachers (research journal, May 11, 2011). She seemed to be letting her guard down and interested in building relationships with the Hirst Educators. From our conversations and her interest in co-planning the January workshop, it seemed she was starting to consider ways that she and local teachers could form connections to benefit one another. The gesture of preparing and presenting food for the teachers, along with the time she spent after work hours with them, was an indication of her interest.

January Workshop

The workshop was held on January 22, 2011, from 9 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. During the afternoon of Friday, January 21, Lisa and I went over plans for it. Lisa had decided upon the theme, had personally picked up the art supplies for the artmaking component, had reserved the studio space, laptops and had ordered catering for participants. She introduced me to the woman from the local non-profit organization who would be introducing the Peace Essay and Art contest. We had a chance to talk about the workshop and the theme of teaching tolerance. I also visited a few of the Hirst Educators at their schools for interviews. I asked Marshall if he would be willing to give the same historical and political background on the Rwandan genocide at the
workshop that he had given spontaneously to the group on Thursday night, which he agreed to do.

At the opening of the workshop on Saturday morning, the representative from the local non-profit organization introduced the Peace Essay and Art contest that students could become involved in. She also showed how the organization had worked with local teachers to create clay bones for One Million Bones (see One Million Bones, 2009). The non-profit organization was partnering with the museum to further promote ideas related to the Alfredo Jaar exhibit throughout the community. Teaching strategies were then presented and ways to teach tolerance in the classroom were discussed.

Prior to entering the gallery, participants were given historical and political background to the Rwandan genocide by Marshall. Lisa contributed with background on the artist. Then they experienced the video installation. They responded through blogging on the Hirst Educators site with their laptops. Because of the violent subject matter, the group debriefed after the experience and talked about potential strategies for approaching the work with students.

The final part of the workshop involved an artmaking component. Participants took their laptops to the studio classroom in the Diller University art building, adjoined to the museum, where they learned more about the One Million Bones project from Lisa and created a clay bone each. She said that when the museum was originally talking about hosting the exhibition, there was concern that the content could lead to feelings of depression and guilt from viewers. They decided that a way to overcome that was to empower people to do something afterwards. Lisa said that the One Million Bones project makes a statement and advocates against genocide. It allowed viewers of the exhibit to vent some of their emotions.
One Million Bones is a fundraising art installation. The goal is to raise awareness of genocide, with the secondary goal to raise funds for specific groups that address conflicts in different regions of Africa. The goal is that one million bones will be created and be on view in Washington, D. C., on the National Mall, in spring 2013. Lisa directed the teachers to a section on the website about how to make the bones. She suggested using materials like air-dry clay, plaster, and papier-mâché.

Lisa showed resources from the One Million Bones website that could be used for classroom application and a 2010 School Arts magazine article that gives an overview of the project. She mentioned that the article could be shown to administrators, colleagues or parents to give the background on the project. There is a gallery section on the website that shows images created by other groups. Lisa encouraged teachers to take photographs and post them to the Hirst Educators site, if they participated in the project with students. She showed them curriculum links for educators on the website. Lisa said, “Obviously, you need to partner with your social studies teachers and let them know: ‘we can do this together without reinventing the wheel.’ You could also partner with your language arts friends.” She referred them to the One Million Bones website and blog if they sought background on the current conflicts in the African countries.

Lisa said that if the teachers chose to have their classes participate in the project that, once completed, the bones could be dropped off at the museum. They talked about logistics for this. Lisa said that she would like to have as many bones as could be completed by March 1 but that she would continue to accept them through the end of the school year. The March 1 deadline allowed for creation of a display for Alfredo Jaar’s visit to campus on March 3. The museum facilitated the packaging and shipping of the bones in mass to the project headquarters.
Then the teachers started making their own bones. This activity served as a further response to process the Alfredo Jaar artwork. I cut pieces of clay and passed it out with tools to the teachers, modeling how they could distribute materials if they were not art teachers. Most of them used their laptops to find images of bones and kept referring back to the image as they created, while a few created more free-formed sculptures. They were quite focused and engaged in their artmaking.

At the completion of the activity, Lisa gave clean up procedures and offered them a choice. They could be among the first bones donated to the project from the museum or could take their work with them, which could be used as teacher exemplars if they chose to have students participate in the project. Afterwards, the group went back to the conference room to fill out workshop evaluations and participant logs. At the end, teachers were able to register online on My Learning Plan for recertification points for attending the workshop. I had requested this from the art curriculum specialist but had not heard back that it was granted, so it was a surprise when Addison and Marcella checked online and it had been posted. I considered this a success.

Seven of the ten participants went for lunch at a local restaurant. As most people finished eating, Lisa presented Addison, Bronwyn and Marcella each with a framed Hirst Museum postcard of Buz Carpenter, autographed and personally addressed to each of the schools that he visited.

Addison: My intention for this plaque is for it to hang in the front hall with the other pictures of significance to the school. Lisa said that Buz wanted it to be displayed there. How perfect is it that it will be hanging so people can see it as they walk in the front door? The community will know that we had Buz Carpenter for a special presentation and know about our relationship with the museum (personal communication, January 24, 2011).

I asked Addison if she would wait to present the gift to her principal until I visited her school for an already planned interview. I wanted to be able to meet Addison’s principal and photograph
them together with the framed piece, to give to the museum. I also wanted to convey words of praise for Addison and her commitment to professional development to her principal.

*Feedback from teachers.* Feedback from all of the teachers involved in the January workshop indicated that the workshop needed to be longer than three hours. They thought we were trying to fit too much into a three-hour time span. I decided that the June workshop would be from 9-4, seven hours. Lisa and I also decided to conduct the workshop on a Friday, rather than a Saturday, since school would be out for summer.

They also said that they enjoyed the artmaking component within the workshop and the strategies for how to implement the One Million Bones project into classrooms. The teachers learned about the Rwandan genocide and how contemporary artist Alfredo Jaar responded through art. They experienced a very political form of art. They spent time reflecting through a written blog and then discussed with one another during the artmaking time. As they created their art, they talked about the Alfredo Jaar work. It took time to process.

In their participant logs, the teachers reflected on ways that the activities in the workshop might contribute to their understanding of content knowledge. They discussed what they might share with colleagues and how the activity has potential to build community. However, because of the violent content associated with the Alfredo Jaar work, it was difficult for many of the teachers to figure out practical ways to implement what they had learned in their classrooms.

Marcella was one who talked about personally enjoying the content presented at the workshop, but was unsure how to incorporate the artwork or theme of genocide for her elementary art students. This presented her with an issue. The theme of the workshop was Teaching Tolerance, which is applicable to all grade levels. There were teaching resources introduced at the beginning of the workshop for elementary, middle and high school related to
Teaching Tolerance. The resources provided in participant packets included lesson plans on teaching about controversial issues and human rights lessons plans, a lesson plan provided by Irene about creating artist trading cards in response to conflict, articles and the Art21 educators’ guide on Alfredo Jaar.

Marcella: I didn’t figure out a way to make the bones project work with my elementary students, but I personally got a lot from it. I went to the museum’s book club. For me personally, genocide was a really good thing for me to think about, and how all of these things are going on in other parts of the world... I didn’t take the genocide theme directly to my kids, but we need to teach kids to be empowered in their own setting. For example, empowering them to stand up to bullies, which is working with the theme of tolerance—how do you stand up to bullies? How do you get other people on your side to help you stand up to bullies? (personal communication, June 13, 2011)

The workshop, and other related programs Marcella participated in, (the book club and Alfredo Jaar’s presentation) led her to consider ways to address what she was learning about with her students. She became more sensitive to conflicts and bullying in her classroom.

*About Lisa’s participation in the workshop.* Lisa was much more present during the January workshop and took on most of the leadership of it. Around the events of the workshop, I started to pick up what I perceived as more interest on Lisa’s part to build relationships with the returning teachers. She said, “Part of how I selected schools for Buz to speak at was through Hirst Educators. I wanted there to be a direct benefit for those teachers who had recently signed up” (personal communication, January 24, 2011). She reflected on the success of the large group presentations that had occurred a few months prior in three of the local schools.

I also noticed that she seemed to become more open to collaborations with teachers. She suggested that I ask Marshall to assist with providing historical context at the workshop after his spontaneous contributions at the Thursday night event. And though it may seem like a small detail, the teachers were quite impressed with the fact that Lisa and her husband put so much
care into preparing dinner for the group as part of the Thursday night event. The gesture created a relaxed and very personal setting.

Reflection. As outlined earlier, the goals of this workshop were: a) to introduce new content and strategies for teaching about tolerance through art; b) to provide a hands-on artmaking experience for the teachers related to the One Million Bones project; and c) to create another opportunity for Hirst Educators to come together and to invite new teachers to join the group. These goals were achieved. Strategies for teaching tolerance were contributed by many in the group and were discussed at the workshop. The hands-on artmaking experience was a highlight for many of the teachers. And three new (to our group) educators attended, including Cynthia, who went on to partner with Lisa on many different initiatives.

I reflected on four components of teaching and learning in this cycle. The first was while the focus of the workshop was a temporary exhibit, the curriculum ideas presented were well connected to a theme, tied to a far-reaching artmaking project. Second, I noticed Lisa was highly involved in all aspects of this workshop and introduced the One Million Bone project to teachers. As I began to notice the pattern, I reflected on why Lisa might be attracted to promote participation in external projects that already exist on a national or international scale. Third, looking back, I reflected on further connections that could have been developed with the project through initiatives between institutions. Lastly, I also reflected on the success of obtaining professional development points for teachers in attendance at the January workshop from the local school district.

The focus of the workshop was a temporary exhibit and did not include discussion of work from the permanent collection. Looking back, I think it would have been beneficial to ask the curator to identify work in the permanent collection that could be linked to the theme of
tolerance (research journal, December 4, 2011). It could have provided a grouping of pieces to create curricular resources for, useful to other teachers in the future. This might have created interest in the permanent collection while encouraging exposure to other contemporary artists who have addressed the theme of teaching tolerance. The teachers could have been given a resource list of these pieces with artist background and discussion questions for possible use in the classroom. They might have been able to discuss cross-curricular implications and questions for different age levels related to selected pieces.

Especially, there could have been more discussion of contemporary artworks that address tolerance for use with elementary students. Work of a more mild nature could have been suggested as a way to scaffold learning. This scaffolding should provide appropriate images for elementary and middle school level, while also providing entrance points for high school. It would address the needs of all Hirst Educators, regardless of the grade level they teach, more fully. I came to a new understanding of the significance of such scaffolding through my interview with Marshall (January 21, 2011). The fact that the focus was on the content of the temporary exhibit indicated that no one was thinking more long-term towards creating museum resources around the theme. However, the connections made through the One Million Bones project were aligned with the content of the artwork.

Second, I started to recognize a pattern with Lisa’s tendency to support large-scale non-profit projects like Fundred and One Million Bones. Lisa is resourceful in finding already-established social justice projects that fit with exhibits at the museum. It fits her needs to become part of a movement that she does not have to design. It allows the museum to show support of larger national and international projects. In the case of both Fundred and One Million Bones, Lisa served as a liaison between the museum, local community, university and schools through
implementation of the projects. She was successful with tying the projects in with her programming. Both projects aim to bring awareness to human injustices.

Neither project was based around work in the permanent collection but both were extremely worthy and provided a means for engaging with the local community through making art. Lisa arranged for the museum to be a collection site for both projects. The actual artmaking component part of Fundred and One Million Bones involved instruction on the organizations’ websites that could be used by any interested teacher or group and was not limited to those with art experience, making it feasible for teachers of subjects other than art to use it. The activity was not dependent on visits to the museum. Participation and organization of the mentioned events by the museum demonstrated their commitment to supporting non-profit groups through outreach events. But the downside is that school issues and the possible longer-term continuities were not considered.

Third, Lisa was able to get many different audiences involved in the One Million Bones project. She told me about how successful it was to have the Diller University students helping kids silkscreen t-shirts at the Peace Day community event. Reflecting on this success, university students could have been invited to attend the teacher workshop and help teachers silkscreen t-shirts. This could have added another layer of artmaking and advocacy to the workshop, since the teachers all commented that they enjoyed the art production-learning component of the workshop. Teachers could have then promoted the project (and the Peace Day at the museum) within their schools by wearing the t-shirts, extending advocacy efforts and creating another bridge between the museum, university and schools. As a further element of the school partnerships, it might have been possible for the university students to lead silkscreen workshops
for interested teachers and students at the four schools that partnered with the museum on the One Million Bones project.

The silkscreen process brought the Diller University Art and Design students into the mix. These students were mainly studio majors. It could have been a course requirement and teaching opportunity for the pre-service and studio majors to facilitate artmaking at these museum events: practicing with the teacher workshop to prepare for the larger community day. This would also create a networking opportunity for pre-service students to meet local teachers. T-shirt silkscreen workshops could have been offered to participating teachers at the workshop as an incentive for partnering with the museum on the project. These workshops, led by university students, would give experience teaching in local schools, while maintaining affiliation with both the university and museum.

Lastly, Lisa and I considered it a success that we were able to obtain professional development points for the teachers that participated in the January workshop. This indicated administrative support from the school district. Did the school district feel that since the Hirst Museum winter newsletter advertised the teacher workshop in advance and mentioned partner schools for the One Million Bones project that it was worthy of professional development points? It was clear that Louise was the one that made it possible for the workshop to appear on My Learning Plan. Why was this workshop more supported that the past two? Though it was not directly communicated to me why the district approved this workshop, it felt like relationships were being strengthened between the museum and the school district administration. However, there was no easy communication about it and the listing felt a little mysterious.

Related programming for the exhibition. In the weeks after the January workshop, I found out from Lisa that though other local teachers had been targeted to partner with the
museum on the Alfredo Jaar exhibit and related One Million Bones project, Cynthia was the one who had truly embraced the project. The content was more fitting, since her students were of high school and college age.

Cynthia: At the Hirst, I have been able to get a lot of resources for my classroom, especially teaching more than just art. We really got into the One Million Bones project with the Alfredo Jaar piece. I was able to utilize Art21 resources to introduce the class to Alfredo Jaar’s work and then we were able to discuss genocide as a topic in our classroom. Also, we discussed contemporary art, installation art as well. So it opened up a broad discussion that integrated social studies, history, art—on different levels. So, the Hirst Museum is invaluable to me as a teacher because it gets my students excited about art. A lot of students do not go to museums or galleries or have exposure, so it is a first time for them. That creates a lot of memories. Most of all it creates an experience for the students, which is the most important thing because we have so many different types of learners... It opens up a conversation in the classroom that wouldn’t have existed before, had it not been for the exhibition. It’s a great resource for me (personal communication, June 13, 2011).

Cynthia’s comments about her experience show the power of contemporary art to start dialogue in classrooms about societal issues. Museum resources related to the temporary exhibit made these conversations possible between Cynthia and her students. She was able to use resources introduced at the teacher workshop, including the Art21 video and educators’ guide on Alfredo Jaar and implementation of the One Million Bones project after viewing the video installation at the museum with students. Since Cynthia teaches at the art magnet high school a few blocks from the museum, she was able to walk her classes over for fieldtrips. Beginning with the Alfredo Jaar exhibit, she continued to walk her students over for fieldtrips until the galleries closed for renovations in late November 2011.

On March 3, 2011, Alfredo Jaar was brought in to speak at Diller University by the museum. Cynthia, Irene, Diane and Marcella were among the teacher participants that attended the lecture and engaged further with the content. Irene wrote and posted a lengthy and detailed summary of Jaar’s presentation on the Hirst Educators’ site on March 4. Cynthia encouraged her
college art appreciation students to attend the lecture and had her high school students contribute handmade bones on display for Jaar’s visit. As a further extension, Marcella also joined a book club sponsored by the museum and a local bookstore that explored the novel, *Baking Cakes in Kigali* by Gaile Parkin, set in Rwanda six years after the 1994 genocide.

It ended up that four local schools partnered with the Hirst Museum to submit bones for the project. It was not practical for Marshall’s classes to participate in the project, so three schools had work represented, including Cynthia’s students and another high school art teacher who attended the January workshop from another school. Lisa reported that the One Million Bones organization sent confirmation of receiving close to 500 bones from the museum. The museum sent pictures to One Million Bones to post on their website of their bone-making activities and displays.

Marshall’s involvement with the Hirst Museum as a social studies teacher made an impact on the other teachers and Lisa looked to him for advice with communicating with Jack, the social studies curriculum specialist in the local district. When I communicated with Jack, I made sure to give Marshall credit for his involvement. Jack recognized Marshall’s participation to the other secondary social studies teachers in the district when he forwarded the email advertisement for the January 2011 Hirst Educators workshop.

Marshall: I didn’t know when I signed up for it [Hirst Educators] that I would be the only social studies teacher in a district of several thousand teachers to take the museum up on this opportunity to be part of this collaboration group. I think it is good, but it has kind of thrust me into the limelight, so to speak, a little bit, on an earlier schedule than I had wanted. But I think it is definitely intriguing a lot of my colleagues and it is getting some buzz, especially when people hear about fieldtrip opportunities like what we were able to put on. I think it is good, but the sky is the limit, and you never know where it is going to go from here. Will it be a main type of program throughout the whole school system? Will it grow to that point where every school has some kind of liaison to the museum? Or maybe it will level out with some interested parties, or because of all the other demands of education—or the demands or direction the museum wants to go—if it will just kind of go away. So the future is just kind of up in the air. I guess it is going to be determined by
the people who are a part of it, and what kind of future connections can be made for people who want to be a part of it (personal communication, January 21, 2011).

Marshall’s comments indicate that other teachers were starting to be interested when they heard about his individual experiences partnering with the museum. He suggested that he was receiving positive acknowledgment from administrators and colleagues through his involvement with Hirst Educators and his partnerships with Lisa. He also expressed uncertainty about the direction of the group, indicating that there were no clearly identified goals to sustain shared vision for the group. He was the only one to raise this crucial topic. There is an underlying implication of the different priorities between schools and museums in his suggestion that the demands of the institutions make it unpredictable whether the group will continue.

Marshall turned out to be a central figure in the project. This is because he is a social studies teacher interested in art, bringing his perspective and experiences as a teacher of a subject area other than art to the group. His comments in January 2011 were observant and insightful. As a group, we were working toward goals, but they seemed hard to identify beyond the general idea of using the museum resources for teaching. Several individual partnerships were developing outside of the group. The group only communicated as a whole when I conducted workshops.

How does a facilitator clearly identify goals with a group? When is it right to identify goals and when to let them emerge from the group? How clearly should those goals be defined? How do goals change over time with the group? The question of identifying goals and sustaining a shared vision is one of the important issues in the study. Marshall was correct that at this point, there was not a clear enough sense of goals. I was trying to build a more institutional relationship between the school district and museum, a more permanent set of connections. It was not clear that the teachers or the museum were as interested in that as they were in individual partnerships.
And it didn’t seem that there was school district support for the group, as there was for individual partnerships through the local school administration. However, it was a sign of support for the group from the district that teachers were able to receive professional development points through My Learning Plan at this workshop.

Why hadn’t Lisa thought of connecting with teachers other than art in the district prior to this study? It is surprising because through the social justice projects she advocates and the programs she plans, she is clearly supportive of cross-disciplinary connections. She advocates art being about social issues, which may be due to working at a contemporary art museum. From discussions with Lisa, I know that she interacts regularly with academic departments on Diller University’s campus other than (in addition to) art to plan educational activities using museum resources. From these experiences, she was ready to explore working with teachers of subjects other than art in the local schools. But why had it taken so long, and what were the differences for a museum educator between collaborating with university educators and local schoolteachers?

Action Research Cycle 4

This cycle took place between March and July 2011. It included planning, implementation, observation and reflection on the June workshop, and interviews with the main participants, as well as the museum director and Louise and Jack. A brief summary of the Summer Youth Program at the museum is also included in this cycle, since two Hirst Educators, Kelly and Cynthia, led it.

Between the January 2011 workshop and the June 2011 workshop, I struggled with what to do with the Hirst Educators networking site. Participation on the site was sparse between workshops. The pattern had been consistent over time: just before, during and right after
times we were all together in workshops, participation on the site was highest. I considered creating CDs for the participants of the June workshop with digital resources (especially since several new teachers registered to attend). However, I decided that if there was a chance of the Hirst Educators site continuing beyond my involvement, I should post all resources on the site and demonstrate how to access them at the workshop.

As I planned the June workshop, I took into consideration ideas that Marshall had shared with me for potential workshop topics. I realized that his insights as a social studies teacher interested in utilizing contemporary art in his classroom had deeply affected me and added to the knowledge of the other Hirst Educators (research journal, March 15, 2011). I researched interdisciplinary resources online that would coordinate with the temporary exhibit in the museum and discovered a plethora of resources for teachers through the state Historical Society museum, including resources that related to African-American artist Gordon Parks. I told Lisa and asked her about me approaching Lucy, the director of education and outreach from the state’s Historical Society, to co-facilitate activities at the workshop. Lucy agreed to do this.

I also heard from Jack, the local secondary social studies curriculum specialist in the district, that he would attend the workshop. This was big news; I took it to indicate that central administration was interested in professional development for teachers being offered by local museums. The fact that Jack would attend the workshop could indicate willingness to build relationships between local public school administration and museum staff. He was also interested in networking with the state Historical Society curriculum specialist, a connection I intentionally coordinated. I had previously invited both Louise and Jack to the workshops but this one seemed to interest them most.
Jack oversees 260 secondary social studies teachers in the school district, 56 foreign language teachers and all elementary teachers in social studies. He has power and authority as curriculum specialist in central administration of a large school district (around 50,000 students). The social studies teachers look to him for guidance with curriculum. His decisions may determine some of the opportunities that are promoted, encouraged and required of teachers. The importance of administrative support continued to emerge as a significant theme in the research, particularly in this cycle.

To promote the June workshop, I continued the patterns I had established for notifying teachers. I invited members of the Hirst Educators through an email disseminated through the site and followed up with personal emails. (Upon reflection, it might have been beneficial if I had been given a museum email account for the span of my workshop facilitator role. I am not sure how it was perceived by district administrators that my emails came from a non-educational email account.) I emailed Jack and Louise and asked them if they would send information about the workshop to local teachers under their supervision. I asked Louise directly about posting the workshop opportunity on My Learning Plan. Several of the new participants indicated that they found out about the opportunity through this avenue. As in January, those in attendance were able to obtain professional development points through My Learning Plan and register their attendance while at the workshop.

June Workshop

The workshop was related to the theme of explorations of where we live. It occurred on Friday, June 10, 2011, from 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. The goals were: a) to introduce new content and strategies for teaching about art created by local, regional and state artists; b) provide opportunity for Hirst Educators to engage in conversations with the curator as well as a local
artist with work on display at the museum; c) to empower Hirst Educators by offering leadership roles; d) to involve a state social studies expert in leading activities and providing interdisciplinary resources. Since this workshop was focused on local and regional artists, there were many possible connections between the content and learning standards in multiple subject areas. The art discussed during the workshop came from many sources, including the permanent collection, temporary exhibition and from outside research of local and regional artists. Resources were sought from around the state, including Lucy, who led a presentation and gave out classroom resources and teaching materials (in print and online form).

There were new presenters at this workshop and leadership roles were distributed to museum staff and teacher participants. Lucy led activities using the resources that she brought. The Hirst Museum curator talked to the group about how the museum goes about purchasing pieces for the collection. Three of the teachers (Irene, Cynthia and Bronwyn) gave a presentation on Outsider art by state and regional artists. (Irene and Cynthia went on to have a proposal accepted for a session at the fall state-affiliated NAEA conference, where they shared their Outsider art presentation.) Kent Williams, one of the local artists with work on display in the museum, came to speak to the teachers.

*Museum memories activity.* I created a think, pair, share activity based on museum memories, inspired by the museum scene at the Art Institute of Chicago from the 1980s movie, *Ferris Bueller’s Day Off* (Appendix I). As an introduction to the activity, I explained to the teachers:

Throughout the day, we will be talking about interdisciplinary connections related to using museum resources in teaching. We have to assist our students in making these interdisciplinary connections. For us to do that, it is important that we also experience these connections.
After watching the video clip, I had them identify their most vivid museum experience. I did not specify that it had to be associated with an art museum. I asked them to individually write down descriptive words related to the experience and to reflect on it. Then I asked them to turn to a partner and share their experiences with one another. In preparation for the other activities during the day, we talked about how the activity could relate to other disciplines and how personal memories are significant in learning about social studies and history.

I told them that it might be significant for museum visitors to communicate their personal memories with museums. The activity was inspired by a Twitter chat on the topic of museum memories. On May 17, Twitter users were encouraged to send their favorite museum memories to the museums where the memories occurred. The Hirshhorn Museum is where I first saw it posted: “Today is Museum Memory Day. Tell us your best stories. Use #MusMem.” This suggests many museums are interested in knowing their various audiences and use social media to engage with them. How could social media activity such as this affect future museum programming?

After the workshop, Cynthia said that she planned to use the think, pair, share activity with her more advanced high school and college art students. It provides a way for students to reflect on their past experiences in museums. It also might serve as a survey of students’ experiences to help teachers know how to create student-centered activities based on their responses prior to a museum fieldtrip. Another application would be to pose the reflective questions to students after a fieldtrip, which could serve as a way to evaluate what students gained from the trip. These questions could be modified to fit teachers’ content or purposes.

Upon further reflection of my communications with the teachers, I realized that my words in the beginning of this activity set the tone for the day and summarized what I thought to be the
shared vision of the group: interdisciplinary connections related to using museum resources in teaching. Did all in attendance share this vision? I believe that the teachers that had been to the prior workshops did, but I had not asked the new members. However, it was clear in the workshop description what it would be about. In any case, I don’t think the beginning of this workshop would have been the appropriate time to discuss the vision of the group. But when was the right time for this?

I started to recognize that from the past workshops, the group had been hinting at wanting to build a more institutional relationship between the school district and the museum. They often mentioned the curriculum specialists in their conversations and whether or not the school district could use some of the museum’s resources. Clearly, we had to have the curriculum specialists’ support to be able to obtain professional development points and inclusion of the workshops on My Learning Plan. We needed their support for the group to survive and grow.

*Trading card activity with Lucy.* As the director of the education and outreach division at the state’s Historical Society museum, Lucy told the teachers of her interest in art history as evidence of a culture. She described how she uses art to teach history, actively learning by looking at artwork, photographs, and historical documents. One of the learning tools that the Historical Society produced was a set of 150 trading cards of famous people from the state. As Lucy explained, the people on the trading cards are all deceased because choosing people who are still alive can become political. She said that one of the downsides of having only deceased figures on the cards is that history is not only about the past; it is about the present.

Ten of the trading cards in the set feature artists from the state. Lucy passed out one card to each pair of teachers and told them to share one fact from their card to see if the others could guess who the artist was. She gave ideas of ways the cards could be used in teaching, including
presenting a famous person from the state everyday in the classroom and having students use the cards to learn more about the historical figures. After the workshop, Marcella said that she planned to use the cards at her school, connecting them with a wax museum project that one grade level does every year about famous people from the state. She was sure that other teachers at her school would want the resources that Lucy provided. All of the teachers were pleased to get a complete set of the trading cards and the other teaching resources that were provided. Art teachers might not have ever obtained these if they were not accustomed to actively seeking out resources beyond their subject area content.

Curator presentation. The curator gave a presentation about how the museum purchases artwork and showed pieces that she had purchased in the three years she had been at the museum. She explained to the teachers that the Hirst Museum’s collection starts right around 1900, primarily consisting of work from Western Europe and America, but she emphasized that the museum is working toward globalizing the collection with 21st century art. When she started at the museum, one of her first assignments was to write a collection plan, a document that AAM recommends that museums have. This document assesses what the museum currently has and lays out a direction for what it might acquire.

Writing the collection plan required the curator to go through the entire collection and quantify how many works could be considered representative of different genres and styles of art. She talked about how she noted strengths and weaknesses of the collection and then made goals. Abstract Expressionist works, photography and African-American art are strong areas of the Hirst Collection. Her goals were not specifically about purchasing, but more general, such as “photography is strong in our collection, we should keep building that.” Identified areas of need in the collection are women artists, as well as work by international artists and regional artists.
I wondered why no teachers raised the question of why the collection is heavy on Abstract Expressionist work and African-American work. Later, I asked the curator. She said that the Abstract Expressionist work is logical because it was a dominant style in the years leading up to the museum’s founding. The large portion of work by African-Americans may reflect the interests of one of the former curators, who seemed to have an interest in artists exploring ethnic and racial identities. There was no learning activity to involve teachers in a discussion of the collection plan. Perhaps at this point, there could have been a visual identification game of some kind as an attention getter, for teachers to be able to look at images of artwork and guess the category and what strength or weakness the piece built on in the collection.

The curator often comes up with proposals for purchasing art but in no way does she make the decision to purchase on her own. She made it clear to the teachers that every decision is collaborative. Ideas for purchasing start with a conversation with the director. From there it goes to a collection committee, then to the full advisory board for the museum, and then to the Diller University Foundation, since the Foundation owns the collection. So, in order to purchase a piece of art, the proposal goes to the director, then through three different governing bodies before being able to finalize a purchase. Sometimes it can take three to four months to gain approval. Learning about this structure provided insight about the hierarchy of the museum. The curator said that one of the considerations for purchasing a piece of art is how the work could be used in teaching. I took this to mean teaching within the university, not for the schools, but that was not clarified. I wondered if this stipulation for purchasing is also a priority for museums that are not affiliated with a university?
This presentation did not suggest teaching activities, nor had I asked the curator to introduce them. This would have been an opportunity to talk about how to integrate learning activities related to collecting and curating into school curriculum. Beckman (in press) provides an example of how curating an exhibit could be integrated into college courses at an academic museum. Some of the ideas she presented could be modified for digital or mock exhibits in classroom spaces, particularly with high school students.

To keep with the theme of the workshop, she showed several pieces created by regional artists or artists with connections to the state. This work included: Larry Schwarm photographs; Roger Shimomura prints and paintings; Patrick Duegaw paintings; Terry Evans photographs. Many of these pieces were purchased around the time of exhibitions or in preparation for future exhibitions.

Linking to significant artists from the state, the curator recognized that Diller University was awarded a large amount of Gordon Parks papers in 2008, now held in Special Collections in the university library. The museum realized that the university had become a center for Gordon Parks research. This caused the museum to look at what Gordon Parks photographs were in their collection. The museum’s collection plan states a very specific goal to continually purchase Gordon Parks photographs. So after the acquisition of the papers to the university, the museum purchased 25 Gordon Parks photographs; they currently have 29 in the permanent collection. The Hirst Museum hosted a retrospective entitled, *Crossroads: The Art of Gordon Parks*, which was on view January 23 – April 11, 2010.

At the time the curator was planning the Gordon Parks retrospective at the museum, she wanted to have a survey of African-American artists from the collection in the smaller gallery to complement the work. This gave her reason to look for more work by contemporary African-
American artists to add to the collection. Of note in the collection are pieces by Mark Bradford, Kerry James Marshall, Julie Mehretu, and Kara Walker. The exhibit of contemporary African-American work and the societal issues it addressed became the subject for a course the curator taught for the Art History department at Diller University in the spring of 2010, while the exhibits were on view. Out of the research she did for the course, she was able to find more artists that would fit well in the collection, including pieces by Hank Willis Thomas and Carrie Mae Weems.

The presentation by the curator to the teachers was both informative and educational. One of the teachers commented in her evaluation that the curator’s talk was what she enjoyed most and that she would like to have her talk to her students about being a curator and purchasing art. Another focused on the curator talk as her chosen activity for the participant log. She wrote that she planned to share ideas for lessons on art careers with her colleagues based on the presentation.

I wondered why none of the teachers asked questions about teaching with the resources that the curator introduced. They might have been so focused on the content of the presentation that at that point it was difficult to think of teaching applications. Or it might have been because we were on a tight schedule of activities and there was not enough time given to exploring curricular connections with the curator.

_Presentation on Outsider art by teachers._ Irene, Cynthia and Bronwyn made a presentation to the other teachers about Outsider art. They introduced several Outsider artists from the state and gave ideas for lessons with students. As a personal connection to Outsider art, Irene brought in a bird constructed out of farm equipment by one of her relatives, given to her when the relative found out she wanted to be an artist.
Cynthia explained that they put the PowerPoint together as if it was intended for students and it would be available to the other teachers on the Hirst Educators site. She started by giving background and history of Outsider art and said that the conversation about defining high art and low art is an interesting one for students. Bronwyn said that to show students examples of Outsider art because it helps students understand that there isn’t just one correct way to make art.

Cynthia talked about her high school memory of going to the Garden of Eden, a sculpture garden around a house built by Samuel Dinsmoor (one of the artists from the card set that Lucy had passed out earlier). Cynthia presented a lesson idea about creating memory vessels that could connect with Dinsmoor’s work and other Outsider artists. The memory vessels could be created using old teapots, bottles, jars and other found objects. Teachers said that this lesson might be most appropriate for high school but talked about ways to modify it for elementary students. Students could be inspired by memories of a life event in their past, a vacation, or a pet. With high school students, the focus could be about memorializing something. Cynthia talked about the historical connections with memory vessels in African countries and southern areas of the United States and how there was symbolism in breaking the vessels and making new ones.

Resources and links for memory vessels were given, as well as listed objectives and procedures for the lesson.

Bronwyn explained that she had put together slides from lessons she had done with students in the past, using Outsider artist Grandma Layton as inspiration. Grandma Layton didn’t start creating work until her 70s and most are blind contour self-portrait drawings. Bronwyn shows Grandma Layton’s drawings in her classroom to get students thinking about self-portraits and representing their own personalities. She uses Grandma Layton as an example of expression and utilizing pattern. Bronwyn showed student work inspired by Grandma Layton and the rubric
she used to explain expectations of the project to students. She told them that her resources would be available on the Hirst Educators site.

I asked Bronwyn to tell the teachers about her methods of using museum resources through Skype and secret fieldtrips. She said that she has had at least ten local artists visit her classroom, either physically or through Skype. The technology makes it possible for students to virtually visit the museum as well as see artists’ studios.

She told how she had used Skype to bring Lisa into her classroom for a discussion with students in March 2011, since her school district does not allow fieldtrips. Bronwyn said that the discussion was mostly about museum etiquette and different jobs at the museum. Lisa did not show artwork during the interaction, but Bronwyn pointed out that this was possible if Lisa would have used a cell phone rather than a computer to Skype. This made me think about how students might glimpse the artwork within the museum in this format with the museum educator (or a docent). I wondered why artwork wasn’t shown in this instance. I found out from the public relations manager that because the museum does not own the copyright to works of art that are borrowed, they cannot allow it to be photographed or videotaped. But I wondered if it could be streamed through Skype for a strictly education session like this? This points again to reasons why work in the permanent collection should be used with schools: it would not be a problem to capture artwork in video when Skyping with students.

Bronwyn also occasionally plans secret field trips with her high school students. She has asked her students to meet her at the Hirst Museum outdoor sculpture collection after school (she teaches a course on sculpture). She acknowledged that she cannot count it against students if they don’t attend the secret fieldtrips but pointed out that it is a way to get parents involved.
In terms of teacher feedback on the workshop evaluation form, two teachers named the presentation on Outsider artists as their favorite learning activity of the day. On the participant logs, one teacher of a subject other than art seemed to feel less threatened about creating art after learning about Outsider artists: there are artists beyond those that are formally trained. Another said that she learned a new strategy for designing memory vessels and that she planned to share with colleagues the purpose and meaning of Outsider art.

*Word cards and gallery talk with Lisa about Patrick Duegaw’s painting.* After this, we went to the gallery. The teachers previewed the *Fisch Haus* exhibit and wrote questions for the artist Kent Williams, who joined the group after lunch. It was also a time to introduce how manipulative word cards, another resource provided to the participants, can be used with students as an art criticism strategy. Marilyn Stewart, NAEA 2011 National Art Educator of the year, had recently been to the university where I worked and discussed an art criticism strategy using manipulative word cards (see Katter & Stewart, 2001). I gave each teacher three envelopes containing small slips of paper with text and told them the envelopes were in the order they were to be used for scaffolding purposes: descriptive, expressive and interpretative. The manipulative word cards can assist students with talking about art in a non-threatening way. I explained ways this could be done. Starting with the descriptive word cards, the teacher could ask who had a word that described the artwork the group was looking at. Teachers might also ask students to hold up a descriptive word that does not describe the piece and formulate discussion from student responses. Compare and contrast methods can be utilized. The expressive word cards can assist students to identify emotional aspects of the work and the interpretive word cards can help elicit responses from students about what the art is about.
After introducing the word cards, Lisa led a brief discussion about Patrick Duegaw’s mural. Duegaw is one of the founding members of the Fisch Haus artist cooperative group featured in the temporary exhibit, but this piece was commissioned by the museum for the permanent collection. She reminded teachers that they each were given a copy of the catalog from the exhibit, where they could see an earlier stage of this piece before it was completed.

Lisa explained the four-step process she uses to look at a piece of art. She said that in this process, it is important to describe what you are seeing (which is what young children really focus on—she asks them to find different things). Then the work is analyzed in an attempt to categorize things: what are the colors? What are the shapes? What are the textures and implied textures? After that, viewers can attempt to interpret the story or the meaning behind the art. Finally, the evaluation process asks viewers to consider why this art is important to oneself, one’s family and community? Lisa said that she notices again and again that the four step looking process is the same in many different fields.

Lisa: We use the four step looking process in science when we go outside and look at biology and plants that are in the gardens. We identify the different plants by first describing what they look like. Using the basic elements of art, the eucalyptus plant has a different shape than the lemongrass plant. So learning to look and spending time on those first steps is crucial to get to the evaluation stage (personal communication, June 10, 2011).

One of the things that came to light with Duegaw’s piece is the very dense horizontal format. Lisa asked what led them through the piece as they read it left to right? A strong diagonal line leads the eye across the piece. Other devices could be the objects pictured. The artist deals with how to compress the space and simultaneously how to open it up. She mentioned that artists try to move the viewer through the piece without languishing in one space for too long and are concerned with how to keep the viewer’s interest.
I thought of other methods of looking at artwork that could be used in the gallery, beyond the four-step process. I wondered if teachers had been exposed to methods of Visual Thinking Strategies, looking for denotations and connotations within an artwork, or Terry Barrett’s (2008) more postmodern approaches to discussing artwork in gallery settings. Schlievert and Fretz (2010) created an updated four-step process for looking at contemporary art that is useful, including: a) active looking; b) considering choices; c) making connections; d) constructing possibilities. If we would have had more time to devote to this activity, more methods could have been described or enacted with the teachers. Later, I shared Schlievert and Fretz’s updated four-step process with Lisa, since it was closely tied to what she had been using, but was more contemporary in approach. I was careful not to insinuate that I thought she should be leading interpretation in the galleries differently.

*Artist talk with Kent Williams.* Lisa introduced Kent Williams, whose work was on display as part of the *Fisch Haus 21* exhibit. He is one of the four founding members of the local Fisch Haus artist cooperative. Lisa described Kent as always reflective, thoughtful of the space around him, looking at form and function, and interested in the surrounding world and living in a better way. Kent spoke mainly about the story behind *40 Chautauqua*, an 8’ x 9’ mixed media piece that he started creating in 1998. He began it in Los Angeles as a healing device for processing a series of challenging events that took place on a 40-acre piece of land in Southeastern Kansas that he and Eric Schmidt (another Fisch Haus artist) own. This work is a map of that 40-acre area. There are between 4,000-4,500 flathead screws in the piece, representative of trees, which is close to an accurate representation of the forest on the land. Through a series of road improvement projects, the bulldozer operators wrongly removed a large portion of trees on their land. Kent said, “Due to my very romantic relationship with this place, it
was heartbreaking to see. I could probably deal with it if I understood why it happened, but the more I learned, it was simply out of ignorance and negligence.”

The teachers were interested in the personal story behind the work and the mechanics of recreating the land through the map format. Lisa facilitated questions to Kent that the teachers had written on cards prior to his visit. The teachers asked additional questions, inspired by the talk. They wondered about the screws and their metaphoric meanings, as well as technical aspects of layering and creating the piece over many years. They were interested in the relationships between the artists in the cooperative. Kent ended his talk by saying that he likes to ask the question, ‘where is home?’ This fit unexpectedly well with the workshop resources; I had provided a lesson plan in the teacher packets on the theme of home and mapping. The geographical references and narrative about time and place also fit well with Lucy’s presentation and the overall theme of the workshop.

*Lucy’s presentation: social studies connections and state lesson resources.* Following Kent’s presentation, the workshop continued in the conference room. Lucy led the teachers through the [state] Memory website, affiliated with the [state] Historical Society. Each of the teachers had a laptop to explore the site, and Lucy instructed using a projector. She directed them to images of the Dust Bowl, as well as actual audio and video sources about the historical event that occurred in the state in the 1930s. These primary sources (many of them visual) can assist learners in understanding what was going on during the time and effects on the community.

Lucy introduced a third grade lesson plan to the teachers. In the lesson, students compare their local community with another. Students are instructed to talk with their parents and with their grandparents about their communities; it is meant to be intergenerational. Then students break into small groups in the classroom to create a poster based on a category within a
community. The categories identified were: population, region of the state, industries, jobs, high schools, places of interest. Lucy said that art teachers could have students look at public art in their community and go online to look at public art in other communities. Students could draw an image of their community based on the research that they had done or on the community that they studied. The lesson was intended for third grade and uses critical thinking skills through synthesis questions such as: what have I learned as I compare and contrast my city with another? Lucy claimed that a benefit of using primary sources is that students must apply their knowledge.

Lucy told the teachers about the virtual repository on the [state] Memory site, which includes 16,000 unique items. She showed them the link for teachers on the site and pointed out that teachers are the main audience. Resources were organized by state learning standards. It is possible to identify a standard and find images and documents related to it. She also showed how it was possible to click on the map of the state, then on a particular county and see all of the documents and primary sources that are digitally available from that county.

Another resource that Lucy provided was a lesson plan on Gordon Parks, intended for seventh grade social studies. This lesson included questions for analyzing one of Parks’ poems; and others for analyzing his image, Ella Watson. Several of the teachers commented that they would be able to use the document for analyzing a photograph in their classrooms. The lesson plan provided history and reading standards addressed, but did not mention art standards. This resource provoked thoughts in me about how the curriculum could be reworked to become more integrated and related to images in the Hirst permanent collection (research journal, March 15, 2012).

Throughout the day, there was an emphasis on connections to resources beyond the exhibit that teachers could access later. This was in different from the resources provided at the
January workshop, which were mainly focused on the Alfredo Jaar temporary exhibit. I deliberately wanted Lucy to show teachers interdisciplinary lessons and resources about the state that were permanently on the state’s Historical Society site for them to use time after time. Lisa saw this and was active in Lucy’s presentation, but we did not discuss implications of this for future workshops or teaching resources for the museum. It was becoming clearer to me that efforts for creating Hirst Museum teaching resources must be focused on work from the permanent collection. After experiences with both through the study, this seems to be the only way to truly align museum priorities with school priorities.

*About Lisa’s participation in the workshop.* Lisa was involved in many aspects of the June workshop and she continued to show interest in discussing ideas and potential learning activities with me. At the beginning of the workshop, Lisa welcomed teachers, talked about fieldtrip procedure and upcoming programming, and was an active participant in the morning activities. She presented strategies for discussing art related to Patrick Duegaw’s painting in the gallery. She designated two interns to assist with preparations and throughout the workshop. She had lunch catered for participants and encouraged other museum staff to eat and mingle with the teachers. At the end of the day, she gathered with teachers and Lucy at a restaurant, continuing conversations and informal connections.

*Feedback from teachers.* Overall, the feedback from the teacher participants in the workshop was very positive. Activities appealed to teachers in different ways. Many said they would feature local and state artists in their teaching more. They enjoyed the history components and learning about the available resources from the state Historical Society. They liked the resources they could take home with them, including the trading cards, resource packet and word cards for talking about art. They learned about content and process for making art through
interaction with the artist. A few said that there needed to be more time in the workshop and one mentioned a desire for more hands-on activities. In an effort for exposure to many activities and resources, the time was over-planned, leaving less time for the group to digest and reflect together on the material. One wrote that what happened during the workshop between teachers of different grade levels and schools – learning about teaching strategies from museums and other organizations was inspiring.

Seven new teachers attended this workshop. All participants from previous workshops came, with the exception of Marshall, who was out of state. Several of these new participants found out about the workshop from the listing on My Learning Plan and others heard about it from teacher friends, Louise or Lisa. In addition, two local curriculum specialists, Louise and Jack, made appearances during the day. As had become customary from workshops past, many, including Irene, Addison, Kelly, Diane, Robin, Lisa, Lucy and me, went together to a nearby restaurant at the conclusion of the workshop.

_Reflection._ The goals of this workshop were: a) to introduce new content and strategies for teaching about art created by local, regional and state artists; b) provide opportunity for Hirst Educators to engage in conversations with the curator as well as a local artist with work on display at the museum; c) to empower Hirst Educators by offering leadership roles; d) to involve a state social studies expert in leading activities and providing interdisciplinary resources. I believe these goals were met.

I reflected on four areas after this workshop. One was the administrative support shown by the school district and the museum, which played a significant role. Jack and Louise had both agreed to interviews and both made appearances at the workshop. Though neither of them stayed
for long, they were able to glimpse the learning activities and interact with participants. Their presence demonstrated support of the workshop to the teachers and the museum.

The museum demonstrated administrative support in a variety of ways. Lisa was able to dedicate the entire day to the workshop. She devoted two interns to making sure the needs of presenters and teacher participants were met, and she let them participate in learning activities with the teachers. The museum also funded breakfast, lunch and snacks for all participants at a level that had not occurred at previous events.

Second, leadership was distributed among participants, representing perspectives from different institutions. I deliberately coordinated activities by external guests and others within the group, rather than making presentations myself (other than the museum memories activity). I was preparing to gradually step out of my facilitator role and empower participants to lead activities for themselves.

I asked Bronwyn, Cynthia and Irene to present because I recognized their expertise from multiple interactions. Teachers were receptive to the presentations and asked questions about process in the classroom and expectations for student work. These were questions that they might not ask a museum educator. Arranging this might be difficult for a museum educator. It might be another reason for a museum educator to partner with university educators to plan and implement teacher workshops.

Third, teachers learned a great deal about museum priorities through the curator’s presentation. They learned about purchasing procedure and about unique characteristics of the museum collection. The opportunity to interact directly with a curator is sometimes limited but I made a point to invite the curator to interact with the teachers on several occasions. She presented to them at the July 2010 workshop, the January preview night and the June 2011
workshop. As mentioned, a few teachers indicated that they were interested in having the curator talk to their high school art students. Clearly, they understood more about the role and responsibilities of a curator through the presentation.

Teachers learned about museum priorities through the curator’s presentation, yet there was a tension here with the schools’ priorities because we did not discuss curriculum related to it. There really was not dialogue between the teachers and the museum staff during the presentation, but I had not asked for it and the curator knew we were on a tight time schedule. I thought it would be enough for the curator to talk with the teachers about the museum’s collection policies, but in hindsight this was not engaging enough and did not provide any tangible resources the teachers could use. If there would have been more time, the curator’s talk and Lucy’s expertise provided an entry for generating cross-curricular ideas based on work (by state artists) from the permanent collection.

I personally learned much from the curator’s talk. I started to understand why some pieces of artwork might fit better in the collection than others, and the governance of an academic museum. The presentation helped me to understand how complex it can be to develop and expand collections. It also helped me to realize that in a small museum, job responsibilities overlap: communication and shared vision seem to be key to effective operations.

The last area I reflected on was the missed potential for creating curriculum during the workshop. As mentioned, there was opportunity to have teachers write collaborative lesson ideas based on artwork from the permanent collection that the curator introduced during her presentation. I do not feel I would have cut any of the activities during the June 2011 workshop, but if there had been an additional day of the workshop, I now know methods I could have employed to have teachers write curriculum based on work in the permanent collection. The
curator mentioned many pieces by artists from the state or with ties to the state that had been recently purchased. In keeping with the theme of the workshop, it would have worked to split teachers into groups of 3-4 to create a curriculum document based on one of those pieces. It would have been ideal to have a mix in each group of art and teachers of subjects other than art. If teachers of different age levels of students were to group together, this would be another opportunity for vertical teaming. I started to identify an emerging theme as curriculum development of resources for long-term value. This theme builds on past workshops. Previously, focus on using resources devoted to temporary exhibits proved that those resources were only available for use by those teachers able to access them at the time the exhibit was on view. And the resources we created based on the sculpture collection for the September 2010 tour were never put into a format that other teachers might be able to access and use.

Teachers may become more invested in the museum’s collection if they know pieces within it that could be used to address state standards in many subject areas. They might be more interested in a curricular resource if it was known that local educators created it. Resources could be added to or expanded over years if focus of the curriculum is on the permanent collection. If particular pieces from the permanent collection align with state standards, those pieces could become staples for study by particular grade levels in the local district.

In order to guide teachers towards writing curriculum intended for a gallery setting, I suggest that curriculum tasks could be broken into segments. Parts of the lesson could be addressed by individuals or collaboratively within the group. Performative pedagogy could be included, since it had been introduced at past workshops. Curriculum documents could be consistently formatted, such as the following:

- Introduction (catchy attention getter, overview of lesson, objectives, standards, interdisciplinary ties, discussion questions related to theme, vocabulary);
• Visual culture / artist connection (ties to everyday life and understanding media, analysis of image(s) through discussion questions and presentation of cultural, historical and artist information);

• Kinetic / Performative activity – partner, small group or individual activity that combines subject area content and making/doing/action;

• Debriefing (discussion of activity, reflective questions, closure, ties to theme, other artwork and interdisciplinary connections).

If each teacher within the group focused on a particular part of the lesson, this type of curriculum should not take long to create. The collaborative nature would promote discussion and interdisciplinary brainstorming. Ideally, the teacher group would be able to present their curriculum through leading their activity with the group.

*Summer Youth Program*

The Summer Youth Program (SYP) at the museum is a way that the museum supports local children’s groups and their teachers. In past years, former Hirst Educators involved in leadership positions for the SYP included Marcella, Bronwyn and Irene (all art teachers). In late May 2011, Kelly contacted me about her interest in being the coordinator of the summer 2011 program. Kelly was enthusiastic and passionate about the Hirst Museum’s collection and had volunteered as a docent for the SYP the previous two years. She sent me an email and said that she didn’t feel that she had enough experience to be the coordinator but had contacted Lisa about the position. Lisa had told her that she would be perfect for the job; she said the fact that Kelly was not an art specialist allowed her to focus on her knowledge of how to connect other subject areas with art. Lisa gave her the coordinator position. However, Kelly did not know this until the week before the start of the program, which did not give her much time to research, organize, plan and practice.

Kelly was both excited and nervous about the position. She said, “Lisa told me she would help and I will be calling on my resources, i.e. you, Robin and Irene to help me too!!!! Very
excited but very…nervous?” (Personal communication, June 6, 2011) I sent Kelly the transcript I had from when Lisa had led the Hirst Educators through a tour of the sculpture, *Millipede*, during the July 2010 workshop. Kelly was responsible for leading this tour for the month of June for all SYP groups.

Soon after it began, Lisa and Kelly both realized that the program would be stronger if Kelly could share leadership responsibilities with an art educator. Cynthia was brought in to help. For each tour group, Kelly led half of the group in a tour and discussion of the artwork, while Cynthia assisted the other half in an artmaking activity in the studio. The groups then switched so every child was able to talk about art and create a piece of art to take with them that complemented the discussion. When smaller groups came through, Kelly and Cynthia led groups together through the activities.

Since Kelly was a new teacher, it was important that she was given training, resources and support to develop a successful program. Lisa may not have known exactly how to prepare Kelly for success. She was used to having an art teacher in the role of SYP coordinator each summer, with the presumption that the coordinator had confidence and experience leading art discussions and activities. She could have given Kelly more time to prepare and research and clearer guidelines for her responsibilities.

Kelly and Cynthia worked well as partners; together they planned and implemented curriculum for the June sessions and July sessions. Kelly posted positive comments both on Facebook and the Hirst Educators social networking site about the SYP. Her confidence in leading conversations about art with children grew through her leadership role. She utilized the resources available to her and capitalized on the relationships she had made through Hirst
Educators. She gained much new knowledge and leadership experience during SYP from working directly with Cynthia on a regular basis.

Lisa realized that Cynthia had become a valuable resource for the museum. Cynthia was asked to lead the SYP program for 2012. Kelly had other commitments tutoring for another local school district during the summer. Since the galleries were under renovation at the time, focus of the artwork for the program was on the outdoor sculpture collection.

Upon reflection, a few issues came up. Through the description of the SYP program, the difficulty of planning and implementing integrated curriculum is shown. It also demonstrated the necessity of training another educator to be able to lead the program. Lisa didn’t seem to know how to support Kelly beyond employing Cynthia to assist. It seemed that she was not used to giving much in-depth teacher training, assuming that art teachers could lead the program on his or her own. From our workshops and Lisa’s interaction with teachers, Kelly had become accustomed to employing principles of integrated curriculum and themes when discussing artwork. Lisa supports integrated curriculum, but something seemed disconnected in this instance. Why was this an issue? It seems that there was either a lack of confidence in training a teacher of a subject other than art for the leadership position, or more simply a lack of time to devote to it. Included in the stipend for the coordinator position is typically the expectation that the curriculum for the program will be written. Perhaps it was an issue that Kelly was not as experienced in addressing art standards in lesson plans? I presume that Lisa neither felt confident with personally writing the curriculum nor could not devote time to this task, another reason why Cynthia was brought in.

I looked back at what I had learned from planning and implementing the four workshops, and started to prepare for my exit from the project. In late July 2011, I had accepted the fact that
the Hirst Educators group could not yet be called a community of practice (in the strong sense of Wenger’s concept). This was because the group so rarely met; the participants met all together only when I organized it; we had not created a clear shared vision; and, because of the physical distance between us, I could not accurately track communications between members. At first, I viewed this as a failure on my part. Now I see it as a discovery of what was involved in creating a long-term relationship between a school district and a museum. These discoveries include how long it takes to build interest, the need for a committed organizer and development of mutual understanding and the importance of a shared vision. However, I do believe that this intervention has created the beginning stages of a school-museum learning community (Learning Forward, 2012). According to Learning Forward, learning communities “require continuous improvement, promote collective responsibility, and support alignment of individual, team, school and school system goals.”

*Action Research Cycle 5*

This research cycle began in late July 2011 as I planned for the September 2011 focus group and Educators’ Night, and it continued until completion of the dissertation. It included planning, implementation, observation and reflection on the focus group and Educators’ Night; summary of a school visit reported by Lisa; observation and reflection of Addison’s museum fieldtrip with her fourth grade class; report and reflection on the Art21 museum-school partnerships and events and report of Cynthia’s leadership with the museum’s Girl Scout initiatives. In this cycle, I continued to work towards strengthening relationships between the museum and local teachers through interviews and digital communication.

As I reflected on the June 2011 workshop, I realized that I needed to plan an event for the Hirst Educators to encourage them to reflect together about the activities that had taken place
since inception of the group. I wanted to gather participant perspectives on their overall experiences in the program. Collaborating with Lisa, I began planning a focus group that took place on a weeknight evening in September 2011 at the museum.

I remembered an Educators’ Night at a museum in Washington, D. C. that I had attended many years ago. I thought it could benefit the museum and local teachers to have an Educators’ Night at the Hirst Museum. This was another kind of event that had never taken place at the museum. I asked Lisa if it might be possible to host it immediately following the September focus group for Hirst Educators. I encouraged the Hirst Educators to invite their colleagues so that they could lead their colleagues through the exhibits, as well as serve as docents for other local teachers. A general invitation for all local teachers was posted through the museum website and through emails sent out from the art and social studies curriculum specialists.

After the June workshop, I received the secondary social studies pacing guides for the 2011-2012 school year that I had requested from Jack, separated by academic quarter. I began researching Terry Evans’ photography work online to create a curriculum guide that would relate to the temporary exhibit of her work at the Hirst Museum, on view August 20 through November 27, 2011. This action connected many things I had been recalling from interviews. The Hirst Museum director had mentioned in her interview (June 9, 2011) how other museums create curriculum based on testing standards to address during a fieldtrip, but that given Lisa’s other responsibilities, it was not feasible to do this. Jack commented in his interview (June 8, 2011) about the need for digital resources that connect to standards and how it is not the teachers’ job to create museum-based curricular resources.

This highlighted a tension between museum and school priorities that arose in interviews with school and museum administrators. Who should create these resources? With Terry Evans
coming to the Hirst Museum in November 2011, it seemed like a ripe opportunity to create curriculum tied to the local social studies standards. I intended for the curriculum I wrote to serve as an example, not as a solution in itself. With encouragement and appropriate incentive and reward, the teachers could be creating the curriculum. One way to achieve this would be to have university educators assist with creation of the resources, to benefit and align with both institutions’ priorities. This may be more feasible for university museums since they already have established connections to university educators, though this was not happening at the Hirst Museum.

In July 2011, during analysis of transcripts, I realized how extensively I was acting as a liaison between the curriculum specialists and the museum educator (research journal, July 18, 2011). I recognized that I had been using thoughts elicited through interviews for relationship building between the curriculum specialist and museum educator. Jack mentioned that if museums want to be involved with schools, they might look at the curricular pacing guides to see how their programs fit. I used the pacing guides that I had received from him and developed curricular correlations between the first and second quarter pacing guides and Terry Evans’ photographs I found online, since the exhibit was on view during the first two quarters of the school year. In this case, I was lucky that the photographs included in the temporary exhibit were all grouped together on Terry Evans’ website.

The curriculum was not requested by the museum or by the social studies curriculum specialist. It was a response on my part to both institutions. It was also a reaction to Marshall; he thought that Jack and other school administrators might be more open to collaborative relationships with the museum if there were obvious ties between an exhibit and the standards. Also of note is that the subject matter of the photographs in the exhibit represented regional
concerns, which I thought might also attract local schools’ attention. The curriculum that I wrote (Appendix J) was interdisciplinary; it addressed social studies standards through art. It was based on the exhibit theme, Terry Evans: *Matfield Green Stories*. Though there were possible ties to other subject areas, the main purpose was to address the social studies standards and the broadly defined art standards.

I knew that Lisa would likely not write curriculum for two main reasons: she was too busy with other responsibilities and she may not have felt confident writing standards-based curriculum for schools. The curriculum that I wrote might serve as an example for Lisa or others at the museum, since there were no museum staff members with degrees in art education.

*Focus group and Educators’ Night: September 2011*

I planned a focus group meeting with the teacher participants who had most attended the workshops. The purpose of the meeting, which took place on Friday, September 23, 2011, immediately before the Educators’ Night open house at the museum, was to elicit feedback about attempts by the museum at building community with local teachers and providing resources. I made it clear to participants that I would be stepping away from a leadership role while still making an effort to maintain personal and professional relationships. The meeting lasted 45 minutes. The Hirst Educators attending included: Cynthia, Irene, Kelly, Addison, Bronwyn, Marcella and Lisa. Marshall was not able to participate. I did not invite district curriculum specialists to this meeting because I feared participants would not be as open about sharing.

Questions asked to the group included: 1) What were you originally expecting when you came to your first Hirst Educators workshop? 2) What motivated you to attend more than one Hirst Educators event? 3) Have interactions with this group or relationships with Hirst Educators (including Lisa) affected any lessons taught in your classroom? 4) What do you think would
attract more educators to participate in Hirst Educators events? 5) What are your thoughts about the Hirst Educators social networking site? 6) Do you think there should be future Hirst Educators events, and if so, why?

Educational applications were discussed when the teachers addressed the third question. Marcella talked about the artwork her students created related to their fieldtrip to the Art on Speed exhibit. Marcella and Addison talked about Buz Carpenter’s visits to their schools. Cynthia talked about bringing her college art appreciation and her high school students on multiple visits to the museum.

When I asked what the teachers thought would attract more educators to Hirst Educator events, the main response had to do with practical benefits for the teachers. Addison suggested that the school district should consider museum events for approved professional development options during paid inservice days. Irene recommended the events be posted on My Learning Plan for teachers to receive recertification points (they all agreed that this had helped to attract more teachers to the group). Bronwyn suggested offering graduate credits for participation.

Bronwyn asked who sees the lesson plans that are written about the exhibits and suggested that if other local educators were sent the curriculum that it could attract new group members. She asked Lisa if she creates lessons for every exhibit, to which Lisa responded, “Don’t I wish.” There didn’t seem to be an understanding from the teachers that Lisa had not been creating educational resources for them. I told the group about how I had talked to the curriculum specialists in the district (Louise and Jack) about sharing the curriculum that I created with the teachers they serve. Lisa told the teachers that she shared the curriculum with select groups on campus, such as the elementary education art methods students and Diane’s art education classes. She said, “We are attempting it (connecting curriculum to exhibits), but it is a
big hill and I think we still may be in the foothills” (personal communication, September 23, 2011).

It was interesting that Bronwyn assumed that Lisa had been creating curriculum for every exhibit. We hadn’t discussed this as a group and this was the first time it had come up. I acknowledge that it was an error on my part that I had not ever raised the question with the group. This demonstrates how Lisa’s focus is on whatever exhibit is current or coming up at the time and not thinking about long-term connections with the school district. It is not feasible for her to be thinking about concerted efforts with the school district with so many other priorities. She admitted to me that she tends to work in the moment, short-term and must be responsive to problems that arise. It is a simple solution to distribute or talk about curriculum that someone else has written for an exhibit. This is a positive action, but makes clearer that an additional person is needed to help with curricular applications of artwork at the museum. Lisa was not ready to take over this group upon my departure and it is doubtful that it was ever considered it. She never made a commitment to me that she would carry it on after I left and I never have asked that of her.

I asked the teachers for their thoughts about the Hirst Educators social networking site. Irene said that it was hard to go on another social networking site in addition to Facebook. Addison and Bronwyn said they felt guilty for not going on the Hirst Educators site more often but that they just didn’t have time for it. Bronwyn said that the site is not as familiar to use but that they are all using Facebook. I asked if they liked that the site was closed (only visible to them) or if it should be accessible to others outside the group. Kelly said that she liked the fact that it was only available to members because it was a safe space to get to know each other.
When she was student teaching, she sometimes wrote reflections about her experiences on the site, which were quite personal.

I realized that even though the teachers were talking about staying in touch over the Hirst Educators site, this was likely a sentimental response. They all said they were active on Facebook. To sustain the social networking component, I created a Hirst Educators group on Facebook (January 15, 2012). Since they said that they liked the privacy of the closed group, I kept the Facebook group as an invitation-only group. I uploaded many pictures that had been on the Hirst Educators site and told members they could use the group for whatever type of communication they wished, and to feel free to invite others into the group. Marcella posted a comment that day, thanking me for bringing the group to Facebook. There have been posts from many of the members within the Facebook group in the months since it was created, which indicates those members still have interest in the group. Typical posts include pictures of artwork they think the other group members might like or notices about events or activity in the community that might interest the others. These posts are valuable because it keeps them thinking about themselves as a group and their association with the museum.

What were the advantages and disadvantages of moving the online group platform from Ning to Facebook? I was hesitant at first to take the group to Facebook because of my assumption that it would be perceived purely as a social group. One of the main purposes of the online site was to store the resources members found and created; I did not think all of the resources could be uploaded in the same way on Facebook as possible on Ning. However, in hindsight it would have been better to move the group to Facebook much earlier, especially since some members said that the Ning format was not as familiar and they were not willing to put time into learning it. They did not end up sharing resources in the way that I had planned. I could
have emailed group members with the few PowerPoints and other documents not possible to upload to the Facebook group or created another type of digital repository for these, such as Slideshare or Google Docs, posting the link to the resources in the Facebook group.

After our discussion, I had teachers write responses to three questions. The questions and answers were:

1. **What are three things you would like to see happen (related to Hirst Educators) between spring 2012 and the end of next school year (2012 – 2013)?**
   a. Special tickets to museum events; inservice option
   b. I would like more cross-curricular activities with non-art teachers; I would like to work with new teachers as a mentor
   c. A reunion! And invite new teachers! I want us to visit the Hirst Educators site and keep in touch. I hope that happens.
   d. Another opportunity to get together as a group; more teachers getting involved
   e. I like connections with Art21, even though it doesn’t directly connect to my elementary curriculum. I need to figure out how to get my students back to the Hirst Museum. What about bringing more guest speakers to our schools?

2. **How can the Hirst Museum be relevant to you (personally and professionally) as an educator?**
   a. I’m ready to schedule a fieldtrip!
   b. I would love it if Lisa would email lesson plans related to exhibits to all (not just art) educators in the area
   c. I hope I can fit in a fieldtrip for my students. I use information and images of artwork from the Hirst [permanent] collection in many of my lessons.
   d. Personally the Hirst provides me inspiration and opportunity. Although I am not in a position currently to integrate the Hirst Museum’s resources into my curriculum, I plan to integrate as soon as possible.
   e. The Hirst is our best connection to contemporary art. The events are always fun and the social aspects are significant.

3. **How do you think you (or others) could best contribute towards making some of your ideas happen?**
   a. I will come to the events and would help lead other elementary teachers.
b. I would love to talk with pre-service art education students and other pre-service education students about lessons related to Hirst exhibits; grants and/or college credit for attendance / participation in Hirst Educators

c. By committing, keeping in touch, keeping the ownership we have of this program alive!

d. By making a real commitment and carving out the time to make it happen.

e. I could go to the Hirst Educators site monthly.

On one hand, I was pleased with their responses, but on the other hand, what lay behind their answers was unawareness and an unwillingness to take on responsibility for meeting together as a group. In their responses, they did not write that they wanted more workshops, though they had talked about it earlier. It seemed from several of the responses that they wanted individual partnerships rather than a focus on the group as a whole. Some responses imply the group, but it did not seem that they were thinking about the workshops as group activities.

The workshops were not on their mind. It seemed that they still expected either Lisa or me to continue with them. I made clear at the very first workshop when consent forms were explained that the workshops were part of the research, and it was uncertain if they would continue after data was collected. Maybe they had forgotten about that. In retrospect, I should have talked about what would happen when I would leave at the end of the earlier workshops. I did not raise the issues soon enough for them to think about it. Conversations occurred with individuals, but the continuation of workshops wasn’t a formalized group conversation until the June 2011 workshop. The teachers were somehow presupposing that the workshops would continue and the work would be done for them. They did not seem to be able to commit to much leadership with planning future events for the group or have consistent thoughts about what they would like in a future event. The responses suggested that the group had not completely gelled and needed a dedicated coordinator to thrive.
I felt disappointed that there was no shared vision or emergent leadership from within the group. This meant that the group had not yet become a community of practice. When would have been the right time to discuss the vision of the group with them? How does a facilitator know when the conditions are right for this? The teachers came to the workshops to learn what the museum had to offer. A few seemed more interested in socializing with other teachers and supporting one another in a professional development type atmosphere. They had not developed a shared vision for the group.

An idea that affected my future actions was Bronwyn’s suggestion that more teachers might participate if they could receive graduate credit. This comment validated earlier thoughts that higher education could be called upon to play a role in organizing and leading (or co-leading) teacher workshops, particularly at academic museums (research journal, January 16, 2012). Looking back, it seems a problem that these relationships between the museum and faculty were not already in place since the Hirst Museum is affiliated with Diller University. However, for in-service teachers to benefit, there would need to be an option for graduate credit and there is no graduate level art education program at Diller University, but there is a M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction program. Broadly speaking, a university art museum could partner with the university’s graduate education program to offer course credits to local teachers. This could forge new partnerships or strengthen existing ones between the education professors at the university and the museum educator and staff.

Immediately following the focus group, the Educators’ Night open house took place. It ran from 5:30 – 7:00 p.m. and was an opportunity for the Hirst Educators to lead other teachers through the exhibits and to talk to them about the benefits of using museum resources in their curriculum. It was a chance for them to serve as ambassadors of the museum and to share their
Hirst Educators experiences with local teachers who were not familiar with the group. It was also a time for the Hirst Educators to talk about the work in the new exhibit.

There were between 10 – 15 local educators that came to the Educators’ Night, all of whom had some connection to one of the Hirst Educators or had received information from Louise. There were a few pre-service art education students from Diller University, since Diane had encouraged her students to come. The teachers were given a folder of resources, including a hard copy of the curriculum that I wrote for the Terry Evans: *Matfield Green Stories* exhibit and materials about upcoming programming.

I thought that the Educators’ Night open house was not overly successful, mainly due to low attendance. On a positive note, there was intermingling between Lisa, Hirst Educators, outside teachers and pre-service art education students. The curriculum for the exhibit was digitally sent to both Jack and Louise and distributed by them to the local secondary social studies teachers and art teachers. Along with the curriculum, information was sent inviting local teachers to the Educators’ Night open house; I had hoped that this might have piqued their interest about the exhibit, but it did not. Jack and Louise commented that it is unclear how many teachers actually even open forwarded emails from the curriculum specialists. Since there were no professional development points attached to attendance, there might not have been enough incentive to attract teachers to come.

I attempted to obtain professional development points for the Hirst Educators that participated in the focus group and led other teachers during the Educators’ Night. I had sent an email to Louise with description of what the event entailed, how the teachers were showing leadership and building connections between the museum and schools. I did not hear back from her about the request. In the focus group, I told teachers to let their district curriculum specialists
know if they thought the Hirst Educators workshops and events were worthwhile to them, since it would have different meaning coming from them rather than the museum. I saw Louise at the Hirst Museum for an event on September 27, 2011 and asked her about the possibility of obtaining points for the teachers. Louise said that the teachers don’t understand that if they go to all of the required district inservices that they will have more than enough points, which relayed to me that she had decided not to give them points. Lisa seemed frustrated when I told her this.

Lisa: To me it says that the district may be thinking, ‘look how much we are helping you guys, because we are providing you the opportunity to earn everything you need. You don’t even need to go out and discover anything for yourself.’ Where the teachers may be saying, ‘maybe we would like to have the ability to determine some of our own professional development choices. And doing something that is actually of value to us, that we feel like we have a stake in’” (personal communication, October 9, 2011).

After checking with Addison months later about this, it was evident that the teachers did not receive points for their participation. This demonstrated a lack of support by the school district for the Hirst Educator group, after all.

On the other hand, Lisa’s comments show that she was coming to a better understanding of the local school system. The comments reflect what the Hirst Educators had communicated to her about not being able to attend outside professional development (non district-mandated) during paid inservice time and the district’s reward system. She was coming to an understanding of school district priorities and the pressures put on teachers by the district through relationships with Hirst Educators.

Lisa claimed to have a revelation when she reflected on my question about her overall perception of the significance of building relationships between the museum and local teachers:

Lisa: By having a different relationship with the teachers—less of ‘I’m here to provide a service for you and your students—come take advantage of it’—by communicating with them and being one of their peers—by changing that hierarchy, they may feel more of a commitment and more connected, and like they have the ability to take advantage of resources. It is a real shift in thinking for me, and I never would have gotten from point A
to point B in that shift without having had the journey. Someone could have told me all of it, but I probably wouldn’t have gotten it (personal communication, October 9, 2011).

Lisa said that her perspective was changing. She realized that there had been a sort of hierarchy in place before that she had not given attention to and was starting to see that relationships with teachers could benefit her. How would this new perspective alter her interactions with teachers in the future? How would it change her interactions with the school district? It seemed like she was talking about relationships with individual teachers rather than the school district, but it was positive nonetheless. It was not clear to me if she had new vision of how to relate to the district.

*Addison’s Fieldtrip: November 2011*

During my research trip in September 2011, I visited Addison at her school, where I met with her and the other fourth grade teacher. She had been talking about wanting to take her fourth grade students to the Hirst Museum for several months. I spoke about the process of planning a fieldtrip to the Hirst Museum and the bus reimbursement program that the museum offers. I focused on cross-curricular connections with the Terry Evans photography exhibit and provided a copy of the curriculum written for the exhibit. The other fourth grade teacher seemed hesitant about committing to a fieldtrip, but on Thursday, November 17, 2011, Addison took her class to the museum. I was able to follow along and observe. The class spent a little over two hours on campus, split between time inside the museum galleries and outside on campus, walking around to visit the sculpture collection. Addison led the group around to eight sculptures on campus prior to entering the museum. The sculptures that she chose to discuss with her students were ones discussed during Hirst Educator events, including *Accord Final* (Figure 15). She used her research notes from the Hirst Educators’ discussions in the summer and fall of 2010 and the manipulative word card resource provided at the June 2011 workshop.
Students seemed to have been prepared for the museum visit and engaged with the work through discussion with Lisa and her education intern. Questions were asked to assist students with making connections between the images and other subject areas. In the gallery, Lisa had students play a game that she called verbal hot potato, while looking at three large-scale Larry Schwarm photographs. She chose three student volunteers to participate and instructed them to keep their eyes on the photographs and in turn call out a descriptive word related to the images. They could not repeat something that had already been said. The rest of the class was to pay close attention to make sure they didn’t repeat anything and to help Lisa keep time, since they only had three seconds to articulate a new descriptive word. The last one standing was the winner. Lisa successfully got students involved in analyzing the images in a way that was enjoyable and interactive in the gallery space—a new teaching strategy for Addison.

At the conclusion of the gallery tour, Lisa led an activity outside with the nearby Tom Otterness sculpture, *Millipede*. Since Addison had already introduced this sculpture to the students, Lisa did not spend much time talking about the background of the piece. Instead, she drew their attention to all the legs on the millipede and how those legs (on an actual millipede) would have to work together in order to move. She placed a student group on each side of the
sculpture and challenged each group to work together to systematically race to a designated place, in competition with the other group (Figure 16). Students were engaged in an activity that allowed them to collaborate toward embodied experience of the artwork. This reminded me of the performative pedagogy that we had discussed in the July 2010 workshop.

![Figure 16. Students working together as if they were a millipede, like the sculpture](image)

After the September 2011 Educators Night, Addison took her class on a fieldtrip to see the Terry Evans exhibit and tour the outdoor sculpture collection. After the fieldtrip, I asked her how she prepared for the sculpture tour.

Addison: Well, I was with this wonderful group over the summer—the last two summers—and for some reason, everything just came right to me, exactly what I wanted to say about each sculpture. I had a memory of where I was going to start, and once I went to each sculpture, I would talk to them about the elements. I brought along my envelopes (word cards) to ask them questions to help them think and respond. We have been working on the concept of comparing and contrasting. Usually we use a Venn diagram to compare and contrast, but students may not pay attention to what compare and contrast means. Every time we would go up to a sculpture, I would pull out the cards and I would ask them to apply a given word when we looked at a sculpture. ‘I’d like you to let me know if that is a comparison statement or if that is a contrasting statement.’ And they were just right on it! They had thumbs up, thumbs down. They knew it! So [the museum] is another place you can take students to use their new knowledge (personal communication, November 17, 2011).
Addison was able to apply what she had practiced during the Hirst Educators workshops; she appeared confident when leading her students in discussion and seemed proud that her students were able to use concepts learned in the classroom at the museum.

*Art21 Preview Screenings at Local High Schools: April 2012*

In August 2011, Lisa invited art teachers from three local high schools to the museum to discuss hosting a preview screening of the sixth season of Art21 in April 2012. Lisa wanted to lure in a new audience for the programming. The museum has been hosting Art21 screenings for each of the six seasons and has hosted several Art21-affiliated artists at the museum through their Buzz-worthy Art Talk series. They always make it known if their guest artist speakers have been recognized as an “Art21 artist.” Since 2008, these artists have included: Mel Chin, Mark Dion, Trenton Doyle Hancock, Alfredo Jaar, and Kerry James Marshall. Also included in the museum’s permanent collection are artworks by Art21-affiliated artists: Mark Bradford, Trenton Doyle Hancock, Hubbard/Birchler, Kerry James Marshall, Ursula von Rydingsvard, and Kara Walker. Many of these artworks tie in with the museum’s collection priority to add to the collection work from African-American artists.

Bronwyn and Cynthia attended the August meeting with one of Cynthia’s colleagues and a teacher from the third school. Each participating high school was invited to host a preview screening of Art21 and an art exhibit on the same dates (four consecutive Tuesdays in April). The exhibitions consisted of new student work inspired by the student artists’ favorite theme or artist from Art21. “Like a themed exhibition, it should tell a story. It should have layers. It should be reflective of that school and those artists” (Lisa, personal communication, March 12, 2012). The schools were invited to attend each other’s art shows and preview all screenings. The museum also sponsored Art21 artist Trenton Doyle Hancock to speak at one of the schools and
provided bus transportation for students from participating schools to attend it. The Diller
University community was invited to attend and some of the art professors offered extra credit to
their students for attending. Community events are open to the public and have been advertised
in the Hirst Museum newsletters, on their website, and through public marketing described
below.

Lisa proposed a standardized approach to the preview parties and exhibits at the
individual schools. She noted that standardizing procedure is her typical approach method, but
that the teachers involved seemed most excited about having flexibility to decide how they
wanted to approach the events at their respective schools. By working more closely with teachers
on this project (and others since July 2010), Lisa may realize that customizing with schools is
key for optimal learning to take place (and for strengthening relationships and building trust).
She is used to standardizing programming and tours, mainly for practical time constraints, which
does not optimize learning possibilities. Museum educators may not have had training (or
experiences) to understand strategies for differentiation and these methods may be different for
schools and museums. However, if Lisa is focused on building relationships with the district as a
whole and not individual schools, finding time to customize tours would seem impossible for
her.

Louise was not involved in the planning process of the Art21 events at the schools. Lisa
did not make an effort to include her in the conversations. Perhaps this is because she thought
Louise might advise against her ideas or suggest ideas that were beyond Lisa’s vision for the
project. Louise might have suggested different schools to consider for the events. Or, Louise
might have supported the program fully and it could have strengthened the relationship between
the school district and the museum if they had planned the partnerships together.
The involved teachers decided that each exhibition would consist of 30-40 works of student art. They decided this number should be consistent at all schools and talked about including as many students as possible in various ways. For example, one said that graphic design students could create promotional posters and labels for the work while others could assist in roles such as hospitality.

In an effort to continue the conversations during the planning process, Lisa suggested that the art teacher representatives come to the museum for meetings on a monthly basis. One teacher questioned the need to meet so often and proposed keeping in touch over email, which seemed to appeal to everyone. Lisa planned one meeting with the participants at the museum in December 2011 to catch up on everyone’s progress and to share some good news.

The Diller University Foundation, in conjunction with the Hirst Museum, received a $20,200 grant to support the Art21 community project from a local health organization. The organization wanted to demonstrate that health is defined beyond physical health. “It shows that they are a broad-minded, community-motivated group” (Lisa, personal communication, December 16, 2011). The grant funded expenses related to Trenton Doyle Hancock’s visit, an intern to assist Lisa with logistics, marketing through the local PBS television station, NPR radio station, and the printing and mailing of postcards and fliers. The museum printed postcards for the schools to send out to their communities. There was an honorarium for a videographer to document the program (a student at Diller University), as well as one for the three community artists asked to judge the student exhibits. For each school, a Best of Show was awarded, and the student winner received a $75 gift certificate to a local art supply store. At the final preview party, held at the museum, an award was presented for the best school exhibition; the award was a $250 pizza party for that school’s art department.
In addition to the $20,200 grant, the museum received (along with the local PBS television station) an Art21 mini-grant. It covered some marketing costs for promoting the Art21 events at the high schools and the museum. The Diller University student videographer visited each of the participating schools multiple times, interviewing students and teachers, and documenting artmaking and the process of the exhibits coming together. This short video was shown at the final preview at the museum, where students, families and community members representative of all schools were in attendance. Lisa hopes to share the video with Art21, demonstrating the dynamic way in which the Hirst Museum is collaborating with local schools using Art21 programming.

Lisa: Our attendance for Art21 had dwindled to 30-60 people, so we are going to easily have way more than that with this program taking place in the schools. And the number one thing that I hear from the students that they are most excited about is the chance that people from the community and other artists might see their artwork (personal communication, March 12, 2012).

This project has enabled Lisa to remain in communication with a group of art teachers over the 2011-2012 school year. It has also allowed her to get into the local high schools on a fairly regular basis for planning purposes. She has been able to interact with individual teachers in the art departments at these schools and to see the different ways in which each art department operates. Her visibility has increased in the local schools; she knows more teachers and more teachers know her. This project required meetings at both the schools and the museum, promoting an understanding of one another’s settings. Teachers saw how the local museum can be of service to them, while Lisa saw how teachers can be of service to her programming goals.

The audience at the preview parties hosted at the high schools was expected to vary from the audience typically attracted to Art21 screenings. Lisa explored ways to appeal to the high school students, their parents, and the school communities, in addition to the greater public. She
met with an art history professor on campus to seek advice on strategies more suitable for the schools, while maintaining the integrity of the Art21 programming. The professor suggested that it would benefit Lisa to preview the student exhibits, articulating connections between artists to be featured in the Art21 screening and the way particular student artists projected similar themes in their work. Lisa seems to have become more committed to figuring out how her role as a museum educator can be woven into educational opportunities at the schools.

A response that Lisa gave prior to the Art21 school events seemingly demonstrated a new understanding of planning ahead and the importance of relationships with school (but not district) administrators. I asked her how she had interacted with the school administrators when in the high school buildings planning for the events.

Lisa: I get the feeling that the administration at all of the participating schools are very supportive [of the Art21 collaborative project]. Looking back, I wish I would have started all of this earlier. I wish I would have started the school visits back in the fall, and seeing how well things went with [one of the participating high school’s] administration, I wish I would have set up meetings with all of the administrators because I think they may have dedicated more effort and time even that what they are already giving (personal communication, March 12, 2012).

As demonstrated through this collaboration, partnerships between museums and schools may be more effective if planned far in advance, to allow time for logistics and communication about goals. Multiple meetings in advance of the event may help create shared vision between the educators at the different institutions. And, ideally, meetings would alternate between sites to accommodate participants.

In addition, Lisa claimed that Louise, the art curriculum specialist in the district, was excited when she heard about the collaboration. From Lisa’s understanding at that time, central administration in the district was working on connecting with a local television station to focus public service announcements on fine arts in the community. She said that the Art21 museum-
schools partnership had been mentioned as a possible feature. It seems that it would have been good to involve the district in the planning of the project from the beginning stages. Then perhaps other subject areas could have been encouraged to take advantage of the Art21 curriculum. Specifically, Jack might have promoted the online curriculum provided by Art21 to the social studies teachers he serves. Involvement of the district curriculum specialists might have assisted with promoting learning objectives of the program throughout the school district.

Though this was a successful partnership between the selected schools and the museum, opportunities to connect to the school district and integrate into other subject areas through Art21 were missed. It was unclear if Lisa was interested in the learning standards the teachers were able to address through the Art21 project. It was also doubtful that she or any of the involved schools thought of addressing standards from subjects other than art through the theme-based content. Her focus was on specific art teachers at the selected schools for creation of the art exhibits but learning could have been extended through application in other subject areas.

Lisa gained experience through her dedication to the Art21 museum-school partnerships. Interestingly, it seems that the grant might have helped to outline the project and set goals in writing, serving as a sort of planning document. Lisa found that it takes additional effort to be learner-centered and it is more collaborative in nature, but that customizing for particular audiences (to some degree) is necessary. Just as she thinks it important for teachers to visit the museum prior to bringing their classes, it is equally important for her to visit the schools and for the teachers to be familiar with the Art21 episodes shown at their schools prior to the public screening.

*Girl Scout Programming through the Museum*
Cynthia had embraced opportunities to use Hirst Museum resources since January 2011 and impressed Lisa with her initiative and competency. In November 2011, Lisa mentioned to me that she wanted Cynthia to lead their Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts programming.

Lisa: I want [Cynthia] heading up the Boy Scout / Girl Scout program, and to take the program to the next level. She has been trying to get meetings with the Boy Scout council so that we can try to figure out how we get our foot in the door, and get them coming on a regular basis. As I told her, I said, you don’t have to do this, but ideally my vision for you is that there are at least two to three educational sessions a month, almost every month (personal communication, November 19, 2011).

Lisa had been creating programming sponsored by the museum for Girl Scouts for eight years. This seems to be one of Lisa’s priorities, since she has been working on it prior to Constance becoming director of the museum. Though she is invested in the program, with her multi-faceted responsibilities, she recognized that she needed to delegate leadership of some of her programs. She involved Cynthia in hopes that she will become the Girl Scout coordinator for the museum, taking over all scouting initiatives. When I asked Lisa why she asked Cynthia to take on this role, she said it was because she trusted her and knew that she would do a good job. This role involves communicating with local Girl Scout and Boy Scout troupes and determining what events or opportunities to offer through the museum, coordinating curriculum and teaching those programs. Cynthia had organized the museum’s participation in the Festival of Giving event in December 2011.

Cynthia was the lead coordinator for the museum’s role in the Girl Scout statewide Centennial Celebration on April 28, 2012, which took place in a small town two hours away. The Hirst Museum was the anchor for the arts part of the festival. Cynthia led an artmaking activity that took place around the art center in the town. She obtained materials for the artmaking activity, arranged for volunteers (including some of her high school students), and coordinated food for the volunteers. Roughly 1,000 people attended the event from around the state. This
was a partnership between the Hirst Museum, the art center in the community and Girl Scouts across the state.

It is curious why a special interest group like the Girl Scouts would be more of a priority to Lisa than strengthening relationships with the local school district. Though the Girl Scout programming brings in hundreds of children to the museum a year, it is not nearly the numbers that school groups bring to the museum. Perhaps the Girl Scouts are less intimidating to Lisa than the schools; the priorities of the Girl Scouts are something that she is familiar with. She has worked with the Girl Scouts for many years and has had many successes, which has built her confidence with the programming. Though the Girl Scouts programming is educational, it is less formal than school requirements.

Lisa and Cynthia first met at the January 2011 Hirst Educators workshop. Since then many collaborations have taken place between the two, at the museum and at Cynthia’s school. Cynthia has become a trusted colleague to Lisa. It is likely that Lisa will continue to seek her assistance in various ways, especially when working with audiences that Cynthia knows well: PK-12 students, college students and teachers.

Throughout this cycle, I noticed a pattern of Lisa allocating special perks to teachers and schools that she knew over ones she didn’t know. Lisa awarded particular teachers and schools that demonstrated loyalty to the museum with events like guest speakers at the school. This was the case with the Buz Carpenter school visits. Another example is when Lisa took a member of a historical performing touring troupe to a local middle school in November 2011 for a large-group performance sponsored by the museum. This school had taken their students for museum fieldtrips for several years, and within the past year student behavior on the fieldtrips had greatly improved. Though there was not a particular teacher contact at the school, loyalty and improved
behavior shown also gained favor. Lisa said, “I wanted them to feel as though this was a benefit—this was a perk to good behavior.” This is also true of the Art21 project. When I asked how she selected the high schools and teachers to participate, Lisa said, “I thought about teachers that I knew and liked, that I knew I could work with, that I knew were excited and would take the bull by the horns and just go with it” (personal communication, November 19, 2011). This was also the case with SYP and asking Cynthia to take over Girl Scout initiatives.

These examples show effort on Lisa’s part to build relationships with the teachers that she had seen multiple times at the museum and considered to have a sincere interest in utilizing museum resources. It was a less risky approach by Lisa and involved fewer schools from the district, yet it was building sustained interactions over time. I do not think that these actions prevented other teachers from participating.

Though I am not leading more workshops, I cannot stop thinking about artwork in the collection that could be the focus of future teacher workshops (research journal, March 7, 2012). Two bodies of work that could easily have relevance would be the Gordon Parks collection at Diller University (including works in the Hirst Museum collection) and works in the Hirst Museum’s collection by Art21 artists. Cross-curricular resources created for these works could be developed over time and become part of the museum’s educational resources to share with the greater public. Curriculum would be crossing disciplinary borders and the implementation would be crossing institutional borders. I discussed these ideas with Lisa and she agreed. She has already been working on a program with an English professor at Diller University. As part of the program, all English 101 students visit the museum and write about Gordon Parks’ photographs from the collection. I see great potential for this program to be modified for use with the local schools.
Summary

This chapter gave an account of the eight main participants in the study and the events that took place over the course of the research. The choice to present the events in sequence of occurrence demonstrates how reflection, shared experiences and sustained interactions led to new collaborations between members. Description of planning, implementation, observation and reflection of events pointed to tensions that exist between the institutions of museums and schools. In this data, the following five themes emerged, which will be discussed in Chapter 5: 1) creating a shared vision; 2) museum and school priorities; 3) administrative support; 4) border crossing; 5) curriculum development.
CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS OF EMERGENT THEMES

Introduction

In this chapter, I analyze five main themes that emerged through the study. The themes were: 1) creating a shared vision; 2) museum and school priorities; 3) administrative support; 4) border crossing; 5) curriculum development. I orient my analysis to the initial research questions: 1) What are the difficulties involved in, and the conditions necessary for, forming a community of practice among a group of teachers and a museum educator? 2) What are the challenges of keeping this group connected? 3) What are the educational benefits for the group members? 4) How does the group change over time?

Creating a Shared Vision

To be identified as a community of practice, the importance of a shared vision within the group is critical (Wenger et al., 2002). Group members will undoubtedly have differing motivations and levels of participation, but the long-term goals of the group need to be agreed upon. These goals can grow and change with the group, but a shared vision must emerge from within the group. This is a difficulty that I encountered which affected the subsequent themes that emerged through the data. A shared vision is something I could not impose as the facilitator. I could suggest goals and ways to go about reaching them, but without buy in from the members, there was not a shared vision. For example, lack of a shared vision is why the Hirst Educators social networking site did not work and why my goal of creating curriculum for long-term use did not work. I expected a shared vision to grow from within, but this was not possible to the extent that I wanted during the time of the study.

There were two areas of emphasis for coming to a shared vision within the group. The first was the teachers’ personal development—learning about what happens at the museum and
about the artwork. This area was highly successful; there were no real issues that stood in the way of coming to a shared vision for personal development. The second was professional development—using the material with students and accumulating resources for classroom use. It was not dependent on the group, but dependent on the individual relationships with Lisa. The group as a whole did not profit from the individual partnerships.

The initial step taken to form the group and to create a shared vision was to name it. A name is the first step in creating identity and it creates a symbolic relationship between the named and characteristics associated with the name (Scheidt, 2005). “Hirst Educators” was included in all promotions and activities related to group events.

Wenger et al. (2002) asserted that working toward a shared vision for a community can allow group members to build trust and relationships. To strengthen relationships between museum educators and teachers, it is important to understand each other’s working environments (Bode, 2010). Over the time of this study, the teachers and museum educator learned more about the job responsibilities of one another in their specific work environments. Through sustained interactions and shared interest in utilizing museum resources in teaching, individual participants expressed that trust had been established.

Burchenal and Grohe (2008) stated that advances in the role of art museums in PK-12 education are made through ongoing contact with students and teachers, not through single visits or one-time teacher workshops. This implies that building relationships between museum staff and teachers over time and through multiple interactions might advance the role of art museums in PK-12 education, which makes it easier to move towards a shared vision. And relationships that develop between teachers at museum workshops and events may build support between teachers within school buildings and within a school system. In addition, positive relationships
between a museum educator and local curriculum specialists may open the door to create a shared vision between the museum and school district and provide a link for museum educators to access and communicate with local teachers.

In this section, I will discuss ways that I attempted to create shared vision with the group. Other aspects of moving towards shared vision during the study are discussed through an analysis of leadership within the group and establishing expectations. Finally, there is a summary of Lisa’s growth through the study. Advances and challenges that remain are noted.

**Creating Shared Vision for the Group**

Patterns observed of ways that we attempted to reach shared vision for the group included: 1) cross-curricular applications and local connections to art; 2) Hirst Educators social networking site; 3) involving additional museum staff; 4) emphasis on reflection; 5) discussion of long-term vision of the group.

**Cross-curricular applications and local connections to art.** It seemed from the beginning that Lisa and the teachers agreed to approach discussions of art at the workshops from an integrated curriculum perspective. This was one of the factors that brought the group together, since the workshop was advertised to attract teachers of different subject areas to come together to discuss art. Teachers agreed that they wanted to discuss cross-curricular implications of the individual sculptures for the sculpture tour they led in September 2010, but thought that associating one theme with all sculptures on the tour might be too limiting. The teachers felt it was beneficial to them to hear ideas and perspectives from their peers who taught different subjects and had students of differing age levels. Over time it became evident that local connections to the art, such as focusing on work in the permanent collection created by artists in the state or with themes or natural resources abundant in the local area, could create shared
vision for the group. The local community is a topic commonly suggested for integrated study (Parsons, 2004). In particular, the theme underlying the June workshop, “Explorations of where we live,” could provide inquiry that would continue to bring the group together.

This became evident to me through discussions with teachers and a curriculum specialist throughout the workshops. For example, at the September 2010 workshop teachers thought of many ways to explore local connections and address standards through discussion of Andy Goldsworthy’s site-specific sculpture, made from local stone. On the June 2011 workshop evaluations, several teachers commented that they would be talking about local artists from the region and state with their students after content was introduced at the workshop. They liked learning about Outsider artists from the state and hearing from artists in the community. Addison, an elementary teacher, found many ways she could address fourth grade standards through local connections related to discussion of artwork. The same was true for Marcella, an elementary art teacher excited about incorporating some of the state-based resources she received from Lucy at the June workshop. The social studies curriculum specialist appreciated the theme at the June workshop and the multi-disciplinary resources that were introduced. Further, he distributed the curriculum I created for Terry Evan’s exhibit in the fall of 2011 to his teachers, which was about the local area and could address social studies content standards. This theme seemed to spark interest by teachers and curriculum specialists as a more practical for integrating into classroom use.

After the workshops, I realized that the larger theme of “Explorations of where we live” could be applied to potential curriculum based on Art21 and Gordon Parks’ work, two bodies of work in the museum’s permanent collection discussed in more detail later. The themes presented in the first six seasons of Art21 could be discussed in terms of local issues, which could be
expanded in programming for Season 7 and provide a framework for creating curriculum for artwork in the permanent collection by Art21-affiliated artists. It could also be discussed through themes presented in Gordon Parks’ photographs: racism, intolerance and poverty.

*Hirst Educator social networking site.* I thought it was important to have a Ning site called Hirst Educators to start forming the identity of the group. I repeatedly tried to get the site to catch on with the group and create shared vision, but outside of activities during the workshop utilizing the site, they did not seem interested. I had hoped that the group members would use the site to plan future educational events and curriculum, as well as collaborate on group decisions.

The main teachers did not use the site very often but they did not want it to be discontinued. They expressed wanting the online group to remain closed: a space where they could communicate safely with one another privately. I adjusted to the desires of the group and moved it to Facebook, which I should have done long before January 2012. If the group grows, new members need to be invited to join, so that it does not seem an exclusive group, a potential disorder of communities of practice (Wenger et al., 2002). The fact that group members continue to post to one another in the Facebook group shows it is promising; it keeps them thinking about themselves as a group and their association with the museum, but ultimately, it was a failed attempt to create shared vision during the study.

*Involving additional museum staff.* Moisan (2009) recognized that a project cannot succeed if only one staff member at the museum is dedicated to it. Participation from a range of staff members is key. This is true with the Hirst Educators. The group will not survive if it is given to Lisa and expectations are that she will carry it on, especially given all of her other job responsibilities. If it is a priority for the museum (especially with such a small staff), other staff members need to demonstrate that the teacher group is a priority. I involved as many staff
members as possible in activities. The curator spoke to the group on two formal occasions; the public relations coordinator spoke to the group formally and interacted on many informal occasions; the special events coordinator attended and participated in many of the activities; the education intern was active on many levels with the group; and of course, the museum educator was key in all stages of its development.

The curator’s presentations helped me realize how much job responsibilities overlap in a small museum and how communication and shared vision is key to effective operations. From the very first workshop, I made a point to involve as many museum staff as possible in activities with the teachers. Involving museum staff creates support for one another’s initiatives. If other museum staff begin to understand the dynamics of the museum-teacher group, they will know how to better tailor their conversations with the group.

Creating shared vision involves museum staff becoming supportive of the program and making it a museum priority, but before that can happen the museum educator has to advocate it as a priority. Once support has been gained, the museum can help market it as it typically does for other programming. Requests for advertising and promoting the workshops through the museum were coming from me, which may not have indicated to the other museum staff that Lisa was fully on board.

*Emphasis on reflection.* I incorporated reflection and debriefing after group interactions, an important step in professional growth and understanding (Schön, 1987). This included reflection after looking at art together, after activities, after workshops at the restaurant outings. I reflected through dialogue with participants in multiple interviews. Workshop evaluations helped us keep adapting and moving toward shared vision. For example, in January 2011 the teachers indicated that the three-hour time frame was too short. We took advice from teachers to make the
June workshop longer and scheduled it on a Friday, which we thought would work for all schedules. The participant logs were intended to elicit written reflections about how to become more focused on the group, through addressing questions about content knowledge, instructional strategies, collaboration, building community (Appendix D). Ideas and perspectives discussed through reflections (verbal and written) informed my future actions. Post-workshop reflections helped us evaluate what was working at the workshops and what was not. On the participant log form, there was a section about building community, which I originally intended as building community within the teacher group, but intentionally left it more open to interpretation by the teachers. Perhaps I should have been more specific that I hoped for them to reflect on how activities during the workshops could build community among the group members. They seemed to mainly discuss ways the activity could build community in the classroom or between teachers at their schools.

Reflection is essential for developing successful co-teaching relationships (Brody, 1994). There were several incidents of co-teaching within workshops. It is clear now that I should have done more to facilitate reflection after instances of co-teaching. Some of the most notable co-teaching took place between Irene and Cynthia at the June workshop (their presentation on Outsider art that they later presented at a state conference); Kelly and Cynthia during the 2011 SYP; Lisa and me at various points; and on a smaller level, Marshall and Lisa, as they presented background context at the January workshop. Articulation of reflections from co-teachers throughout the study could have provided insight into what they learned from one another as they taught together and if their personal and professional relationships strengthened through the experience(s). There could have also been reflections from members of how they learned from each other and from the group that could have informed working towards a shared vision.
Discussion of long-term vision of the group. Marshall seemed to be the only teacher that was thinking about long-term vision of the group. This was evident from his quote in January 2011 about what would happen to the group in the future and indicated that there were no clearly defined long-term goals. Marshall was starting to question the direction and vision of the group at this point. It had been six months since the formation of the group and it seemed difficult to identify long-term goals with the group as a whole.

At the July 2010 and September 2010 workshops we discussed that as a group the teachers thought it was important to develop the sculpture tour for other local teachers but we did not discuss long-term vision beyond that for the group. When striving toward strengthening relationships, it is important that museum educators and teachers do not form assumptions about the roles and responsibilities of one another (Tran, 2006). These assumptions could easily carry over into a professional development setting. As the facilitator, I could not assume that they would all continue dedicating time to the group, especially since at that point there were no professional development points offered for their participation and Lisa’s role in the group was unclear. It was an awkward position to be in as the facilitator wanting to discuss long-term vision. I could not force it. At the end of the September 2010 workshop (in discussion and written evaluations) and through interviews with individual participants, we decided to continue with more workshops. Lisa knew that she wanted the January workshop to be focused on her temporary programming, but we did not have vision beyond that.

There were individual partnerships forming, but the group only communicated with one another at events I planned for them. There was no clear sense of goals for the group as a whole, so it was easier for individual members to form short-term partnerships with Lisa. I started to realize here (with Marshall’s help) just how much I wanted to build a more institutional
relationship between the museum and school district, one that would be more permanent and long-term. It was not clear that the teachers or the museum were interested in long-term group development over establishing individual partnerships.

Verbal and written responses from the focus group indicated a lack of shared vision for the future of the group. They were unaware and unwilling to take responsibility for meeting together as a group and did not mention that they wanted more workshops. They said they would attend events if they were planned and would make efforts to stay in touch. As mentioned in my reflection of the September 2011 focus group in Chapter 4, I felt disappointed that there was no emergent leadership from the group. There was no one ready to take over my facilitator role in the group upon my departure. We were not able to come to long-term shared vision for the group.

Leadership

Leadership was encouraged of teachers within the Hirst Educators. Since direction of the group depended on its members, it was important for them to take on leadership roles, so that leadership was shared. I took on a distributed leadership perspective (Spillane, 2006; Spillane & Diamond, 2007), one that carefully looks at leadership practice in a group, taking shape through interactions of people. While this perspective has mainly been conceived and tested on school leadership, it seems appropriate for a museum-school teacher group. Critical to this perspective is how the leadership is distributed between the leaders, followers and their situation; it has to be understood together in context (Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001). Interdependencies are important, as the followers co-produce leadership.

To gain insight on leadership practice, knowledge, expertise and skills that leaders bring need to be understood (Spillane et al., 2001). It took some time to determine individual strengths
of the teachers in the group and ways that they could best contribute, but I invited co-leadership from all group members from the very beginning of the study. On the first day of the July 2010 workshop, the teachers agreed to lead their peers in discussions about artwork and Lisa was invited as a co-leader at the beginning of our discussions of vision for the group. Ways that teachers served in leadership roles with the museum following the September 2010 workshop included:

- Marcella and Addison both coordinated at their school and with Lisa to host the museum-sponsored speaker at their schools in November 2010. They also each led fieldtrip groups from their elementary schools to the museum (Marcella: October and November, 2010; Addison: November 2011).
- Marshall spoke to the group about historical context behind the 1994 Rwandan genocide in preparation to view the Alfredo Jaar exhibit at the January 2011 workshop.
- Kelly and Cynthia co-led the Summer Youth Program in June and July 2011. Cynthia led the program in 2012.
- Irene, Cynthia and Bronwyn researched and presented about local Outsider artists at the June 2011 workshop.
- Bronwyn and Cynthia were leaders at their high schools in planning the Art21 preview parties and student artwork exhibits in April 2012.
- Cynthia took on leadership of the museum’s Girl Scout initiatives.

After the June 2011 Hirst Educators workshop, Marcella spoke about how valuable it was to her that Irene, Cynthia and Bronwyn had put together a presentation for the other teachers. In a group such as the Hirst Educators, members share the best of what they already know (Schmoker, 2006). They presented during the workshop and later shared the PowerPoint files through the Hirst Educators site. Marcella told me, “I think that is a way of [the museum] supporting teachers, and valuing their opinion and valuing how they are going to use it [resources] in the classroom” (personal communication, June 13, 2011). In addition to the museum educator and other guest presenters the museum brings in, Marcella stated is that it is significant that teacher leaders are discussing their work and research during museum workshops.
My efforts to establish a distributed leadership perspective within the group worked fairly well within the context of the workshops but when it came time to look for future leadership of the group, there was not shared vision. What could I have done to more effectively communicate that the group would not continue if members were not willing to take on more leadership after my departure? In the context of the workshops, members were not willing to take on the leadership role of the facilitator. They were willing to co-lead smaller parts within the workshops and seemed empowered by those roles, but did not want ultimate responsibility for the group’s activities. Individual members were interested in leadership roles for personal or school partnerships with the museum, but not for the educator group. Without this commitment, it seemed unlikely for the educator group to continue, but promising that new museum-school partnerships would develop.

In this study, I found that a coordinator or facilitator is necessary for the group’s success and that this needs to be a long-term commitment in order to be effective. The coordinator needs a significant amount of time to devote, as a volunteer or as part of one’s job responsibilities. The coordinator should be able to refocus members to goals of the group or assist with individual partnerships, and use reflection and evaluation from members to inform future projects. The coordinator should work towards distributed leadership among the members and institutions. However, I believe that the coordinator is always necessary as a leader and organizer of the group. Perhaps an ideal situation would be volunteered leadership by a group member who fully understands the responsibilities associated with the coordinator position.

*Establishing Expectations*

Discussing and agreeing upon expectations is a way to create shared vision. There was tension at times during the study because there were no clear expectations in place. Lisa and I
had not discussed her expectations for the initial workshop, which also highlighted differences in institutional priorities. I did not communicate my desire to Lisa that she attend the teachers’ sculpture tour at the September workshop. This was a missed opportunity to create shared vision. It also showed that she was still unclear or skeptical about how teachers could benefit the museum’s priorities.

Similarly, it was important to talk with the outside speakers coming to the workshops about how their individual contributions would fit into the big picture and to make the expectations clear. I talked with Lucy prior to the June workshop to give her more of a sense of how to tailor her presentation for mostly art teachers. However, I had not asked her to introduce teaching activities with the pieces that she showed. With clearer expectations, more ideas could have been discussed relative to teaching with artists from the state whose work is in the permanent collection.

Lisa’s Growth

Over the course of the study, Lisa’s actions demonstrated that she became increasingly more interested in collaborating with local teachers. Teaching in museums is shaped by what the educator believes is good for visitors and what the learners hold (Mayer, 2012). In June 2010, Lisa did not attend much of the workshop, for various reasons. At the September 2010 workshop, she did not attend the teachers’ tour. But after the second workshop, things started to change. After multiple interactions with the teachers, particularly Marshall, Kelly and Addison (teachers of subjects other than art), Lisa took a museum-sponsored speaker to local schools for the first time. She realized that it would be worthwhile to form relationships with educators and content area specialists (in addition to art) in the district. Without Lisa’s own changes in view, we could not make significant changes. However, it did not appear that Lisa agreed that the group was a
group outside of the workshops. She saw individual partnerships as the way to go. Perhaps this is most suitable for her needs with time and job restraints and much easier that working with an entire school district.

There was an obvious change in Lisa’s participation level at the January 2011 workshop compared to the July 2010 weeklong workshop. One reason Lisa may have been motivated to spend more time in the workshops was that she was becoming more familiar with the teachers in the group. By January 2011, she had led large fieldtrip groups for two of the teachers in the group at the museum (Marshall and Marcella), and had taken Buz Carpenter to speak at three schools. There had been a Hirst Educators workshop in September 2010, consisting of the July 2010 participants (Marshall, Kelly, Irene, Addison, Diane, Marcella) with the addition of Bronwyn. Lisa was able to interact with the teachers another time at the museum and gauge their interest in museum resources. Mutually beneficial events were occurring that had come from direct relationships between Lisa and the particular teachers in the Hirst Educators group.

I asked Lisa if she thought that her increased interest in participating in the workshops and initiating partnerships with Hirst Educators had to do with the relationships that had been built between her and the teachers in the group between July 2010 and January 2011.

Lisa: Oh yes, now we all know each other. We recognize each other on the street and feel comfortable talking with each other, calling each other on our cell phones if we need to, Facebook, whatever. We needed to communicate in a less formal kind of way. So it is related to knowing each other better, which can come from time and those connections (personal communication, January 24, 2011).

Lisa was more naturally inclined toward less formal interactions. Disparities between formal and nonformal pedagogy and language may have been slightly intimidating to Lisa in the first two workshops. It was easier for her to communicate with teachers once she felt like she knew them better personally.
Another reason for Lisa’s increased participation could be attributed to the fact that the January 2011 workshop activities did not take place during museum business hours. Lisa commented that there had been some staffing issues in July, which is one of the factors that prevented her attendance at much of the July workshop. Since the September 2010 and January 2011 workshops took place on Saturday mornings, there were no scheduled tour groups (or other scheduled events) during the time that needed her attention. The fact that the Saturday morning workshops (September 2010 and January 2011) were only three hours in length (at Lisa’s suggestion) could have also provided a more comfortable setting for Lisa.

By January 2011, Lisa was starting to take more leadership in the workshops but was mainly interested in promoting the temporary exhibits and associated programming. She was becoming more interested in providing benefits for the teachers that had shown loyalty to the museum and understanding that relationships with teachers could link to her programming goals. It was evident that teachers of subjects other than art were useful to her initiatives, especially with the social justice projects. At this point, Lisa was not yet going into schools to promote school-museum partnerships with One Million Bones, but she was showing interest in visible connections between the schools and museum by promoting partnerships in the museum newsletter and giving framed autographed postcards to the schools that hosted Buz Carpenter events. This showed her growing support of the particular teachers and schools involved in partnerships but did not yet show a commitment to the school district. However, she was interested in communicating with Jack about programming, approaching Marshall for advice.

At the June 2011 workshop, Lisa showed that she was coming to a better understanding of the school system and showed a deeper commitment through her involvement at the workshop. She designated museum interns to assist (and participate) at the workshop and
encouraged interactions between the teachers, curriculum specialists, presenters and museum staff. And through her interactions with the Hirst Educators, she was coming to understand school district priorities and pressures put on teachers by the district.

Kothe (2012) encourages museum educators to engage in meaningful participatory practice, inviting the question: “What if art museum educators approached their roles not as imparters of wisdom, but as facilitators of experiences where they learn alongside visitors?” (p. 24) Lisa recognized that her perspective had changed towards working with teachers and that she had learned through taking a different approach: communicating regularly with teachers and “being one of their peers.” She was still focused on individual teachers rather than the school district but she was engaging in participatory practice.

The Art21 project marked a change in that every step of the project was her doing and it showed a longer-term commitment to the schools. She facilitated planning sessions at the museum and involved schools, and she worked towards creating shared vision between them for the preview events and student exhibits. The grant she received served as a planning document that helped to guide the vision of the project. There was much publicity and promotion of the events at the schools and building community connections between the schools and the museum through Art21. But it appeared from my perspective that Lisa, along with the teachers and administrators involved in the Art21 project, may not have reflected and evaluated together strengths and weaknesses of the project to inform the next partnership. This reflective practice is similar to debriefing, and the dialogue reiterates how Lisa and the teachers did or didn’t come to create shared vision. It is unclear if this important step occurred with the programming.

There is potential for shared vision between the museum and school district if Lisa and Louise were to plan the next season of Art21 events together. Louise showed support of the
project but was not included in the planning stages. A clear focus on curriculum or building connections within the schools (outside of the art departments) through themes was not evident. This is an area that Louise and Jack could help with if Lisa decides to commit to similar programming for Season 7. After the Art21 programming, Lisa seemed more committed to figuring out how her role at the museum can be woven into educational opportunities at the schools. And for serious change to take place in the city—for the ‘nut to be cracked’—there needs to be a focus on the school district rather than individual teachers.

At the end of the study, Lisa was nominated for the state-affiliated NAEA Museum Educator of the Year award. Marcella led efforts for the nomination and eight Hirst Educators and museum staff wrote letters of support. This sign of appreciation and support demonstrated that Lisa had made and was continuing to make an educational impact, both at the museum and in the local schools.

Museum and School Priorities

There were differences between the priorities of the museum and the local schools. The museum and local school district did not communicate well and working together was not a high priority for either institution. Berry (1998) asserted that fostering understanding and communication between museum educators and teachers is the first step toward establishing collaborative efforts. Museums and schools necessarily have different, as well as overlapping, goals, which affects issues such as the artwork chosen to study and approaches to curriculum and instructional delivery.

Museum Priorities

In my analysis of the data, the following emerged as educational priorities at the Hirst Museum: 1) promoting temporary exhibits and associated programming; 2) museum-community
connections through promotion of social justice projects; 3) promoting connections with Art21; 4) using local teachers as leaders of museum programs.

Promoting Temporary Exhibits and Associated Programming

Both exhibits of work from the permanent collection and temporary traveling exhibits are featured at the museum. The issue of which exhibits to focus on at teacher workshops presents a tension between the museum’s goals and the schools’ educational goals. Lisa and the museum tend to promote temporary exhibits to audiences that include teachers, though work in these exhibits may not be the best choice for teacher focus, since it is only accessible for a short amount of time. Promoting artwork in temporary exhibits not owned by the museum to teachers works towards meeting the museum’s short-term goals but not the schools’ longer-term ones.

Concerns specific to teachers were not a high priority for the museum. Lisa must consider different communities for each exhibit; teachers make up only one of those communities, though they work with diverse community audiences on a daily basis and could relate to Lisa’s situation. Schools are educating children, whereas Lisa is responsible for educating all audiences in the community, including school-aged children. However, teachers are also well versed on communicating with parents, local policymakers and others in the community. Perhaps a teacher group like Hirst Educators could help advise the museum on upcoming exhibits and ways to attract diverse audiences?

Museum-Community Connections through Promotion of Social Justice Projects

Museums have an important role to foster understanding of societal issues (Pickering, 2012). Lisa demonstrated a pattern of promoting temporary national and international social justice projects through the museum. One reason for this might be because these projects are ready-made and make for good publicity and funding; another organization has already
completed research and development for the project. Fundred and One Million Bones, two of the projects promoted, are large-scale, have an artmaking component, and advocate for human rights. Local schools could easily be involved in these projects because there was already curriculum developed for them at the national level and they were promoting social causes. So there were many opportunities for goals to align between museum and schools through these projects. For example, One Million Bones could address content standards of multiple subject areas and promote service-learning. But there was little effort to realize these opportunities, although four schools partnered with the museum to submit bones for the project. The museum’s priority was to show that they were partnering with schools (in their newsletter and in display at the museum) but there was no outreach work done within the schools. For the museum, the use of Hirst Educators during the One Million Bones project was again for short-term gain with no more lasting consequences.

Lisa did suggest the theme of teaching tolerance and the workshop time for the January workshop. The theme was more apt to fit character education standards in the local schools, which should have been further researched prior to the workshop. Lisa took on more leadership and responsibility within the group during this time because it met her short-term programming priorities.

*Promoting Connections with Art21*

Art21 is a big priority for Lisa and the museum, as they book and promote artists featured in Art21 films for lectures at the museum and purchase artwork by these artists for the permanent collection. It was a priority for Lisa to attract a new audience for her Art21 programming for Season 6. Opportunities to connect the school district from planning stages were missed, as well as ways to integrate the curriculum into other subject areas at the schools. It was unclear if Lisa
was interested in the learning standards being addressed through the program. Lack of attention to these details made it seem that the museum’s priorities were more of focus than the schools’ priorities.

However, there were areas within the Art21 project with the selected schools that merged priorities. One was that each school was asked to create an exhibit of student work based on the students’ favorite Art21 artist or theme. Another was that Lisa had originally wanted to use a standardized approach to the events at the schools, but was flexible when the schools wanted to design the events to suit the culture of the individual schools.

*Using Local Teachers as Leaders of Museum Programs*

Lisa has used local art teachers to help her run the Summer Youth Program for many years. She employs a teacher as the coordinator and curriculum writer each year for this program. This is one way she has shown support and relationship building with local teachers. She outsources this program to local art teachers because they are familiar with leading student groups in discussion and creation of art, and writing curriculum.

When Kelly, a new elementary teacher and Hirst Educator who had volunteered with SYP for two years, expressed interest in coordinating the 2011 program, it presented an issue for Lisa. She was not accustomed to training teachers that were not as familiar with methods for teaching art. Lisa also did not have time to devote to in-depth training or much hands-on involvement, so the solution was to involve Cynthia as a co-coordinator. Lisa realized what a valuable resource Cynthia was becoming for the museum and invited her to lead the SYP program in 2012.

Lisa recognized that Cynthia could help her with her Girl Scout programming. Programming for Girl Scouts was a priority for Lisa and over eight years, she had built a strong
relationship with the local organization. She delegated these initiatives to Cynthia. Girl Scouts seemed to be as much of or more of a priority to Lisa than strengthening relationships with the local school district. Girl Scouts might be less intimidating than the schools in terms of rules and policy, and Lisa had an established relationship with them. She understood the way the organization works from sustained interactions.

In terms of relating to schools and teachers, Lisa usually gives priority to working through individual teachers that she knows. It has not been a priority to her to work through the schools, directly with curriculum development efforts to benefit schools or with the district. However, that did start to change over the course of the study.

Cynthia is now leading two programs for the museum: Girl Scouts and SYP. Lisa feels confident delegating these responsibilities to her and can focus on other priorities. It benefits Lisa to find local educators who can assist her with her priorities. Teachers can be great representatives of the museum, particularly to help promote the museum’s educational activities and programs. Lisa was realizing through the study how strengthened relationships with some of the teachers from Hirst Educators could help her with her programming goals.

School Priorities

The following emerged as priorities of the schools: 1) school district mandates and meeting testing requirements; 2) teacher development; 3) curricular connections to learning standards; 4) practical resources for long-term classroom use.

School District Mandates and Meeting Testing Requirements

Mandated testing and accountability narrow curriculum, including teachers’ choices of instructional strategies (Firestone et al., 2004; Hess & Brigham, 2000; Jones et al., 1999). This testing and accountability may also diminish teachers’ perceived roles or purposes in teaching
(Mason, 2010). District-wide requirements for tested content areas dictate curricular resource support. Due to budget restraints and not meeting NCLB mandates in reading and math, district inservices over the past two years have been focused on a state-regulated program similar to Response to Intervention (RTI). This program aims to: “contribute to more meaningful identification of learning and behavioral problems, improve instructional quality, provide all students with the best opportunities to succeed in school, and assist with the identification of learning disabilities and other disabilities” (American Institutes for Research, 2007). There have been district-wide inservices that focus on consistency among schools with this program rather than content-specific inservices. Implementation of district-wide behavioral programs like this seems to support Nowak’s (2011) claim that pressure to improve test scores causes a significant amount of stress on teachers, while student behavior problems have also increased related to stress and pressure on the students.

Teachers spend more time teaching content they know is tested while reducing time spent teaching non-tested material since implementation of NCLB (Mertler, 2011). Since art is not a tested subject area, it is often disadvantaged in schools and looked at as inferior to those subject areas that are tested. Prior to the NCLB mandates the curriculum specialists were able to lead content-specific inservices with input from the teachers they serve. Jack and Louise expressed similar viewpoints related to ways to support teachers in the district and both are eager to be able to conduct content-specific inservices again.

Teacher Development

In the past, Louise has considered local museums when planning art content-specific teacher inservices. Related to ways that Louise had experienced collaborative planning efforts for teachers with museums prior to June 2011, she mentioned utilization of three local museums
as host sites for elementary art teacher professional development sessions. Besides providing the site, the museum staff at each site provided a tour to the art teachers and delivered information about their programming. However, this was the extent of the museums’ involvement in the teacher professional development. Though dialogue exchanges between the specialist and museum educator at each site must have taken place to plan the teacher visits, the institutional goals were separate. In these instances, I feel confident that Louise would have been interested in discussing long-term goals with the teachers during an inservice, while Lisa would have been more interested in discussing artwork and programming new to the museum (short-term goals).

Curriculum specialists and museum educators are independently busy and consumed with a multitude of duties. But, if curricular standards are going to be directly addressed through museum resources, extended dialogue beyond a tour and description of programming needs to take place.

It seems that Lisa was taking a consumer-type approach to the status of teachers (Stone, 1992b; Liu, 2000), and the schools were taking a consumer-type approach to the museum. This indicates one-sided relationships, where the museum educator passes on expertise to passive teachers. In this case, perhaps that is what Louise conveyed as her expectation. This approach is also evident when teachers take on a passive role in development of museum-school collaborations. A consumer-like stance of the schools, and in particular, of teachers, limits potential to complement school curriculum (Stone, 1992b). The alternative is to emphasize the various kinds of expertise that comes together when developing educational initiatives between museums and teachers and to co-design museum resources with teacher participation (Liu, 2000).
In June 2011, Lisa felt that the museum offers services to the schools but may not have fully understood how schools benefit the museum. The schools also may not have understood how they might play a role in advocating the educational potential of the museum to the community. However, the consumer-type approach to museum-school collaboration was not as evident because of direct communication sustained over time with individual teachers: new programming was created and individual Hirst Educators had taken on leadership roles within collaborations.

Lisa reflected about developing relationships with curriculum specialists in efforts to continue building relationships with them and the teachers they serve.

Lisa: I agree that solving these issues requires relationship building. I think we’ve talked about this before. I’m more likely to be excited about somebody’s idea when I know that person and their track record. So when some random girl comes be-bopping into the office, saying ‘I’ve got this really cool idea and I really think you and all secondary social studies teachers should partner with us—it would be really awesome’ that he [Jack] wasn’t ready to just sign on makes complete sense. What I don’t understand is how some people are such wonderful networkers—that you have such a large group that you can build these relationships with. Because I don’t feel like my circle is the right circle or a big enough circle. Maybe part of it is because I don’t actively seek out those relationships. Maybe I should be going to wherever Jack is going for things, so I can run into him (personal communication, June 8, 2011).

From this statement, it seems that Lisa’s understanding and perspective on the significance of building relationships with local curriculum specialists changed over the 2010-2011 school year. This may have had to do with Lisa’s interactions and strengthened relationships with local teachers through Hirst Educators. Through informal and formal conversations with teachers, she was able to come to a better understanding of job requirements of teachers and the hierarchy within the school system. Lisa’s direct experiences with teachers and administrators inside the school buildings and in the museum space likely contributed to new understandings of how she could assist teachers in meeting curricular standards. She also
mentioned that she had not been actively seeking out those relationships, acknowledging that she had taken on a reactive attitude to working with teachers. She seemed to allude that she wanted that to change.

Curricular Connections to Learning Standards

In our June 2011 interview, Jack acknowledged that there is an issue with communications between museum educators in the community and the school district. He alluded that from the schools’ perspective, museums may not understand how to effectively address the schools’ required learning standards through their programs. From the museum’s perspective, the small staff, lack of time to devote and lack of education background do not provide conditions to allow for the museum to produce standards-based curricular resources for schools.

Jack said that he is aware of the history of the relationship between museums and the district. He said, “It appears that, yeah, I think the people in the community feel that we are hard to work with.” When asked to explain this negative perception between local museums and the school district, he said, “I think part of it might be what is offered and pulling kids out of school is hard” (personal communication, June 9, 2011). Meeting testing goals consumes much of school time, with little time left for fieldtrips. The four areas he mentioned as considerations for a fieldtrip include logistics, time, money and rationale for going. To be relevant and practical, it is essential that museum resources directly address learning objectives for courses.

Jack mentioned that a museum working with individual buildings is a lot easier to do if the right relationship is found rather than a district-wide initiative. Lisa had been increasingly working on individual and school partnerships within the district, mostly with teachers from the Hirst Educators group. She had approached Jack about a district-wide partnership with secondary
social studies teachers for the Alfredo Jaar exhibit and One Million Bones project the first time she met him, months in advance of the exhibit. Though the content of the temporary exhibit was historical and dealt with social issues, Jack was not convinced it was a good fit for a district-wide partnership. Though there was ready-made curriculum on the One Million Bones website as well as on the Art21 website for Alfredo Jaar, state and district standards were not considered. Additionally, there likely could have been challenges with training the secondary social studies teachers on leading discussions about genocide. Jack was in support of Lisa partnering with a few schools that were willing to align their curricular goals with the content of the Alfredo Jaar exhibit and One Million Bones project.

The curriculum specialists oversee creation of curriculum guides and the resources that are included within the guides. These include textbooks but teachers are encouraged to supplement with a variety of resources, including online resources. Many online resource links are provided within the pacing guides. Jack mentioned that if museums are interested in connecting more with the schools, they might want copies of the district’s social studies pacing guides to see how the museum programs fit with the local curriculum.

Jack: And then the other thing was that Lisa was like, well, we want your teachers to develop their curriculum and a set of questions to go with it. Well, that is a good idea, but what I want is—you got something that is worth coming to that is ready to go (personal communication, June 8, 2011).

This seems to be Jack’s ideal. Lisa understands that curricular standards need to be addressed to attract more teachers to bring students to the museum. However, in addition to not having time to commit to this, her background training is not in education and she has been unsure of practical ways to accomplish incorporation of standards.

The obvious tension between museum education and public school education is clear in this instance. There were good intentions on the museum educator’s part to approach the
curriculum specialist and suggest that district teachers aid in creating curricular connections for the museum exhibit. However, since this had not happened at the museum in the past, there was no clear vision for practical ways to do it. There is most likely some anxiety on the part of the museum educator related to being able to produce curricular connections that mesh with what is expected in the schools. On the other hand, there could be teachers willing to assist the museum in creating these curricular connections if offered incentive for doing so.

After talking with Jack on June 8, 2011, I believe that his willingness to engage with Lisa (or other museum educators) depends on knowing and trusting the individual coming in to speak to the teachers and ensuring that the experience is aligned with standards teachers must address (research journal, July 3, 2011). He does not want to make more work for the teachers he serves but does want to provide experiences for them that will aid in delivery of their content. If the Hirst Museum can provide a link to that, it is more likely to be promoted. If Jack senses that the teachers will have to put a lot of effort into something that has not been designed with teachers’ needs in mind, he is more likely to be a safeguard for the teachers. However, he is able to identify and recommend mentor teachers or teachers that might fit or benefit from initiatives.

Practical Resources for Long-term Classroom Use

In addition to meeting curricular standards, teachers need curricular resources to be useful for years to come (Grossman et al., 2001). There were resources given at the June 2011 workshop appropriate for long-term use, including the word cards and resources introduced by Lucy. I asked Lucy to be a co-presenter as a historical expert that could connect museum priorities with school priorities and expose the group to visual examples on the state Historical Society’s website specifically created for teachers. Visual literacy strategies address institutional priorities of all: the museum, state Historical Society and school district. These resources were
practical; they were useful beyond the time the exhibit was on view and created with intention to address standards. Resources given to teachers connected to temporary exhibits may not be as applicable for long-term use.

I found that including practical resources not necessarily specific to one exhibit but applicable to interpreting art in general proved best for long-term use. Another example of a resource given to the teachers applicable for long-term use was Sandell’s F+T+C form for interpreting art. These resources made it possible for goals of the different institutions to coincide. The curriculum I created for the Terry Evans temporary exhibit in the fall of 2011 made it possible for museum goals and school goals to coincide for a short time frame. Though the works were still available online after the exhibit was gone, the resource was not as useful to the schools after the exhibit was gone and did not meet museum priorities once school groups could no longer schedule fieldtrips to see it.

Importance of Administrative Support

Museum-school partnerships must include commitment of both administrative support and teacher interest (Sheppard, 1993; Stone, 1993). Hirzy (1996) wrote that early commitment from administrators, early planning, shared vision and clear expectations are necessary for successful partnerships between museums and schools. The Wallace Foundation (1999) points out that long-term, ongoing relationships are vital to sustaining participation with partner organizations. Administrative support at the museum, district and individual school levels were important factors in this project.

Museum educators need administrative support from the museum to devote time and resources for effective programming for local teachers. Teachers need administrative support at the school level and from their content area curriculum specialist for fieldtrips, hosting
assemblies and other partnered projects with a museum. Central administrators (curriculum specialists) provide guidance and expectations for curriculum. They also have the authority to grant professional development points to teachers for their efforts and may be able to promote museum resources to the teachers they serve. I found there was an increasing degree of support and communication at all three levels through the study, though not in sufficient degree to maintain a community of practice.

*Support from the Museum*

This section discusses the priorities of the museum relative to local schools. Those priorities currently include fundraising to support innovative ideas and to continue the 100% bus reimbursement program. The museum also provides time and monetary resources connected to Lisa’s involvement with NAEA. The museum has only one educator. She is responsible for many ongoing programs, including: Buzz-worthy Art Talks, Senior Wednesdays, Girl Scouts, Summer Youth Program, Art for your Ears, Family Fun Days, docents, school programming. The museum provides funding for an education intern to assist Lisa with her many responsibilities. This position is typically filled by an art history or studio major from Diller University.

*Long-term Vision*

Lisa struggled between short-term and long-term priorities throughout the study. She had a tendency to work with individual teachers and schools, where she had lots of success. A sense of risk and the unknown came with long-term goals and communications with the school district. For the most part, she shied away from much communication with the school district. She made attempts to collaborate with Jack and the social studies teachers in the district for the One
Million Bones project, but it was for programming associated with a temporary exhibit. She needed support from the museum to help balance long-term and short-term vision.

The first sign of support that I encountered was being able to perform my study in the museum space and in collaboration with Lisa. Constance had the final word on whether the study could take place. At the conclusion of each workshop, I shared copies of the teacher evaluations with Lisa and encouraged her to share them with Constance. After the January 2011 workshop, Lisa said:

Lisa: Constance said the most wonderful thing to me. She asked how it went Saturday morning, and I said I was so pleased, and that I had kind of hoped for more people, and she asked, ‘why are you worried about that?’ She said, ‘something like this takes at least five years to launch.’ So we are really lucky that we have a director who gets it, that something like this doesn’t happen overnight, that she even put a number on it like five years to get it going (personal communication, January 24, 2011).

From this statement, Constance seems to embrace long-term project growth. She acknowledged that programming like the Hirst Educators takes years to build. Lisa seemed relieved by the support that Constance’s response conveyed.

Five months later, I was able to interview Constance in her office at the museum. Lisa was also present. Constance responded to my question about her views on museum-school partnerships: she supports strengthening relationships with schools. Related to long-term project growth, Constance shared an example of sustaining relations with local schools (but not the district level).

Constance: [At the last museum where I worked], the education department had something like a preferred treatment program. We established a relationship with I think it was three different schools, that was just more intensive. They got more, and there were more program planning meetings. The school and we agreed that we were going to work on stronger better programming with one another—not just the ‘I’m going to call you up and come for a school visit every once in awhile.’ And I think that that was particularly wonderful (June 9, 2011).
This “preferred treatment program” occurred at another museum where Constance worked for 11 years; she shared her positive views of this experience with Lisa and me. Her example illustrated working with a few schools on a more intense level over extended time and seemed to provide Lisa with a suggestive example. Just two months after this conversation Lisa conducted the meeting with art teachers from three local high schools about hosting the Art21 preview parties and student exhibits in April 2012.

Constance has Lisa and the rest of the staff conduct strategic planning together, so they think long-term and know what many of their ideas are for the next five years. This strategic planning is a way that a museum director can provide administrative support and to create a shared vision among the staff. Though she admitted that it is sometimes difficult to think about programming so far in advance, Lisa expressed appreciation, “[Constance] does an excellent job of balancing long-term and short-term goals and keeping us thinking and looking to the future. The future will come, and she is smart enough to know that” (personal communication, November 19, 2011). However, it still proved to be a challenge for Lisa to balance long-term and short-term vision when it came to working with local schools and the school district; short-term goals seemed to take precedence.

Fundraising

I asked Constance how she can best support the education staff at the Hirst.

Constance: I don’t know that education staff are singled out in a way. We all have our place and role. One of the better things I can do is go out and fundraise so Lisa has lots of money to do fun things.

Lisa: And I would agree that probably that is the key thing; I see other museums, and I hear from other people that say, ‘yes, programming is very important to us—but I’ve got $5 to work with.’ Constance acknowledges that yes, we want to do a lot of programming and we want it to really heighten quality. It is not enough to do the program, which does cost money, but that you also have to market and advertise that efficiently, which is
another cost. And she goes out there and she fundraises for it, and she makes it happen. And I think that is the biggest support.

Constance: Related to that, even the way we approach annual budgeting—everybody has his or her niche. Lisa is an entire department—she has her department budget. Budgeting is a process, and we establish priorities for the year while we are budgeting. The first budget that you bring should be the budget that you really want. And every year, those first budgets—we have to cut them way back, but if you don’t dream, if you don’t begin to have the ideas about what could be, then we don’t have the opportunity to have them enter the realm of the possible. Whatever your bright idea is in a certain year, maybe we can’t do it that year, but maybe we’ll find a way to make it happen the next year. So, in terms of support, it’s what are the best ideas and how can we find the resources for it? And then there are lots of pats on the back (personal communication, June 9, 2011).

Constance encourages her staff members to dream big about ideas and initiatives. The primary way that she shows support to her staff is by fundraising on their behalf.

A major way that Constance shows support for building relationships between the museum and local schools is through funding for bus reimbursement.

Lisa: Ultimately, it really all comes down to Constance. She is the one fundraising. She is the one that is putting together a budget that she presents to a board. And she is the one who said, ‘bus reimbursement is a priority and it should be 100% bus reimbursement, and it should be all the time.’ If she walks away from that or leaves the museum and someone new comes in who does not see the direct benefit of that, it could all go away. It hinges on Constance. In front of donors, she talks about things like we had 1,000 kids come through in seven days through the JASON Project partnership. Those are the things donors are like, ‘wow, science and art together…how do you do that?’ (Personal communication, February 25, 2012)

Lisa mentioned the correlation between school group attendance at the museum and fundraising by Constance to continue the 100% bus reimbursement initiative. Figure 17 shows that September 2011 had the highest attendance by school groups at the museum in four years (close to 1200 students). The JASON Project partnership, coordinated with an office at Diller University, was the main reason for the attendance spike. The JASON Project is a middle school curriculum program that immerses students in real-world situations connected to science, technology, engineering and math (JASON Project, 2012). Students would visit Diller
University: take part in JASON Project activities and also visit the museum. The museum provided bus reimbursement for these school visits. Documentation of school group attendance numbers helps maintain support for the bus reimbursement program (and other initiatives). The sharp drop in attendance is marked at the end of November 2011 when the museum galleries closed for renovations. The galleries will reopen on September 15, 2012.

Time and Professional Associations

From the beginning of the study, Lisa said that she did not have time to devote to making relationships with teachers a priority. She had too many other job responsibilities that filled her workdays. She needed administrative support of time to be able to devote to working on collaborations with schools, once she decided it was a priority. Her work time was filled with planning programming and events, assisting with special projects and meeting with school or other public groups visiting the museum. Therefore, she did not have time to plan special events for teachers. She also did not have time to create curriculum or online resources for the museum, which would be ideal for schools.

Another way that Constance demonstrates support to Lisa is by funding annual membership fees to NAEA and granting her time to devote to the state-affiliated NAEA chapter, including board meetings and associated responsibilities with Lisa’s leadership role. Lisa shows support to the art teachers locally and around the state by serving as a board member (museum representative) of the state-affiliated chapter of the NAEA. Constance supports Lisa in her efforts of hosting an event and reception for art teachers around the state during the 2012 fall conference held in the city.

Constance showed support of my research by informing the community of it. The winter 2012 newsletter that promoted news and events at the museum from January through April 2012
highlighted the collaboration between Lisa and me. Constance approved a large ‘spotlight’ area in the newsletter for this and acknowledged that the museum had gained much from the collaboration.
Support from District Curriculum Specialists

In this section, issues related to administrative support from the school district are discussed through perspectives of two of the district curriculum specialists, relative to relations with museums and local teachers. In addition to school-based administration, leadership in school districts is also relative to content areas across schools. For the purpose of this study, the art curriculum specialist and the secondary social studies specialist for the local school district were contacted because of direct communication and supervisory roles associated with participants in the Hirst Educator workshops. Stone (1986) stated that it is imperative for museum educators to involve key leaders in school districts when attempting to establish relationships between teachers and a museum. She asserted, “these leaders could provide the needed support, incentive, and time to encourage the involvement of teachers” (p. 201). The issues identified include fieldtrips, communication, providing incentives, and challenges of time.

Culminating Fieldtrip Experiences at Museums

Close to the end of the July 2010 workshop, Marshall wrote on the Hirst Educators site that he was glad that Lisa was trying to build bridges with district educators because, in his opinion, “the Hirst Museum is the city's best kept secret that needs to be exposed to our students and faculty.” He indicated a need for administrative support from the school district and said that “the museum should provide our students with exciting extra curricular opportunities and capstone fieldtrips guided by people who know how to relate art/history to our students' lives.” Lisa starting selling Marshall on scheduling a fieldtrip for the Luke DuBois exhibit months in advance of the opening of the exhibit.
Fieldtrips are underused as learning experiences (DeWitt & Storksdieck, 2008) and though, they can provide a valuable supplement to classroom instruction, schools are often not supportive, particularly due to time restraints and pressures of testing (Aquino, Kelly, & Bayne, 2010). The district mandates pacing guides that put core teachers on a rigorous track towards making sure all students are learning the same content and does not allow much flexibility for alternative ways of addressing standards. The pressure could make teachers hesitant to even request to take fieldtrips because of the time away from school they take and how students would need to be pulled from other classes, disrupting the delivery of content or review for standardized testing. The district may be skeptical that fieldtrips can be carefully planned to address and review learning standards for testing. If teachers are able to show how museum fieldtrips address tested standards, perhaps the district administrators could be convinced.

One way that a school district can show administrative support to schools, teachers and museums is implementation of a required fieldtrip to a museum as a culminating elementary experience. Fairfax County Public Schools, Virginia (FCPS) has a program like this in place for all sixth grade students in the county (see Fairfax County Public Schools, 2011). As part of this mandate, a fieldtrip is assigned to an art museum by central administration (art curriculum specialists) for all sixth graders in the county. This fieldtrip culminates all that students learn in elementary art. The organization of FCPS district schools is K-6 for elementary. In this study, the local elementary schools are K-5, with middle school as 6-8. Since all students are provided weekly art instruction in the local district at the elementary level, fifth grade would be an appropriate grade level to provide a culminating fieldtrip experience. Something like this would need to be determined by local district and school administration in coordination with the
museums. It may not be realistic to implement, but the local district and the museums in the city could examine this model if it was supported by administration at all of the institutions.

Within the fieldtrip document for FCPS, there are links to pre-tour materials for each of the four participating museums: National Building Museum, National Gallery of Art, National Portrait Gallery and Smithsonian American Art Museum. It is worth mentioning that artwork included in the tours is from the permanent collection. These tours take time and research to create, and it would not be feasible to create them for temporary exhibits. This would create a challenge for the Hirst Museum.

An important difference is that the Washington, D. C. museums are very large with ample staff dedicated to creating educational connections for different audiences. The Hirst Museum is small, with only two galleries that change on a regular basis; but it has the benefit of being affiliated with a university. Online educational activities concerning pieces from the permanent collection could be more useful for small museums that do not always have pieces from the permanent collection on display. However, the sculpture collection, which is expansive and consists entirely of pieces from the permanent collection, seems logical for creating educational materials. These resources could be created for long-term use.

The FCPS curriculum specialists clearly support the fieldtrip initiative. If the local schools were interested in a standardized fieldtrip for fifth or sixth grade, perhaps they could rotate between the two art museums in the city, so that a particular school would visit one museum then the other the following year. This could build bridges not only between the museums and local schools, but also between the two art museums. Curriculum development, training, and communication between the schools, district and museums would call for shared vision. The Hirst Museum’s 100% bus reimbursement would certainly play a role in making
these fieldtrips possible, alleviating the monetary challenge that often comes with planning fieldtrips.

If a county-wide grade level fieldtrip was not possible, it seems fitting for the Hirst Museum and Diller University to initiate a partnership with the Gordon Parks school, to create curriculum based on the Gordon Parks work in the permanent collections of the museum and university. Also, goals of the International Baccalaureate (IB) school could be identified and addressed through a fieldtrip or continued study of the Gordon Parks archives.

Communication

Over the course of the study, I contacted Jack and Louise to inform them about Hirst Educator workshop opportunities and asked them to pass the information on to the teachers they served. Jack said, “Like I told you, communication is one of the most important things I do, so if there is an opportunity I let them know. And then you’re going to have more likelihood of people signing up for programs” (personal communication, June 9, 2011). He made a direct correlation between potential for teacher participation at museum events and his communications with teachers. Teachers look to curriculum specialists for guidance related to their content area.

The curriculum specialist is able to encourage initiatives that he or she deems worthy and connected to meeting standards but cannot require an external learning experience or activity. Jack said “working with individual buildings is a lot easier to do if you find the right relationship than it is to do something district-wide” (personal communication, June 9, 2011). He said that site administrators (principals) often override his opinions. Therefore, when Lisa approached him about a district-wide partnership with the social studies teachers, he thought it was not feasible for him to promote.
Consequently, Lisa suggested that curriculum specialists could aid her in identifying teachers or established programs in particular schools that might fit with museum initiatives. Jack said he could assist with this. If curriculum specialists become familiar with the museum’s programs, they may be better able to match teachers that would best fit. The museum educator could recruit for teacher programming through the curriculum specialists.

In June 2011 Lisa said that she would like to have some teacher teams in the schools, because she thought partnerships within individual schools might be more recognized by administrators. This is similar to how some museums encourage partners from a school to enter a professional development program together. She said that she did not think it would be difficult to make curricular connections between several disciplines in schools but recognized that it would take time. When asked how she imagined this to work, she said that social studies teachers and arts teachers in particular (she did not mention science or math) should be encouraged to build relationships with one another, encouraged by their administration.

Louise is in a unique position to be able to promote teacher programming and content knowledge development in art through the Hirst Museum. Positive personal relationships between curriculum specialists and a museum educator might foster this more effectively. Louise actively conducts surveys amongst the art teachers to find out what they are interested in learning about. It would be helpful for Louise to share these findings with Lisa, together with variations in the data between teachers of different student age levels. This information could help a museum educator tailor particular resources or touch on topics identified by the teachers. Lisa and Louise had known each other for several years. Louise started as the art curriculum specialist in 2008 and prior to that taught high school art in the district for nine years. They had worked together on
several projects and committees, but it was not clear that there was a deep understanding of one another’s priorities during the time of the study.

In August 2011, Lisa hosted the initial planning meeting with selected local teachers for a multi-school partnership connected to Art21, to be held in April 2012. Two of the three selected schools are within the district, and Louise oversees the art teachers at those buildings. Lisa was able to talk to Louise about the initiative informally, since they serve together (along with Marcella and one other person) on the executive planning committee for the state-affiliated NAEA 2012 fall conference. However, this communication did not take place until further along in the planning stages.

It is important that Lisa talk with Louise about initiatives that affect multiple schools, so that Louise might support the program and the teachers involved, as well as for public relation purposes within the community. If Lisa were to communicate with Louise early in the planning stages, she might gain more administrative support from the district. A program partnership such as this could raise morale among the local art teachers and provide a tangible way to advocate the arts within the local schools and community, outside the walls of the museum. Taking time to advise Louise about this program, as well as future partnerships involving district art teachers, may elicit a reciprocal response from Louise to Lisa in future encounters. It was difficult initially for Lisa to grasp the importance of building a relationship with Louise. However, over time and shared experiences, it has become clearer to Lisa how she and Louise can positively impact one another’s initiatives.

Lisa: I was told several years ago that [the local school district] is a nut I will never crack, to just give up. Focus on the things that you can work with; just give up [on the school district]. You have helped with being my nut cracker. It has to be that consistency of effort to keep going back and trying to approach it [an initiative] in different ways. I was waiting for Louise to tell me how I was going to be of service to the district. You were
saying to her, ‘here is how I propose we be of service to the district. It may or may not work, but at least I have an idea.’ And you kept on her!

Stephanie: Do you think that strengthening relationships between you and the teachers had anything to do with this?

Lisa: I think it was multiple things. You, working on a Ph.D., brought an academic level to it, and brought a research component to it. There was a consistency of coming back to her again and again, and an opportunity for her to see high-caliber programming at work. So even though she only came to a little bit of the June workshop, I think that stuck with her. I can’t tell you why, or that it was one specific thing that she said or did, but I think she just started saying, ‘ok, maybe they really are doing something that can be of some use.’ Do I think that Louise may listen a little more keenly when we come back to her? Yes (personal communication, February 28, 2012).

Lisa thought Louise’s decision to attend part of the June 2011 workshop might have shown that central administrators can support the museum’s programming and, that it can be of use to local teachers.

Something else that came out of this statement from Lisa was that she felt that improved communication between her and key players in the local school district could in part be contributed to my work as a liaison between them. Lisa recognized that the academic nature of the efforts and the research that grounded the collaboration as significant to the steps made towards improvement in communication. She mentioned that there were consistent efforts to approach ideas in different ways. If something did not work or I did not get a response, I would frame in it a different way and try again. I did serve as a liaison between the museum and the school district, and (at least in the beginning stages) between the museum and the local teachers. Since I was working through university protocol on research and was known to the museum and teachers as a university educator, I was a representative of higher education in this study. Lisa’s statement shows that researchers in higher education can impact communications between museums and schools. Research provides motivation to aid in cross-institutional understandings.

*Providing Incentive*
In August 2010, Lisa was frustrated with not understanding procedures for promoting programming at the museum through the local school district. This included gaining central administrative support of a museum initiative and ways to communicate information to local teachers, and being able to provide professional development points through the district for teacher participation. It seemed that the topic of awarding professional development points had not come up before this time between the museum and the art specialist in the district.

The curriculum specialists can post professional development opportunities on My Learning Plan, the district’s online portal for teachers. It took months to figure out how to provide district professional development points for teachers associated with the Hirst Educator workshops. It turned out that I was not asking the right questions of the right people. The July 2010 and September 2010 workshops were not advertised in My Learning Plan and teachers did not receive professional development points for attending. This caused issues such as not being able to require readings, since teachers weren’t receiving credit for attending. It also made it difficult to expect any outside work to be done by the teachers on curriculum development for the September workshop, since there was no incentive being offered and no support shown by the district. The museum might have perceived from the low number of teachers showing up to the July and September workshops that teachers were not interested in the offerings, but attendance numbers started increasing when professional development points were offered.

The January 2011 and June 2011 workshops were promoted on My Learning Plan, posted by Louise. This indicated that the district approved and valued the goals of those workshops. Teachers were able to find out about the opportunity online and through emails from the curriculum specialists and they registered for their points online at the workshops.
In June 2011, I clarified the process of posting opportunities on My Learning Plan with Jack. I asked what the best way was for the museum to make a request.

Jack: You’d want to go through someone in the district to sponsor it or to take a look and see if it matches what the mission is—we don’t just put anything up. You could come to me and say, ‘hey we’d like to do this.’ And I’d say, ‘ok, well let’s try to put that on My Learning Plan.’

Stephanie: And then could it be targeted for social studies teachers or art teachers?

Jack: It could. There is a lady who monitors what is posted, so there is that kind of gatekeeper. But in general, we’re not going to allow just anybody to put things on. There is district oversight. We want to know what is on there, and we want to know that it is worthwhile. But if you found somebody to sponsor it or say ‘hey, yeah, it’s a good idea,’ then they would see you through the process pretty easily. So it’s not that hard, but there is some quality control (personal communication, June 9, 2011).

Several participants at the June workshop told me that they found out about the workshop because it was advertised on My Learning Plan. Curriculum specialists can directly support museum programming for teachers by posting opportunities. In addition, the fact that both Jack and Louise made appearances at the workshop and were able to glimpse the learning activities and interact with participants demonstrated support to the teachers and the museum.

I requested a professional development point from Louise for the teachers that participated in the focus group and led other teachers through the Educators’ Night. I told Louise how the teachers were showing leadership and building connections between the museum and schools, with no response back from her. Louise said teachers don’t understand that if they go to all of the required district inservices they have more than enough points. This shows a lack of support from the district for the group or a lack of teacher choice for one’s own professional development. It is clear from this why more teachers wouldn’t participate.

It seemed not to be a misunderstanding on the school district’s part, but that for some reason, they would not support it. No wonder that relations with the school district are
complicated for Lisa. She wants to provide programs for teachers and schools but it is unclear what the district’s expectations are and requirements for obtaining professional development points. I never found a form for providers to submit to justify an activity for professional development points. It still seems to be elusive how a district administrator in this city decides what is worthy of professional development points. And it did not seem that the district was in support of the Hirst Educators group’s efforts.

At the September 2011 focus group, the teachers in the group indicated a willingness to stay connected but there was no incentive for them to do so. The only person saying it would benefit them to stay together as a group was the facilitator. Lisa did not tell them how this would also benefit the museum. And the curriculum specialists were not on board yet. The structure of something like this needs to be determined with incentive for the teachers, prior to asking them to participate.

Another way that curriculum specialists can provide incentive to content teachers is through inviting them to present a lesson to their peers. In past years, Louise has led hands-on workshops with art teachers during content area inservices. Louise explained that those inservices involve putting out a call for teachers that want to share a lesson. In a 45-minute timeframe, the teacher shares a lesson in a hands-on format with other teachers. Louise said that she tries not to hand pick teachers for leading these workshops; rather, she sends out a blanket email and asks for presenters.

Stephanie: Are the teachers that present during those inservices rewarded in any way, or is there any sort of incentive for presenting to their peers?

Louise: Because it is on district time, we are not allowed to give a stipend, but we certainly show our gratitude. We might have lunch together. We might buy them lunch, but it is really voluntary because it is on contract time. And Steve, the executive coordinator, is great at showing his gratitude and telling people thank you, and I think that means a lot to people (personal communication, June 9, 2011).
This could provide an opportunity for Hirst Educators to present about their experiences to other teachers and promote use of museum resources.

Associated with inservices, there may not be a full understanding on the museum educator’s part of what types of activities or initiatives are being emphasized or introduced at district teacher inservices (research journal, May 24, 2011). If local museum educators were invited to attend those inservices, they might get a better sense of that and what local teachers are interested in learning about. Being invited to attend content inservices could provide museum educators a place to be visible to art teachers and promote museum resources.

An experience such as a curriculum specialist accompanying a school fieldtrip to the museum could provide both incentive and recognition to a teacher. There would also be incentive for the museum educator to provide a meaningful fieldtrip experience if a district administrator were to join a school group. The museum educator would be able to showcase a typical tour, current programming and how the museum is able to provide meaningful experiences for local students. The district administrator could promote museum programming more adequately if he or she were to actually experience a museum tour with a group of students. This act could lead to strengthened relationships on all sides, but it would take planning and preparation.

Another way that district curriculum specialists can provide incentive and support to teachers is through local professional networking opportunities in the content area. Marcella, Louise, Lisa and one other city art teacher comprise the executive planning committee for the fall 2012 state-affiliated NAEA conference that will take place in their city. Teachers might have more incentive to participate in the professional conference since it is being held locally. Marcella seems more likely to be supported by central administration because of her established
personal and professional relationships. Her ideas could be more influential (more easily accomplished or heard by more people) because of these relationships.

Marcella has a strong relationship with Louise and commented that she felt very supported by Louise and Steve, the director of fine arts in central administration, but not as supported by her own school administration. She claimed that Louise “does it not because it’s her job and she is getting paid for it; she does it because she has a mission. She believes that this is what she needs to do.” Undoubtedly, Marcella feels more support from district arts administrators because they know her and her needs as an art teacher better than her current school administration does. Marcella may have more incentive to serve on professional associations because of the opportunity to maintain close personal and professional ties with Louise.

*Issues of Time*

Developing curriculum for fieldtrips and experiences with museum resources takes time. According to Jack, teachers want user-friendly resources that will aid them in addressing curriculum standards. If they are asked to create content based around a museum fieldtrip, he felt that many would not put in the extra work. If resources connected to the standards were created by the museum, Jack thought that social studies teachers would be more likely to take advantage of museum programming and resources and he would be more likely to promote them. He said that it takes a lot of extra time to develop curriculum.

Jack said that teachers want to take their students on a fieldtrip and have the museum provide the service. He did not think that most teachers want to have much to do with creating the experience. Lack of time contributes to this mindset. This passivity on the part of teachers when engaging with museums (Liu, 2000) contributes to an unclear vision of what teachers
expect from a museum educator. And certainly the museum educator at the Hirst Museum lacks the time to commit to create curriculum. Because of the tension evident for neither the museum nor the school district wanting to take responsibility for writing curriculum for museum pieces applicable for schools, there seemed to be a lack of administrative support on both ends. These administrators were protecting the educators they serve. Constance was defending Lisa and the fact that she was not able to devote time to curriculum. Jack was defending the teachers he served, indicating that creating museum-based curriculum is not part of the teachers’ job responsibilities. But both sides indicated there is need for it.

Lisa also does not have time to devote to creating online resources, something that Jack sees as an ideal for connecting museums and teachers. He said that online resources created by a museum provide a way for teachers to access museum resources on their own time. Jack mentioned this as something that wouldn’t take away from course time at school with students. He asserted that there are so many online resources for teachers out there, that there is heavy competition for teachers’ attention. He also recognized that often, when he sends resource links to teachers and follows up with those teachers, they may not have looked at it, usually due to lack of time. Inservices to show teachers how to use or effectively incorporate online resources could be beneficial for museums to provide. Online resources may be easy and practical for a curriculum specialist to promote to teachers.

Another issue is the time that the curriculum specialists have to devote to their teachers’ needs. Before the 2011-2012 school year began, Louise’s position was cut down to 3 days a week instead of full time. This was due to budget cuts. It sends a message to local art teachers about the perception the local school district holds of the arts. Along with this cut came other new district-wide stipulations for the year, including scheduling changes in the elementary
schools. The schedule change took away planning time from elementary art teachers and among other things, makes it more difficult for elective teachers to take fieldtrips.

*Support from within Teachers’ School Buildings*

In this section, priorities that affect support for museum-school relations at the school level are discussed. These priorities include: time, scheduling, acquisition of resources, and recognition of teachers for participation. School administrators need to see that a potential museum-school collaboration will address curricular standards, will not cost the school in terms of monetary resources and will be manageable logistically to fit within time and scheduling constraints of the school day.

*Time*

One issue is time for teachers to be able to attend museum workshops or participate in museum-school collaborations. This is managed at the school level. Most of the work involved in external collaborations, such as museum-school collaborations, must be done on the teacher’s own time. For museum-school collaborations that take place during work hours, such as fieldtrips and assemblies, teachers must be creative with scheduling and logistics; it is certain that many hours of unpaid work are put into the planning of those events. If a teacher is interested in learning about museum resources that would connect to his or her curriculum, that also must be done on personal time.

School administrators must implement mandates from district administration at the school. One area of mandates is related to district inservice days. Issues related to NCLB testing and district-wide behavior management plans are currently the focus of these inservices. Teachers did not feel they would be supported by their school administration to take part in a professional development activity at a museum during paid inservice time.
During the July 2010 workshop, Lisa mentioned to teachers that she had thought about the possibility of having a Hirst Educators workshop on a district inservice day. The teachers told her of their experiences with inservices. They did not hesitate to voice their frustrations about mandated district inservices, which they described as “just going through PowerPoints.” One teacher mentioned that teachers at her school would be forbidden to attend a non-mandated inservice like a Hirst Educators workshop during that time.

**Scheduling**

At Marcella’s elementary school, the fourth grade students went to the museum exhibit (fieldtrip visit) in October, heard pilot Buz Carpenter speak at the assembly at their school, and then created artwork based on those experiences. Marcella had to be cognizant of all of the scheduling issues involved with planning these events. There was implied support from school administration for the fieldtrip and assembly to occur. As an established teacher in the building and school system, Marcella has a good working relationship with her school administration and she made it work.

Marcella looks for ways to bring in guest speakers for students at her school and feels confident organizing and scheduling an assembly into the school day. This demonstrates a level of comfort with her school administration and knowledge of how to communicate with colleagues about effects of scheduling changes. It shows that the school administration is willing to support her. The experience that she had with Lisa and the Buz Carpenter assembly may have contributed to her confidence level within her school. Since the Buz Carpenter assembly was such a success, Marcella’s colleagues and administration may be more likely to support her ideas for future assemblies.

Marcella: We can have speakers come out to our school, but we can’t really take the kids places. We can definitely have people come out to the school. That works good! So I
guess I need to look more into that, if they have those kinds of opportunities (personal communication, September 26, 2011).

Though Marcella was able to take her students on a fieldtrip during the 2010-2011 school year, the changed daily schedule for the 2011-2012 school year now makes it impossible. She said that it is deflating to her that support is given at the school level, but not given by the district.

**Acquisition of Resources**

In Addison’s school, the timing was right to receive support from her administration for the Buz Carpenter assembly, which occurred in November 2010. She introduced the idea to her principal in August soon after the first Hirst Educators workshop and they were able to connect the assembly to a school-wide initiative. The science committee at the school plans two events per year based around a theme. She collaborated with a science teacher to plan the event, and both were flexible when the assembly date was changed by the museum. Since Addison teaches at a science and technology magnet school, the content of the Buz Carpenter assembly was appropriate. Addison was supported by her colleagues at her school, who helped her with set up and preparations for the assembly, including the PE teacher, who set up the stage for the speaker.

Addison: Being a part of the Hirst Educators and the relationship that was created because of it with Lisa, put me in good light with my principal because she could tell that I was bringing good things to the school. And then after we did the Buz Carpenter presentation to our school, [my school] piggybacked on top of that for the end of the school year. We called it Flight Extravaganza, and had 20 different presentation people that came in from Spirit to the school. I had a friend who was a pilot come and do presentations of what it requires to be part of the aircraft industry here in [the city]. So, everything just shined this last year, and it had a lot to do with my relationship with the Hirst Educators, and having special benefits that other teachers in [the city] didn’t have (personal communication, June 13, 2011).

Because Addison planned ahead with her administration months in advance, they were able to coordinate for the assembly in November 2010. They were able to correlate the assembly to fit with the theme of flight for the school year, since Buz Carpenter spoke to students about his
experiences as a pilot. The assembly was a good fit for the school and it was free to the school, which contributed to support from the school administration.

Another example of support from school administration was when Marshall led efforts at his school to address History standards through a fieldtrip to the Hirst Museum. He said that it was easy to convince his team of teachers and school administration about going to the museum on a fieldtrip. One of the reasons he cited was that it was free (Hirst Museum paid for busing), and also that “they got excited when he told them about his experiences with Hirst Educators during the summer of 2010.” His statement shows support by his colleagues and administration. Marshall was able to share what he had learned through the workshops with the other teachers at his school. The free busing coupled with Marshall’s willingness to organize the trip logistically contributed to the success of the trip. If the museum had not provided bus reimbursement, the trip would have been less likely to happen. Additionally, if Marshall had not known how to connect History standards to the exhibit, the trip would not have been approved by administration.

**Recognition of Teacher Participation**

The teachers in this study that participated in museum-teacher collaborations received recognition from their school administrators in front of their colleagues. This mainly came as being thanked publicly at the school assemblies for their role in the planning process. They were appreciated for their efforts to create supplemental learning opportunities for their schools.

Besides being recognized publicly, Addison was given encouragement by her principal through her teaching evaluation that goes in her permanent record. In Addison’s formal teaching evaluation during her first year at the science and technology magnet school, she marked herself
as a 4 out of 5 in the category for professional development, and her principal changed it to a 5 out of 5 (highest).

Addison: When my principal was going through my evaluation process she said, ‘no, you are a member of the Hirst Educators, which is putting yourself out there to learn more and obtain strategies to be a better teacher.’ And so she moved me from a 4 to a 5 on my rating scale. I was very excited about that. You know, everyone wants compliments and affirmation that what you are doing is right. So that was definitely a compliment from her (personal communication, January 24, 2011).

Her principal was able to see the positive effects of Addison’s participation in Hirst Educators for students at the school.

Border Crossing

Border crossing occurs when work traverses traditional boundaries and conventional understanding of knowledge (Bresler, 2003; Solomon, Marshal, & Gardner, 2005). During this study border crossing occurred in ways that were cross-disciplinary and cross-institutional.

**Crossing Disciplinary Boundaries**

Local museums offer resources that can connect all subject areas together for meaningful learning. Disciplinary boundary crossing between art and other subjects will be discussed in the curriculum section, which follows this section. It was significant to seek out teachers of subjects other than art to participate in the workshops and to involve the district’s social studies curriculum specialist. Learning in the workshops and collaborations was at a much deeper level because of the perspectives by educators from disciplines other than art. Though the main disciplinary boundary crossed in the study was between art and social studies, there were many other subject areas discussed through thematic content of the artwork.

**Crossing Institutional Boundaries**

In this section, the following will be discussed: 1) boundaries museums and schools; 2) university, museum and schools border crossing; 3) university museums. The institutions of
museums, schools and universities each have differing priorities and approaches to education, but crossing institutional borders for purposes of collaborating and addressing educational goals can benefit all involved. Suggestions are offered for ways to cross institutional borders that separate museum educators from school and university educators. Challenges arise in this process, which are discussed.

An interlude between the first two areas will be provided about the role of the facilitator as an educational entrepreneur. The role of this person crosses institutional boundaries. It is important that this person is affiliated with a participating institution to avoid existing in a space outside institutions, lacking support.

**Boundaries Between Museums and Schools**

Lisa did not have much experience working with local teachers at the beginning of the study, aside from when they initiated fieldtrips to the museum. Improving communications with teachers, which led to improved understandings on the part of museum staff, was a positive result of the study. Prior to the study, there was no understanding at the museum of how to connect effectively with schools and teachers. Lisa said that she wanted to know from local teachers what they really wanted from the museum.

Lisa: Educators are a really hard group in that they—like everyone—are overworked, and while we believe we are giving them all these great opportunities, in the end is it what they really want? I would like for the Hirst Educators, at a more critical mass, to sit down and say, here’s what we really want. Knowing that we may get 100 people in a room and they may all say something different (personal communication, January 24, 2011).

Lisa didn’t seem to know if the opportunities being provided to the teachers was what they really wanted. The focus group in September 2011 provided some insights, but no direct answers.

Another museum staff member, Robin, also did not understand how to make connections with teachers, but saw benefits for teachers of participating in the Hirst Educators group. Robin
served as Lisa’s education intern for two years and now serves as the special projects

coordinator. In this role, she comes into contact with schools and teachers. In January 2011, she

said:

Robin: Because the teachers are part of the workshops, they have had opportunities come
to them that the whole community of teachers missed out on. I’m sure the other schools
would have loved to have had a free lecture of that stature too. But because they weren’t
a part of that smaller network they have missed out on it. There’s got to be some
connection to get that larger community more tied into the museum. I don’t know what
that hook is. I don’t know if teachers are more 9-5 in mind, and don’t want to make those
extra efforts. I don’t understand how we have to make those connections (personal
communication, January 21, 2011).

Robin recognized the Hirst Educators had received opportunities because of their membership in
the group that other local teachers had not. She mentioned her frustration with not understanding
how to hook teachers in or make connections with teachers. This echoed Lisa’s perspective from
earlier in the study. I followed up with Robin to see if she had any updates to her opinions from
the previous year.

Robin: I still believe that this network of educators—those that participated in the Hirst
Educators opened themselves up to something very special. Because they were willing to
commit time outside of their regular teaching circle, their personal time, they had
opportunities offered to them that were provided because of their commitment, time and
networking efforts. The value of their time, reflected in what they received is immense. I
wish the group had grown throughout the various series, that the participants had worked
to bring someone new to the mix, a co-teacher, an educator from another school, another
department into the group and that the experience had been shared by a larger number
(personal communication, March 26, 2012).

Though Robin thinks communication has been opened between the museum and local teachers
through the program, she didn’t comment on what the museum had learned from interactions
with the teachers.

Beyond special opportunities that came about for Hirst Educators members, Cynthia
began bringing her classes on a regular basis to the museum because of the program. Lisa has
expressed regret about not taking advantage of the close proximity of Cynthia’s school (the art
magnet high school) over the years. Lisa aimed to figure out how she could be of service to local teachers over the course of the study and she started to really connect with the art teachers at Cynthia’s school. The school is two blocks away from the museum and has a formal partnership with the university. Due to the close proximity and influence of Cynthia, several of the teachers from the school took their students for tours and events during the school day in 2011. It has mainly been within the timeframe of this study that communications and relationships have strengthened between Lisa and the art department at that school.

Lisa: One thing I have a sincere feeling of regret about—I told Louise about this—is that [the art magnet school that Cynthia teaches at] has been two blocks away all of these years. How could we have not done this earlier? It all comes back to the fact that I didn’t know how to be of service to the district. And all along, they didn’t know what to ask for. So it just really required somebody going to them and saying, ‘I’ve got a crazy idea. I think this could be kind of cool.’ My real feeling of regret is that I had not earlier forged a stronger relationship with them. And now in talking with the art teachers there, they don’t seem too worried, concerned or upset. They are optimistic. Now they are going to use our bus reimbursement money (personal communication, February 25, 2012).

The school will be moving into another building across town to start the 2012-2013 school year and will no longer be within walking distance to the museum. Lisa seems to realize that she had missed an opportunity for several years of working with teachers at that particular school. Because of her other priorities and lack of time, this was likely due to being reactive, rather than proactive with the schools. Now teachers at this school have been very supportive of museum programming and Lisa has figured out ways to collaborate with them. She indicated that the teachers are optimistic about maintaining their relationship with the museum.

Communications with district curriculum specialists have also improved, particularly with Louise. Lisa articulated how her relationship with Louise positively changed over the course of the study. She stated that what was needed was for her (Lisa) to put forth effort in approaching Louise with project ideas and resources.
Lisa: I feel much more connected with Louise now. I feel like Louise believes more in the Hirst Museum and is more excited about what we are doing. She has come through for us by sending out emails to teachers about events and programs. She is doing an upcoming Senior Wednesday program for me at the museum (talking about her own mosaic work). She truly seems excited about the program that will be hosted at the museum for the fall state-affiliated NAEA conference. I think she trusts us more. I’ve always come to her saying, ‘how can I be of service to you?’ I don’t think she ever had an answer. I think she was waiting for me to figure it out and come to her. And now that we have come to her with some valid projects and resources, she is very excited. I don’t think she had time to figure out how I can be of service; she just didn’t want to tell me that because that might look like she was saying ‘I don’t want your help’ (personal communication, February 25, 2012).

In addition to being more supportive of programming for local teachers, Louise has become involved with Lisa with her Senior Wednesday museum program, which provides programs for senior citizens in the community. She has also partnered with her through the state-affiliated NAEA board they serve on together so that the Hirst can host an event for art teachers attending the state conference in the fall of 2012.

*School-museum partnership documents.* I found two documents from museum literature whose frameworks were clarifying and I shared them with Lisa. The first was the document, *True needs, true partners: Museums serving schools* (U.S. Institute of Museum and Library Services, 1998). It identified twelve conditions for successful school-museum partnerships:

1. Obtain early commitment from appropriate school and museum administrators.
2. Establish early, direct involvement between museum staff and school staff.
3. Understand the school’s needs in relation to curriculum and state and local education reform standards.
4. Create a shared vision for the partnership, and set clear expectations for what both partners hope to achieve.
5. Recognize and accommodate the different organizational cultures and structures of museums and schools.
6. Set realistic, concrete goals through a careful planning process. Integrate evaluation and ongoing planning into the partnership.
7. Allocate enough human and financial resources.
8. Define roles and responsibilities clearly.
9. Promote dialogue and open communication.
10. Provide real benefits that teachers can use.
11. Encourage flexibility, creativity, and experimentation.
12. Seek parent and community involvement (p. 50).
This list touches on many of the themes that have emerged in this research. It outlines conditions necessary for successful partnerships in an accessible way for both museums and schools. Curriculum specialists are addressed through the list, stakeholders I identify as having a key role in fostering successful partnerships between individual schools and museums. The list recognizes institutional differences, yet advocates for community design, an approach to evoke aliveness from stakeholders (Wenger et al., 2002).

The second document was Worts’ (2006b) Critical Assessment Framework for measuring museum projects and initiatives. This framework includes a numeric rating scale for stakeholders to rate performance and to assess museum meaning on three levels: personal, community, and museum. Worts claimed that the framework “is most useful as a reference in discussing and assessing the relative merits of various program strategies” (p. 43). Lisa had mentioned that practical guides for establishing and maintaining partnerships, based on research, such as these two documents, would be most appreciated by her (and the museum). In giving these documents to Lisa, I hoped to reinforce lessons that we had learned together through our study.

*Successes by the museum of crossing boundaries during the study.* The museum did successfully come to understand how to involve schools and educators and thereby crossed boundaries. The section is about the wider effects on the schools. Lisa was able to build relationships with a group of local teachers at different schools in the area, which provided direct access to the schools and some collaborations were able to reach a greater audience than just a small group of students. It was beneficial for the museum educator to learn more about school culture through facilitation of events within the schools, and through interactions with the district curriculum specialists.
Lisa had never taken a museum-sponsored guest speaker into the local schools prior to November 2010, when she hosted pilot Buz Carpenter for assemblies at three local schools. Then a year later, in November 2011, Lisa hosted another museum-sponsored guest speaker at another local school. These school assemblies reached hundreds of students and showed the schools and administrators that the Hirst Museum is interested in providing resources to them. A facilitator or supportive colleague from higher education can point out these achievements, continue to encourage museum-school partnerships and reflect with both the museum educator and teachers about the partnerships.

There were projects when the museum managed to connect with the local community through interactions with schools. The Art21 preview parties and student artwork exhibits at three local high schools is an example of Lisa expanding a program she has been doing for years to reach a new audience in the local community. Through this project she has had the opportunity to plan events in the local schools that will showcase student artwork, while promoting a museum program. As mentioned earlier, Lisa said that the high school students were most excited about people from the community and other artists seeing their artwork (personal communication, March 12, 2012). The judges for the student exhibits were community artists. The museum promoted the program in many avenues throughout the community. Along with the general public, Diller University Art and Design students were invited to the Trenton Doyle Hancock talk [the arts magnet high school where Cynthia teaches] on April 13, 2012. [The other participating high school in the district] was able to use bus reimbursement money from the museum to attend the lecture. There were many levels of community outreach achieved through this project. Lisa had not been involved in this way with local schools before this study and deserves full credit for the success of the program.
The Art21 project is an excellent example of a sustained outreach effort by the Hirst Museum. There is much potential for increased presence of the relationship between the museum and schools in the community. With financial aid from the grant for the project, the museum has heavily marketed the school partnerships that have been produced through the project. I suspect the professional relationship between Louise and Lisa will grow stronger after these events. There were shared goals between Lisa and the teachers involved in these individual school partnerships. Through large-scale social issues projects mentioned in this study, Lisa served as a liaison between the museum, local community, university and schools. She demonstrated skill in weaving together programming to fit all of these different audiences. Still missing were links to the museum’s permanent collection and stronger emphasis on curriculum.

Facilitator as Educational Entrepreneur

Educational entrepreneurs build mutual respect and trust, share credit, engage others through valuing individuals’ contributions and recognize the need for their support to accomplish education-oriented tasks (Bresler, 2009). Through the data, it became clear that there were ways that my background in higher education with knowledge of museums and schools aided in communication between them and fit with characteristics of an educational entrepreneur.

Animating others is important to educational entrepreneurs (Bresler, 2009; Miller & Boud, 1996). This notion promotes ways to activate or inspire others through creating conditions that interact with their experiences (Bresler, 2009). In part, I viewed my role as facilitator of Hirst Educators as an animator, intent on stimulating others’ learning (while also stimulating my own learning). These concepts can be applied to bringing together a museum educator and local teachers for engagement in professional development that weaves their fields together. I should note that I do not consider myself an intellectual entrepreneur, but I believe the concepts are
applicable in building relationships and new understandings between formal and nonformal educators.

In this study, my facilitator role was supported by the museum (given permission to conduct the project and research), but there was no commitment or responsibility to provide funding or rewards. I was motivated by the research and obtaining my degree. I felt like I was in a space between the borders of the institutions, struggling to find support and a home for the group. Neither the museum nor the school district wanted to take responsibility for maintaining sponsorship of the group. Because of this, there was not a clear definition of the group. If the facilitator (educational entrepreneur) is affiliated with a participating institution, he or she may be able to better acquire the necessary support and resources to maintain the group.

*University, Museum and Schools Border Crossing*

I suggest that higher educators are in good position to cross borders, serving as facilitators to increase understanding between the museum and schools. Through the facilitator role, a higher educator could consult with the museum and with school leaders to identify issues that exist between them, working to improve communications. The facilitator might convey to the museum and the schools how they might serve one another towards meeting teachers’ curricular goals; this would also address a priority of instructors in pre-service programs. Curriculum could be proposed or developed by higher educators (or pre-service teachers as part of coursework) for the museum to aid in the process of addressing identified issues by school leaders.

Other universities and museums are collaborating to implement programs that bring together museums and teachers. One of note is at University of British Columbia (UBC). In 2001, Kit Grauer, chair of art education at UBC, initiated collaboration with the Vancouver Art
Gallery and the UBC Museum of Anthropology that has evolved into courses in the museum space for graduate and pre-service students from diverse areas of education (Kalin et al., 2007). Another example is the work Renee Sandell has done with NAEA’s SummerVision DC program. This program began as an NAEA initiative, with the pilot program running in July 2010 (NAEA, n.d.). Sandell’s affiliation with George Mason University and partnerships she developed with Washington, D.C. museums coupled with support by NAEA have led to the sustainability of this teacher professional development program. Both Grauer and Sandell demonstrate characteristics representative of intellectual entrepreneurs. The educational programs they have initiated will continue in the future. They cross institutional borders and animate others through the learning possibilities they present.

Another example is the collaboration between the teacher education program at Lehman College (CUNY) and the American Museum of Natural History (NY). Using the Museum as a Learning Resource has been a required course for all master’s degree candidates in science education since 2003, when the college faculty recognized the experience at the museum had become as an essential component of teacher training (Aquino et al., 2010). These examples show ways that museums and teacher training programs have come to share vision and institutional priorities.

Arriving at the point of enacting collaborative possibilities between museums, higher education and local teachers is complex work. Every context is different and what works in one location might not work as well in another. Job pressures and responsibilities of museum staff vary depending on the priorities and size of the museum, which could affect the involvement level of the museum.
Course credit is an incentive for local teachers that can be provided by universities in good standing with museums. Bronwyn mentioned that an option for graduate credit could have attracted more teachers to participate in Hirst Educators. The existing relationship between the academic departments with the museum comes into play here. If a university museum does not have an art education graduate program at the university but does have an education or curriculum and instruction graduate program, a partnership for offering a course could still be considered. Gaining administrative support for offering course credit is one factor that could make initiatives by higher education to bring together museums and schools challenging.

*Border Crossing by University Museums*

Making university museums relevant beyond disciplinary borders is critical to ensuring future existence (Bartlett, 2012). Most recognize their core audience as faculty and students on the campus and work towards establishing the museum a site for interdisciplinary learning (Jandl, 2012). This section addresses specific border crossing of museums on university campuses.

The Mellon Foundation (Fabing & Goethals, 2007) found that university art museums are uniquely positioned to contribute to academic interdisciplinary goals within the institution and foster critical thinking. The longitudinal summative report provides a list of recommendations, including: examining mission and priorities; the importance of administrative support; involving faculty in discussions about use in teaching; designating a “curriculum coordinator” to serve as a liaison; planning for long-term sustainability (p. 30). One area of interest was that Fabing and Goethals found that without a designated “curriculum coordinator” to serve as a liaison between the museum and university faculty, museum staff were typically reactive rather than proactive with educational collaborations. This parallels the role of facilitator of the teacher group in this
study—someone dedicated to bringing together priorities of museums and schools. In my position, after listening to understand the issues of both institutions, I attempted to be proactive with actions to strengthen relations. Many larger museums have a separate coordinator for public programs or specifically for teacher programs within the education department but, in a small university museum, these initiatives typically fall to the museum educator. However, at times job responsibility boundaries are unclear.

When responsibilities overlap at a small museum like the Hirst, it is important that job expectations are known. Jandl (2012) states that “failure to assign specific job responsibilities and identify museum priorities will result in inefficiency and tension amongst the staff” (p. 127). Though I did not observe tension among the staff at the Hirst Museum, there were times when expectations for coordinating with university faculty may have been unclear. For example, the curator and public relations manager were given administrative support to each teach a course for the Art History department at Diller University. In those positions, they have extended their presence on campus and taken on responsibilities as educators. They also have more direct contact with faculty on campus because of these experiences. It was not clear to me if there are agreed upon procedures for working with Diller University faculty and how is that incorporated into a particular staff member’s responsibilities. Has this procedure been discussed and streamlined by the museum? What has been learned through interactions and collaborations with faculty by museum staff? How is this similar or different from working with local teachers in the community? These teaching initiatives demonstrate campus outreach by multiple museum staff, not only the museum educator. Though the courses taught by museum staff were in the Art History department, there are other collaborations occurring with other academic departments, emphasizing interdisciplinary connections with the collection.
Lisa has been working on a program with an English professor at Diller University related to the Gordon Parks’ photographs in the permanent collection. Every English 101 student visits the museum and writes about the photographs. Collaborating with different academic areas on campus for using museum resources cross borders, Lisa gains experience that could be applied to use with teachers of subjects other than art in the local school district. There are institutional differences that need to be considered between PK-12 and university settings and priorities, but the museum’s recent collaborations with university faculty could set the stage for more informed collaborations with the school district.

One example of faculty training and interdisciplinary use of the campus art museum is at the Spencer Museum of Art, University of Kansas. They were recipients of a Mellon Foundation grant and were considered a College and University Art Museum (CUAM) participating institution, which recognized university art museums that were “leaders in embedding their collections in multidisciplinary teaching and research, from humanities to the sciences” (Spencer Museum of Art, 2012). Pat Villeneuve developed a program at the Spencer two decades ago called University in the Art Museum that can serve as a model for faculty training and collaborations (see Martin-Hamon, Woods, & Villeneuve, 2012; Villeneuve, Martin-Hamon, & Mitchell, 2006). This program gained administrative support from the museum and university and boasts introducing hundreds of university faculty members to museum resources and strategies for engaging with art. It provides a basic framework for incorporating museum resources into the classroom. Once trained, the faculty members can do much of the class visit preparations themselves (Bartlett, 2012) and it is suggested that faculty integrating museum activities into course development integrate well with the rest of the course learning objectives.
At a small university museum like the Hirst, there is no funding for a specific “curriculum coordinator” or coordinator of teacher programming. However, an emphasis on training faculty members and local teachers could provide long-term benefits for the museum. Once these educators are trained and understand how to effectively collaborate with the museum, they might be able to encourage their colleagues to do the same. Villeneuve et al. (2006) said that the strength of the University in the Art Museum program lies in its relationships with faculty. (This would call for the Hirst Educators group to continue, since there were both local teachers and university educators involved.) Similarly, relationships built between Lisa and Hirst Educators, as well as with faculty members at Diller University, may lead to future cross-institutional partnerships. One recommendation that already fits with current practice at the Hirst Museum would be to continue to involve faculty from varied university departments in program planning meetings for upcoming exhibits. Likewise, local teachers and curriculum specialists could be invited to participate.

Another way to create deeper interdisciplinary connections and use of art museum resources by higher education is for art education faculty to collaborate with faculty of other subject areas. The faculty team could work with the museum educator to come up with a theme to explore through art in the museum’s collection. This theme could be approached through integrated curriculum that the professors create (see Institute for Visual Studies, 2012) in collaboration or consultation with the museum educator for a special topics course. This would be ideal for pre-service certification students or as a graduate level course for in-service teachers as a way to learn about integrated curriculum theory and methods through experiencing it.

Program planning meetings. The Hirst Museum consistently creates highly cross-disciplinary programming around their exhibits. Two examples are: Branded and On Display
(fall 2007) and *Art on Speed* (fall 2010), both organized by independent curators, Ginger Gregg Duggan and Judith Hoos Fox (see curatorsquared, 2010). These exhibits are mentioned over others because Constance and Lisa hosted program planning meetings months in advance of each of the exhibits. These meetings took place at the museum and consisted of invited professionals in multiple fields with connections to the content of the exhibits. The *Branded and On Display* program planning committee was held in April (the show opened in August) and consisted of 14 local professionals. Five of the 14 were from different departments on Diller University’s campus (communication, marketing and entrepreneurship, university relations, art and design), while the others were from local design and advertising companies. For the *Art on Speed* program planning meeting, Lisa invited Diller University engineering professors as well as a local creative agency that creates animation and digital graphics. Bronwyn also was a participant in this meeting.

The program planning meetings were Constance’s idea: a way to get community members more involved in programming. This demonstrated a savvy way of enticing new audiences. The meetings inspired programs affiliated with the exhibits that crossed borders, which included speakers and panel discussions on business and marketing in the galleries related to *Branded and On Display*. For *Art on Speed*, cross-disciplinary programming included a lecture by pilot Buz Carpenter and a dance performance by Diller University faculty and students. The business and marketing discussions brought in students and faculty from those departments on campus as well as professionals from the community. The Buz Carpenter lecture brought students and faculty from the aerospace engineering department and the local flight industry to the museum. And the dance performances brought in another example of integrated learning applications, attracting yet a different audience into the galleries.
Though program planning meetings take effort to organize, it is a way to involve diverse voices from the community and represent their interests in programming. Inviting participation from instructors of pre-service programs at the university, district curriculum specialists and local teachers would certainly aid in finding ties to curricular standards. Directing focus on programming goals of the museum from diverse voices could bring about new understandings between disciplines and professions represented in the meeting and work toward finding a shared vision.

**Curriculum**

Several issues related to curriculum arose over the course of the study. This section will discuss planning curriculum for teacher workshops at museums; approaches to facilitating curriculum; and selection of art for curriculum development with teachers. The section will start with a summary of how the curriculum for the workshops changed over time.

In the July 2010 workshop, the focus was on the permanent collection, including the exhibit that had just opened. Even though it was a new exhibit, it was work from the permanent collection. As the workshops continued, Lisa was most interested in promoting each new exhibit—to be able to use teaching strategies and introduce contemporary artists from the temporary exhibits to the teachers. The September 2010 workshop was based on a temporary exhibit, but also correlated with the permanent exhibit and it showcased the research that the teachers had done leading the tour of the sculpture. The January 2011 workshop was focused on a temporary exhibit but it was very thematic, so the curriculum became more integrated. Curriculum was based more on an issue and theme rather than on artwork. The June 2011 workshop featured much more cross-disciplinary curriculum, based more on social studies than art. The art was the foundation, but the curriculum was focused on addressing social studies
standards. It was loosely connected to the temporary exhibit on view, centered on Fisch Haus, a group of local artists in the community, but it mainly focused on artists from the state. It brought in resources from the [state] Historical Society and teachers from Hirst Educators presented about Outsider artists from the state. Over the course of these workshops, their curriculum and that created by the teachers became more integrated and tied to local and state resources.

*Planning Curriculum for Teacher Workshops at the Museum*

As I analyzed the data related to planning content for workshops at the museum, three topics were repeated multiple times. First, activities for teachers during teacher workshops must be engaging and participatory. Second, there was an issue with actually creating curriculum at the workshops and what to do with the curriculum if it was created. Third, there were issues with planning well in advance and over planning in general.

*Engaging activities.* Visitor-centered approaches (Falk & Dierking, 2000; Falk et al., 2007; Kothe, 2012; Schlievert & Fretz, 2010; Simon, 2010; Wallace Foundation, 2001) to museum education are not necessarily intuitive for those trained in more traditional museum education practice (Adams, Moreno, Polk, & Buck, 2003). Much effort was given to planning a variety of engaging activities for each of the workshops. However, when organizing with other presenters, at times the goal of participatory activities was not communicated clearly. One example is that the curator’s presentation at the June workshop would have been better if tangible resources were provided for teachers. This would have called for collaboration between the curator and myself. The curator could not be expected to create resources for teachers, but I could, after dialogue with the curator.

In general, Lisa realized that it takes additional effort to be visitor-centered but that customizing for particular audiences (to some degree) is necessary. A parallel can be made
between how important she thinks it is for teachers to visit the exhibit in advance of bringing students. It was equally as important for her to visit the schools prior to the screenings and exhibits. These experiences may help Lisa empathize with teachers and realize what types of learning activities would be of most interest to them.

*Creating curriculum at workshops.* There was struggle throughout the study related to devoting time in the workshops to creating curriculum for long-term use. It seems this should be an obvious goal for teacher workshops but, without a clear vision or direction for the teacher group, it was an overwhelming task to find an appropriate place to start. Since there had not been teacher workshops at the museum prior to the study and I was not from the area, Lisa and I were not sure what kinds of curricular resources would be of most use to local teachers. Beyond that, what would the museum do with the resources if they were created? We needed the opportunity to talk with teachers interested in using museum resources to see what would fit their needs.

Due to the four-day timeframe and the focus on the permanent collection, the July 2010 workshop provided the best opportunity for teachers to create curriculum and each of the participants came to the workshop knowing they would be doing this. They each researched, completed and discussed their F+T+C worksheets with one another on their selected sculptures. Copies of their work were provided to the group. However, their work did not appear to be of use to the museum. What is the best way to share this work with other teachers? Is there a consistent format that teachers could use to create curricular documents that could be disseminated on the museum’s website? (Currently, there are no resources for teachers on the website.) My observation is that materials will not be put on the museum’s website without a staff member dedicated to posting updates. It seems the museum strives to maintain consistency in the website
and would not want to post educational materials without knowing for certain more materials would be added later.

With the shorter time frames of the September, January and June workshops and with the emphasis on work from temporary exhibits, no time was devoted to creating curriculum. Vision for curriculum created at teacher workshops needs to be shared between the museum and school district. It should be developed over time and supported by both institutions. For quality and dedication by the teachers to a project like this, there needs to be incentive for them. There was no incentive at the July 2010 workshop. Likewise, there was no incentive for the teachers to jointly create and share resources related to the museum on the Hirst Educators site.

*Advanced planning and not over planning.* Just as museum educators are typically planning programming a year (or more) in advance, it is important for facilitators of teacher workshops at museums to also plan far in advance. This will allow for better communication with the museum educator and deeper research for appropriate use of time during the workshop. Activities based around pieces in the permanent collection may provide easier access for planning purposes than temporary exhibits of non-permanent work. However, there are ways to involve interested teachers in the planning process of workshops.

Marshall had great ideas that he shared with the group about assessment using Luke DuBois’ *Hindsight is Always 20/20* artwork. If he had been on an exhibition planning committee that looked at the work prior to it coming, he could have shared this idea with Lisa, which she could have taken to Jack. He might have seen this as an effective way to address curricular standards and promoted it to social studies teachers in the district in advance of the workshop. Even though this was a temporary exhibit, there is a permanent website of the work, which could be tied into learning standards and pacing guides.
Moisan (2009) warns against over planning in museum-teacher partnerships, encouraging opportunities to emerge during the collaboration itself. As the facilitator, I found it to be challenging to know how many activities to plan and the time length necessary for each. I can relate this to issues of time management that occur with new teachers or when teaching a new course. It takes experience and knowledge of one’s audience (and their experiences) to know how to efficiently plan for workshops. Appropriate time designation for activities might always be hard in the beginning stages of any collaborative museum-teacher group. It seems that flexibility and reflection are key to the facilitator role.

In all of the workshops, I tried not to over plan but should have planned more in terms of curriculum development by the teachers. One example is that I researched in advance interdisciplinary resources that would connect to the temporary exhibit for the June workshop on local and state artists. While researching I found teaching resources created about Gordon Parks through the state Historical Society. I kept uncovering relevant connections to the theme of the workshop that I felt were important to include in the itinerary. However, I over planned again: I was trying to fit in many activities and resources. This left less time to digest and reflect on the material presented as a group. As I discuss later, it would have been good to devote more time to developing curriculum around Gordon Parks’ work.

**Approach to Facilitating Curriculum**

Over time and through multiple interactions with the Hirst Educators, my understanding of facilitating a group of teachers of several different disciplines and grade levels changed. They demonstrated how intentional scaffolding of information and questioning is significant to all learners, regardless of age, experience or learning setting. Vertical teaming was another aspect that I was not fully aware of how to apply to teacher participants’ learning at the beginning of the
study. Marcella brought to my attention that this strategy of interaction between teachers of various age levels of students added to her learning in the workshops. I now believe that combining scaffolding of content with vertical teaming for teacher workshops in museums has potential to increase learning for participants (and facilitators). Curriculum at teacher workshops needs to include appropriate images for teachers of different grade levels and subject areas if they are the invited audience. When a teacher workshop is open to all local PK-12 teachers (regardless of subject), how does a museum determine what type of curriculum to use? Through vertical teaming strategies and scaffolding of content, it is possible to base a teacher workshop on a theme that can be approached at all different age levels.

Vertical teaming. In January 2011, Marcella reflected on her participation in the Hirst Educators group. As past president of her state-affiliated chapter of NAEA, Marcella has attended many state and national conferences. However, she equally values learning about resources with other teachers in her local community.

Marcella: I think any of these kinds of connections for teachers in a way is like going to a national conference, but you don’t have to go quite as far. You know, it’s right there in your community, which is better because it is in your community. So people are talking about your community and things that they’ve done and ways that they’ve approached it. And different levels… I mean, we’ve got elementary, middle and high school teachers involved. And so we have that range of ages and subject areas. You know, we’ve got vertical teaming going on, which we don’t usually have the opportunity to do! The elementary art teachers usually just meet with the elementary art teachers, and maybe once a year we get together with teachers of the other levels, but we really don’t have much opportunity for vertical teaming. And it is vertical teaming with people in other subject areas and school districts too, so in that’s good (personal communication, January 21, 2011).

Marcella acknowledged value in the opportunity to join with other local teachers for professional development in a manner of vertical teaming. These opportunities do not present themselves very often and may not be feasible for school districts to implement. It could benefit teachers to team
vertically with their local colleagues for the purposes of learning about curriculum sequencing and teaching strategies at the different levels.

This thought of Marcella’s shared stuck with me. It made me think of ways that vertical teaming among teachers through utilization of museum resources could benefit teachers and local schools. She emphasized the fact that one reason she was drawn to the Hirst Educators group was because it is in her community and that it had potential to connect teachers in the same way that professional conferences can. The museum is a neutral location that can serve as a space to bring together teachers of all levels and disciplines. Vertical teaming opportunities at museums might benefit museum educators by providing access to teacher opinions of using museum resources with different levels of students. Museum educators and teachers may be able to exchange teaching strategies if they are able to explore the resources and brainstorm together through a vertical teaming approach.

_Scaffolding._ Marshall learned about the Luke DuBois exhibition at the Hirst Museum during the September 2010 Hirst Educator workshop. He was able to connect the exhibit with eighth grade American History standards in his curriculum. At the workshop, he learned from Lisa ways to approach the artwork in the exhibition with students and background context about the art and artist. He received digital resources related to the exhibit at the workshop that he could use with students. Logistical procedure and components of school visits, including pre-visit, during visit and post-visit activity implementation were discussed with teachers at the July 2010 and September 2010 workshops. Marshall used all of this background knowledge when he created curriculum and planned the fieldtrip for the eighth grade class at his middle school in October 2010.
Marshall reflected on his pre-visit planning for taking his classes to the Hirst Museum. He was able to create strong connections for his students through attention to communicating how the exhibit was linked to what they were studying. This enabled memory of previous classroom discussions of the artwork when they visited it, which may have led to heightened perception or understanding of the work once seen as a series in the gallery.

Marshall: The real buzzword in education right now is scaffolding—scaffolding students up, and that’s what I tried to do before our fieldtrip to the Hirst in October. We scaffolded them up, starting with museum etiquette and exposing them to online versions of the art that would be in the exhibit, how it connects to their lives as middle schoolers and in the curriculum that they are studying right now. We made it applicable to them and built up a certain comfort level, so that when they were in the museum, they had some confidence about the pieces that they were seeing. They had engagement and interest before going to the museum. And then we’re like, ‘this is how it applies to you. This relates to what we’re studying.’ The Hindsight is Always 20/20 exhibit applies because in eighth grade they study American History and we study the different Presidencies. I think they were able to really connect with that because it wasn’t just random art displays (personal communication, January 21, 2011).

The way that he described the intentional scaffolding of information for his students provides a thoughtful parallel for how a museum educator or facilitator of professional development for teachers might think about scaffolding instruction for a teacher workshop. Scaffolding instruction helps a learner undertake a task or goal that may be beyond one’s current understanding and is implemented through cognitive and emotional domains (Bean & Stevens, 2002; Lepper & Hodeell, 1984). Thinking and designing a museum teacher workshop in a scaffold-type structure may be more likely to translate into school culture.

Bean and Stevens (2002) stated that beyond scaffolding of instruction, intentional scaffolding of reflection might shape teachers’ reflective responses, with typical comments referencing personal beliefs and their own pedagogical decisions. Insights articulated through reflections by teachers could be used by the museum to communicate with the local school district about how museum resources can address curricular goals.
Selection of Art for Curriculum Development

An issue that came up many times in the data was related to what type of art is best for teachers to focus on at workshops. There was tension between museum and school priorities about this topic. Should artwork chosen to discuss be from the permanent collection or temporary exhibits? It seemed that Lisa was interested in promoting the programming she had organized around exhibits in the galleries at the time of the workshops, which were most often temporary exhibitions. This could be because she is expected by the museum to promote her programming, especially since school groups contribute a large portion of annual attendance (18-20% was one figure Lisa gave me). It could also be because the physical museum space consists of three galleries on the second floor and hallway exhibition space on the first floor; so often the majority of the exhibits on view (and most accessible) are temporary. However, the outdoor sculpture collection is permanent and always on view.

There are reasons to justify focus on work from the both the permanent collection and temporary exhibits. Work from the permanent collection has potential to be explored on a deeper level over time through multiple visits, since it is owned by the museum. Teachers could access resources from the museum’s artist files about the work and artist. Development of curriculum about works in the permanent collection could be gradual and used at the museum over years. Teachers may be able to repeat learning activities year to year that are focused on pieces in the permanent collection. On the other hand, curriculum focused on temporary exhibits would have tendency to be most used during the time that the exhibit was housed at the museum. These resources could still be used after the exhibit, especially if there is access to online images of the work, but it may not promote sustainable use by teachers. Focus on temporary exhibits and
programming might add new perspective and exposure to unfamiliar artists, which can bring new excitement and energy to teachers and students.

An example of successful implementation of curriculum based on temporary work was the many ways that Cynthia was able to involve her high school and college students with content based around the Alfredo Jaar exhibit at the Hirst Museum.

Cynthia: The work stimulated their creativity and gave the students knowledge of something that they may not have known about previously—such as the topic of Rwanda and genocide. And how we got involved in the bones project with the artist, and how Lisa talked to them about different parts of the world that genocide is still happening—people are often surprised at these things. It opens up a conversation in the classroom that wouldn’t have existed before, had it not been for the exhibition. It’s a great resource for me (June 13, 2011).

Cynthia recognized the relevancy of exposure to current events and social justice issues that contemporary art often addresses. The art and resources from the workshop were beneficial to meeting her goals and she acknowledged that the Alfredo Jaar exhibit exposed her and her students to much more than just art. It provided a platform to talk about issues of humanity.

Cynthia: As an educator, I’ve had a lot of growth through the museum. This concept has been on my mind because of constantly having something new—refreshing your lesson plans, having something new all of the time that is keeping you interested in what you do. The museum is one way I do that, because all of the time there is a new exhibit coming through. Therefore, I can have new plans, something new for my classroom to introduce to them. This is going on year two [with the Hirst], so I have always had something like that to offer to my students, a new experience, and it is helpful to me to keep invigorated and excited about art and teaching about art. I use the museum as a resource for that all the time now. It has been good for me and good for my students (personal communication, September 22, 2011).

Cynthia feels like she and her students have benefitted from continually seeing new art at the museum. The always-changing nature of museums can provide rejuvenation for teachers interested in staying current in their practice. For teachers like Cynthia, who actively seek local connections and new teaching resources to inspire their own learning and spark interest in their students, strengthening relationships with museum staff can have mutually beneficial results.
However, not all teachers are like Cynthia. Testing mandates make it challenging for teachers of subjects other than art to fit in topics outside the learning standards that do not appear in the pacing guides for the course. And work from the permanent collection has potential to engage the entire community (Wallace Foundation, 1998;1999).

Next, I present two bodies of work in the Hirst Museum’s permanent collection that could serve as focus for developing curriculum for classroom use. These are in addition to the outdoor sculpture collection, which is always accessible. Work by Gordon Parks is an identified collection goal; it seems that curriculum created to accompany his work and its repeated use would benefit both the museum and the schools. Curriculum created for pieces in the permanent collection by Art21 affiliated artists would also seem to match priorities of the museum and schools. Focusing curriculum development on these pieces might further promote relationships between the museum and local schools inspired by Art21. All of these works are about issues—topics that cross subject areas—and encourage integrated curriculum.

*Gordon Parks’ work.* In 2008, Diller University was chosen to receive 140 boxes of 20th century photographer (and author, filmmaker, composer) Gordon Parks’ papers and documents. Special Collections at the university houses the archives, but in the spring of 2010 the Hirst Museum hosted an exhibition, *Crossroads: The Art of Gordon Parks*, which featured work from the archives and an array of special public programming. A local school is named after the photographer that could benefit from a long-term partnership with the Hirst Museum and Diller University. Students and teachers at the school might have a special interest in learning about history through the artwork of Gordon Parks.

Work in the Special Collections at the university is part of a permanent collection. The Hirst Museum also owns works by Gordon Parks. Due to the works’ permanence in the
community and the overarching theme of social justice that connects his photographs, films, fiction, poetry and music, this could be a significant body of work as the focus of integrated curriculum. Diller University and the Hirst Museum have shown strong commitment to furthering education in the community about the work of Gordon Parks.

A way to extend that learning is through integrated curriculum created by local teachers or pre-service educators at Diller University. This could provide an opportunity for various pre-service programs to work together (for example: art education and secondary social studies pre-service students). Further, since many of these original pieces are on campus, local teachers or pre-service teachers might have the opportunity to discuss the work in the museum or archives with other teachers or students. Resources created about Gordon Parks by the state Historical Society, such as the ones given to teachers at the June 2011 workshop, might also be used.

I can envision a way for Lisa to collaborate with Lucy and the state Historical Society again, with the shared interest in educating about Gordon Parks’ work. Since the NAEA state-affiliated 2012 fall conference is in the city where the Hirst Museum is located, I suggested to Lisa that she and Lucy could consider proposing a session together. The theme of the conference is “Creating Vibrant Communities through Art and Design,” which Gordon Parks did through his photographs, films and poetry. Lucy could talk about resources on [state] Memories site and the Gordon Parks: First Survival, then Success resource that she provided teachers at the June 2011 workshop. She could focus on Gordon Parks using primary resources through the Historical Society. She could also introduce the Analyzing Photographs resource from the Library of Congress site.

Both Lisa and Lucy could introduce or identify themes and social issues that Gordon Parks worked with in his photographs. It might be possible to provide thumbnail images and
titles to teachers of the Gordon Parks photos in the Hirst Collection. Perhaps a representative from Diller University’s Special Collections could inform the teachers about what is in the collection and how to use resources with students or in their own research. Lisa liked the idea and said she would talk to Lucy about it. If it wouldn’t fit for a session at the conference, it might be written up as a grant proposal, since it brings together three institutions (Hirst Museum, [state] Historical Society, Diller University) along with local teachers to focus on furthering educational applications of Gordon Parks’ work.

Another connection to using the Gordon Parks photographs was provided by the curator. She said that Lisa has created a partnership over the past few years with the English 101 classes at Diller University in which every student in the general education course visits the museum to write about Gordon Parks’ photographs. This idea was tied to the curator’s direct experience with the Spencer Museum’s University in the Museum program (see Martin-Hamon et al., 2012; Villeneuve et al., 2006).

Cross-disciplinary curriculum could have been taken further in the Hirst Educator workshops to become integrated curriculum. The connections between disciplines in the workshops and events increased as time passed. If I had obtained the district pacing guides and curricular standards from all of the subject areas in July 2010, I could have facilitated tailored integrated curriculum from the start. I had been working with cross-disciplinary curriculum for many years but I believe that I came to understand integration on a deeper level through this study.

A focus on only an exhibit and the works within it is not necessarily the best way to develop integrated curriculum. Interpretive possibilities of collections go far beyond exhibits in the galleries (Bartlett, 2012). Moving beyond the individual pieces of art to recognize how a
group of artists represent a universal human commonality or enduring idea (Stewart & Walker, 2005; Stewart & Katter, 2008; Walker, 2001) can aid in identifying a strong theme for integration. Universal human commonalities include: experiencing the life cycles; work; symbols; time and place; searching for a larger purpose; aesthetic response; seeking social bonding; and connections to nature. Enduring ideas include: identity, survival, conflict, spirituality, fantasy, power, rites of passage, change, ritual, celebration, heroes, and ancestry. Once a theme is identified, it is possible to bring in notions of how different subject areas have approached issues related to the theme.

Artwork by artists featured by Art21. Seasons 1-6 of Art21 have focused on four themes each season. The themes for Season 6 (2012) were: change, balance, history and boundaries. Themes like this can be addressed by all subject areas and by all developmental levels. Though the content of Art21 videos can be complex, it is possible for the ideas and themes to be simplified for younger students. Marcella said that, even if she is not able to teach about issues too mature for her elementary students, she can figure out ways to incorporate the underlying theme into her instruction. Perhaps a goal could be for Lisa to talk with Louise about ways to integrate Art21 themes into local elementary art classrooms. Marcella could be invited into the conversation, since she has personal and professional interest and established relationships with both Lisa and Louise.

There were two elementary art educator participants in the nation-wide Art21 Educators 2012 program that incorporate Art21 artists into their curriculum (see Fusaro, 2012). A teacher that works in the same school as one of the art teachers commented on how the elementary art students are seeing the world with different eyes, making their own decisions, and thinking critically. This teacher saw a transformation in the art teacher’s teaching style after the Art21
Educators experience. Incorporating curriculum based on contemporary art and themes into the elementary classroom can be challenging for some teachers, but it is manageable and promotes critical thinking. Educators have much to learn from the elementary art teachers who have participated in this program.

The Art21 partnership between the Hirst Museum and local schools demonstrates how other museums can become more involved with selected high schools while promoting contemporary art. The content is provided by Art21, with an extensive archive of video, images and teaching resources available on their website. Teachers and museum educators interested in such a partnership could begin by dialoguing about these resources and how they might be used in the classroom and museum spaces.

Additionally, in the Hirst Museum’s permanent collection are artworks by artists featured in Art21 episodes. Lisa may want to bring this to the attention of Louise to brainstorm ways these pieces could be of use to PK-12 teachers. Local teachers might be able to create curricular resources for these pieces. These resources could become part of an educational resource archive at the museum. Local teachers could make a request to Lisa to view the actual artwork and learn about its acquisition from the curator. They could discuss the work (or utilize the teaching resource they create) with students or other teachers in the museum space. These resources could be shared digitally with other local teachers, distributed through the museum educator or through the local art curriculum specialist.

Another audience that could be considered for creating curriculum related to these artworks and associated Art21 resources would be the Diller University community. The themes of the Art21 episodes that the mentioned artists in the Hirst Collection are linked with include: paradox, stories, power, memory, structures, play, identity, systems, and ecology. These themes
could be addressed in many disciplines. Maybe it calls for a meeting similar to the program planning meetings the museum has held in advance of exhibits. The purpose would be to gather professors and pre-service education students from different departments on campus to join together at the museum, view the artwork and brainstorm about ways to apply the works in their teaching. To take it a step further, local teachers or district curriculum specialists representative of the various disciplines could be invited to participate.

There are ways this type of partnership could enlist further collaboration with a pre-service art education certification program (see Danker, 2012). Art21 could be discussed in a secondary methods course. Pre-service students could use or adapt available teaching resources or create their own to implement with local high school students. They could learn much from gaining experience helping local high school art departments host an Art21 screening, particularly if there was a partnership with the university museum in place. Pre-service students could glimpse the potential of teaching through contemporary art themes. They could aid in the planning process and details associated with organizing an exhibit and event for the community. They could see first-hand how collaborations within art departments and with a museum work.

Additionally, since the museum owns a number of artworks by Art21 artists, pre-service students might be able to create curricular resources for course credit based on these pieces. These student-made resources could become part of the museum’s educational resources. Pre-service students and local teachers could request to view the actual artwork and learn about its acquisition from the curator or museum educator. They could discuss the work (or use the teaching resource they create) with classmates, students or other teachers in the museum space. These resources could be shared digitally with local teachers, distributed through the museum educator or through the local art curriculum specialist.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This purpose of this study was to learn from an attempt to form a community of practice consisting of local teachers and an art museum educator. I wanted to learn about conditions necessary and the challenges of trying to form such a community of practice. The attempt to form a community of practice in one year proved to be too ambitious, though much was learned from it.

I came to the conclusion in July 2011 (during Action Research Cycle 4) that I would not be able to form a community of practice from the Hirst Educators group in one year. The time was too short and to continue the project would require a facilitator committed to it; otherwise there would be no regular events to bring the group together. Though my attempt to form a community of practice may not have succeeded, a lot of positive change occurred. There were several new or strengthened relationships between individual participants that will likely continue and are significant. There was significant professional development for most participants and some of this may continue to result in more school-museum collaborations. The success with collaborations—between the museum and individual schools and also with individual teachers—suggest that they are a more realistic goal for a small museum than is a community of practice.

The Hirst Educators came together only around planned events. I planned the workshops that were more formal in nature and Lisa initiated the individual partnerships that spawned from within Hirst Educators. Lisa provided me the opportunity and space to plan the events. Though the workshops may not be sustained when I leave, Lisa will stay in contact with the teachers that have been a part of them and further individual partnerships may come about. She has formed
personal and professional relationships with these teachers and they have shown prolonged interest in museum programming and resources.

In this chapter, I will answer the research questions presented in the beginning of the study. Following that, other lessons learned through the study, conclusions, possible directions for further study and recommendations will be discussed.

Research question 1: What are the difficulties involved in, and the conditions necessary for, forming a community of practice among this group of teachers and a museum educator?

Difficulties Encountered

For a community of practice, three elements must exist: a domain of knowledge; a group or community of people who care about the domain, and shared practice (Wenger et al., 2002). In this case, the domain (what brought the participants together to guide learning) was in the use of museum resources for teaching. Various degrees of commitment to the domain were shown by participants. The group included museum staff and local public school teachers of different levels and disciplines. The shared practice was teaching, including teaching in formal school settings and the nonformal museum setting.

It was difficult to create a shared vision in the group and is something that takes time to do. A community of practice—and a school-museum partnership—needs a common vision of its goals. Goals can grow and change with a group but a shared vision is not something that can be imposed by the facilitator. A shared vision must emerge from within the group. If I had a vision for the group at the beginning of the study I would have had to sell the group members on that vision; I hoped for it to grow organically through activities and leadership from participants. I had not been in a community of practice between a museum and teachers before and I found it difficult to know how to promote such a vision. It was a learning process. There may be guiding
principles but every situation is different. In the case of individual school-museum partnerships, creating a common vision early on may be easier to achieve. Use of a planning document (see Lehman & Igoe, 1981) or, in the case of Lisa’s Art21 project, stated goals outlined in the grant documents can make goals and expectations of both sides clear.

Though the participants were all interested in using museum resources, they did not have a common set of more specific goals. The settings in which they worked and their varying educational background and experiences, affected their assumptions, behaviors, understandings and approaches to using museum resources in schools. Few of them had a long-term perspective on the goals of the group and its possibilities. They acknowledged their interest in the domain but there were issues of resources, time constraints, and various conditions that affected the integration of resources into curriculum at the school level.

Lack of time was a major reason why it was difficult to create a shared vision. The museum educator did not have enough time to devote to teacher programming because of other job responsibilities and priorities, and the teachers lacked time for outside professional development opportunities and curriculum development. Due to distance and time, I was unable to make more regular visits to participants. A major conclusion is that some insiders from each institutional setting (museum and schools) need sufficient time assigned to devote to the group’s efforts.

Another difficulty was the lack of incentive for teachers to attend the workshops. There was low attendance at the first two workshops (July 2010 and September 2010) and it was difficult to figure out how to provide professional development points through the district for participating teachers. Once Louise assisted with listing Hirst Educators workshops in advance
on My Learning Plan, there was increased attendance. Attendance numbers at the January 2011 and June 2011 workshops were much higher than previous workshops.

A further difficulty was that no one at the museum really understood the local schools or the school district: how to work with them (beyond fieldtrips) or what teachers would find useful from the museum. There were good intentions and museum staff felt that they had beneficial resources to offer but they were unsure of how to communicate with teachers or district administrators. The educational background experiences of the museum staff were in areas other than education, which is probably why there were difficulties in communication.

I found out early in the study that there was a history of mutual benign neglect (Ebitz, 2008a) between museums in the city and the school district. Later (June 2011), I found out that the curriculum specialists were aware that the museums thought they (the school district) were hard to work with. Not much had been done to discuss this problem. Some of it seemed to be the effects of NCLB policy. These effects on the local school district have diminished Louise’s position as arts curriculum specialist (full time down to 3 days a week) and rearranged scheduling in the schools to focus priority on tested subject areas. New scheduling constraints make it more difficult for school fieldtrips to occur. NCLB has determined the focus of district inservices and has limited the curriculum specialists’ ability to lead content-specific inservices. The museums may not fully understand how pressures associated with NCLB affect district administrators, schools, teachers and students. They did not know how to best support the schools’ priorities of meeting standards.

Conditions Necessary

Administrative support is necessary from the museum, the school district and the school building for successful museum-school collaborations. From the museum, long-term vision,
fundraising and providing time for the museum educator to devote to teacher programming is necessary. District administrators can support collaborations through opening communication channels, providing incentive for teacher participation, and recognizing the issues of time involved. School administrators can support teachers through flexibility with time and scheduling, figuring out ways that available resources can fit with goals of the school, and recognizing teachers for their contributions. Though most of these conditions were absent at the beginning of the project, significant progress was made with them during the year.

Creating a community of practice in this context would require longer-term commitment by leaders of the institutions and members in the group from the different institutions—commitment to relationship building, collaboration, and sustainability of programming. Strengthening relationships between teachers and museum educators involves getting teachers physically in the museum space with other teachers, with direct access to the museum educator. It is also important for the museum educator to be present in the schools, visible to administrators, other teachers and students. Both must leave their comfort zones to understand how they might create learning experiences in the others’ space and must start planning efforts far in advance for more successful collaborations.

Educators from both institutions who are highly motivated and willing to take on leadership are needed for a community of practice to succeed. In this study, relationship building was evidenced through sustained teacher participation and new collaborations with the museum. The teachers began taking on leadership roles within the museum as trust was established between them and they were aware of expectations. The museum educator became more embedded in local schools as she became more familiar with the particular teachers involved in the Hirst Educator group. The teachers that participated in the majority of activities were
internally motivated and wanted to learn more, for their own sake and the sake of their students. They take part in professional development because they want to be better and to provide rich, meaningful experiences for their students. They appreciate obtaining professional development points but each of them would have considerably more points than needed for recertification. Though the group members were willing to take on smaller leadership roles within the workshops, they were not willing to take leadership to sustain the group after the study. This would require assigned time from some institution for an organizer to continue the role that I played. Longer-term continuity seems impossible without this.

Having the voice of practitioners enables multiple perspectives to be heard (Wenger et al., 2002). Multiple perspectives have been heard in the Hirst Educators group. The museum has been graced with educators at different levels and of different subject area expertise who have volunteered their time as part of this group. Lisa has been able to see that when working with local teachers, she does not have to limit her sights to collaborations with only art teachers.

Research question 2: What are the challenges of keeping this group connected?

Time, incentive, and differences in institutional priorities between schools and museums are factors that contributed to challenges of keeping the Hirst Educator group connected. There was enough relevance and value to attract members but they were more interested in individual benefits than parting the life of the group. Lack of a committed facilitator is the main challenge that I see for keeping the group connected.

The group was dependent on a facilitator. Participants relied on someone to organize, plan and implement activities for the group. The museum educator was simply too busy to plan teacher workshops and was not sure what the teachers wanted or needed; her job responsibilities are multi-faceted and as the only museum educator she is spread thin. The fact that the teachers
and museum educator work in different locations with different institutional goals and schedules made coordination difficult at times. They depended on someone doing these organizational tasks for them.

Beyond organizational tasks, the group needed a facilitator that would offer and promote leadership and group reflection. This person was needed to offer leadership during meeting times as well and invite members to provide leadership. The facilitator holds the key to maintaining a sense of direction that comes from group members and responsibilities include raising issues and promoting reflection. One way to promote reflection about long-term goals is to meet with individual participants to gather personal reflection about the group as well as dialogue within the group setting. It is critical that the facilitator is given assigned time from an institution or there is no incentive to take on these responsibilities. One way of assigning time that was discussed is through association with a university course.

Living far from the research site while trying to keep the group connected, I found the role of facilitator to be more of a challenge than I expected. I had expected the Hirst Educator social network site to be a way to keep the group together despite physical distance. However, the participants did not use it much outside of the workshops. It was useful during the workshops and as a repository to share resources when we came together. But otherwise it seemed to be one more password to remember, one more online site to check in with. The social networking site was used most by the “core group” of teachers to communicate outside of group events. Perhaps this is because they had spent the most time together and felt like they were “founding members” of the group.

Messaging on a regular basis, initiated by the facilitator, was important in keeping the group together. A social networking site was one way to provide this but email correspondence
or other forms of group messaging may be just as effective. At our focus group in September 2011, some teachers suggested that we communicate through a group page on Facebook, since they all use it. This has now been implemented and has been utilized by both the teachers and museum staff. It can also be a way for members to invite new people into the learning community, starting on a social level.

Collaborations between participants throughout the 16 months of the study led to new understandings between the museum educator and local teachers, and between the museum educator and local school district curriculum specialists, yet the future of the Hirst Educators teacher programming is uncertain. But I am left wondering about the now vacant facilitator role that I filled. Will a member of the Hirst Educators assume the role of facilitator to promote and enable the collaborations within the group? It seems unlikely that anyone will have the time. This issue was recognized by some participants, including Marshall:

Marshall: …the sky is the limit, and you never know where it is going to go from here. Will it be a main type of program throughout the whole school system? Will it grow to that point where every school has some kind of liaison to the museum? Or maybe it will level out with some interested parties, or because of all the other demands of education—or the demands or direction the museum wants to go—it will just kind of go away. So the future is just kind of up in the air. I guess it is going to be determined by the people who are a part of it, and what kind of future connections can be made for people who want to be a part of it (personal communication, January 21, 2011).

Research question 3: What are the educational benefits for the group members?

I have described in the data and analysis chapters how individual participants (both teachers and Lisa) benefitted from their connections with the Hirst Educator group. Professional expertise comes in great part from the teaching profession itself (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999) and the members within the group taught each other much through discussions about art and teaching. During the workshops, there were two areas of emphasis: personal development and
professional development. Content and strategies discussed were dependent on the interests and strengths of the individuals in the group.

Lisa gained new understandings about working with the local schools as a result. When asked how she thought the local schools have been affected by the Hirst Educators, she said, “I believe they see us as a real resource. They see us as worth it” (March 12, 2012). Teachers and Lisa learned new strategies for discussing art in the museum with school groups and ways to merge priorities of schools and museums. The group agreed on discussing artwork from the perspective of integrated curriculum using a constructivist approach, often incorporating performative aspects. Teachers were introduced to strategies that Lisa found to be successful with students. They presented lessons and strategies to other teachers.

Lisa and individual teachers and schools worked very well together, which was a major success of the project. This is not the same as the original idea conceived for Hirst Educators; it was a different structure but it was a success from the museum and schools’ point of view. The individual collaborations discussed earlier in most detail occurred between Lisa and Marshall; Lisa and Marcella; Lisa and Addison; Lisa and Cynthia. However, all of the main group members were involved in collaborations with Lisa to some degree. The Art21 project was on a larger scale since it involved multiple schools at once. Part of the reason for its success could have been that Lisa was familiar with collaborating with (and trusted) both Cynthia and Bronwyn, who were leaders in the project at their schools. However, there were no group collaborations outside of the workshop times. What this indicates is that there is an alternative way for a museum to work with schools besides the community of practice structure. Individual partnerships still involve engaging with the district to some degree and could be a partial step towards a community of practice if the group decides it is worth meeting together regularly.
Research question 4: How did the group change over time?

The group developed through addition of new participants and through study of different artwork and themes, which varied at each workshop. Primary leadership remained consistent but co-leaders changed for each workshop. Teachers were attracted to the group to learn how to use museum resources and over time, some started to form individual partnerships with the museum.

The Hirst Educators group began as a group of nine (including teacher participants, museum staff and facilitator) and by the June 2011 workshop there were twenty. The group showed signs of gaining administrative support from the museum and the local school district as the study progressed. The museum showed support by continuing to host the workshops and promoting the latter ones in museum newsletters. The district demonstrated administrative support when they granted professional development points for participants and included the workshop description in My Learning Plan as a sponsored professional development option. At the last two workshops in the study, teachers were able to gain professional development points from the school district but group members that participated in the September 2011 focus group were not awarded points. This latter showed there was still not full understanding of the group’s mission by the school district.

The door has opened for closer communications between Lisa and the two curriculum specialists in the study, Jack and Louise. The art and social studies curriculum specialists now know that the Hirst Museum is interested in connecting with teachers on various levels. They perceive Lisa as being supportive of local teachers. Lisa knows more about the role of the curriculum specialist and how they are liaisons to the teachers in the school district. She may feel more comfortable to contact them directly about programming she has coming up. She knows that she can contact them to ask about particular teachers or schools that might fit with an idea
for a partnership. I also personally now better understand the role of the curriculum specialist and how much influence administrative support has on teachers when it comes to participation in localized professional development.

Lessons Learned

The most obvious lesson is that it is not easy to form a community of practice between a museum educator and local teachers. It takes time and commitment from all stakeholders and support from administration at the museum, the school district, and the schools. It cannot happen overnight. Education advocates have adopted the underlying principles of communities of practice in the style of Wenger but have often preferred the term learning communities, as more appropriate when referring to groups in educational settings (see Learning Forward, 2012). Another term that might fit is “transformative practice zones,” characterized by Bresler (2002) as “a space as well as a way of interacting and thinking, where participants are touched and often transformed in the process” (p. 34). Participants in these zones come together from different disciplines to improve their teaching practice.

Action research methodology provides a cyclical system to constantly evaluate a learning community and its needs. The framework serves as a reminder for a group of educators to keep adapting to the context. Multiple action research cycles were conducive for a supportive environment and trust to form between participants through dialogue and reflection about goals and events. From my perspective, this system served as a key to strengthening relationships at the Hirst Museum. As I continued to question participants about their thoughts and opinions, they reflected about what they had learned and their perspectives, which led to subsequent actions of the group. From my perspective, this system served to strengthen relationships at the Hirst Museum.
Through my roles as researcher, collaborator, liaison between the museum and teachers and facilitator of workshops, I learned that effective facilitation of a learning community for teachers at a museum requires a leader who has insider knowledge and understanding of theory and practice of both fields of study. This calls for border crossing (Bresler, 2003; Solomon et al., 2005). Animating others and helping formal and nonformal educators to understand the goals of both. However, as in the case of this study, when the facilitator is not employed by either institution, it is a question which institution the group belongs to; the group in effect exists outside of either institution but needs support from both to exist.

In order to merge priorities of the museum and schools, careful selection of appropriate art to focus on in teacher workshops and curriculum created for teachers are of utmost importance. Though temporary exhibitions often provide excitement through special programming, there should also be intentional connection to work from the permanent collection. This enables lasting effects of curricular efforts and promotes long-term relationships with educators.

We made significant steps towards achieving the goal of becoming a community of practice but there were many obstacles to overcome. It is an ongoing process, since organic groups are always shifting and changing. With commitment and effort from members, the group could eventually evolve into a thriving community. However, for this to happen, the group would need to meet together more regularly. And a professional development group is dependent on support; it cannot be successful without time and resources dedicated to it. Through this study, I have learned that it would take a facilitator more than 16 months to pull off a community with any permanence. If my time had been longer, I would have started raising the issues presented in this paper with the group. Lisa recalled Constance saying to her, “something like
this takes at least five years to launch” (personal communication, January 24, 2011). If it continues, the form of the Hirst Educators will inevitably change over time with different members and leadership goals.

Conclusions

Teachers are central in facilitating educational conversations with their students about artwork found in museums, in both the museum setting and in the classroom. Students and teachers are always constructing new meanings through shared experiences. Connecting museum resources to standards-based curriculum may expose a greater number of students and teachers to available educational resources within the local community. Within the Hirst Educators, it was obvious that teachers benefitted from attending sustained professional development workshops with teachers of other subject areas and grade levels. Museum educators may want to consider that in addition to their own presentations, teachers respond favorably to content delivered from their teacher colleagues in museum settings.

Further, teacher programming cannot succeed without administrative support from the museum and from the school system (principals and curriculum specialists). Administrative support of standards-based curriculum that incorporates museum resources may increase the use of resources, which in turn may lead to greater centrality of the museum within the community. It is also important for those involved to strive for transparency when communicating with one another and to refrain from making assumptions about each other’s educational values or pedagogical understandings.

Museum educators interested in strengthening relationships with teachers (and a school district) may want to begin on a small scale. One place to start could be to initiate a relationship with the local curriculum specialists on a personal and professional level. It would be helpful to
send the curriculum specialists information on upcoming programming and to include a personalized message. Once a working relationship has been established, a museum educator could elicit recommendations from the curriculum specialists of particular teachers or schools to partner with for special programs. Likewise, museums want to see teachers at their programming for the general public. Teachers and curriculum specialists demonstrate support of the museum by attending various types of programming and also expanding their knowledge of the artworks.

Stronger relationships between Lisa and the teachers led to benefits for the teachers and contributed to Lisa’s new understandings. Close friendships have formed between some of the participants and some of the teachers seem to carry a sense of ownership and empowerment with them when they talk about the Hirst Educators group and the Hirst Museum. Relationships between Hirst Educators were strengthened through leadership opportunities within museum-teacher collaborations. Collaborations between museums and schools involve a commitment toward working together toward shared goals (Berry, 1998; Griffin, 2007) and should lead to shared ownership of the resulting educational programs (Wilson, 1997). Community partnerships, in this case between local teachers and a museum educator, must be based on trust and reciprocity and must be nurtured (Conwill & Roosa, 2003).

The idea of a partnership has different meanings to different people; some may look at it as a long-term collaboration, while others may approach it as more short-term, even a single occurrence. The time span of a partnership should be defined at the beginning of discussions to assist in creating shared vision. In order to form shared vision at the beginning stages of collaboration, it may benefit stakeholders to identify needs and contributions from each side, using a guiding document (see Lehman & Igoe, 1981). Research-based documents, such as the
Institute for Museum Services’ (1998) conditions for successful school-museum partnerships, may be helpful.

Creating a shared vision between a museum educator and teachers can be challenging. It may be helpful to acknowledge and articulate the different priorities of schools and museums at the beginning in order to avoid misleading assumptions. At the conclusion of a collaborative partnership, it is important to assess its strengths and weaknesses on the personal level, community level and museum level (see Worts, 2006b). Encouraging mutuality, rather than a consumer-type status of teachers (Stone, 1992b; Liu, 2000), is important.

Implications for Further Study

There are several areas that have come through findings in this study that I would like to explore further. I believe that it was significant that this study took place at an art museum on a university campus. I would like to compare priorities and initiatives with teacher programming at different university art museums. It would be interesting to see if the art focused on tends to be more from the permanent collection or temporary exhibits. It could also benefit the field to study various approaches to curriculum development that university art museums employ with local teachers and how they form connections with pre-service programs.

Another area I would like to study further is related to sustaining teacher involvement and partnerships with museums. How do long-term professional relationships between museum educators and local teachers affect museum programming for teachers and school groups? How does sustained teacher involvement affect classroom utilization of museum resources? Moisan (2009) described a three year collaborative teacher-museum partnership project and Larson (2004) gave account of a long term program between museum educators and teachers, which
consisted of four all-day workshops throughout the year, but there must be more literature devoted to long term studies on sustaining museum-teacher relationships.

Further, a specific area I am interested in exploring is professional development for museum educators. Because of Lisa’s interest, the success of her Art21 project and the consistency and stability of the Art21 organization, I am particularly drawn to looking more into the model Art21 has developed for creating educational resources and professional development opportunities. It could benefit museum educators around the country to engage in a professional development program devoted to their needs as nonformal educators and leaders of teacher trainings, of similar format to Art21 Educators (for teachers). Museum educators benefit from Art21 pre-made resources but may be unsure how to create meaningful connections between the programming, their collection and outreach with schools. It is recognized that contexts surrounding relations between a museum and schools differ depending on factors such as geographical location, size of museum and type of collection, policy of local schools, and priorities of both the museum and schools. Sustained professional development like Art21 Educators, but created specifically for museum educators (or partner teams of a museum educator and teacher), might provide a space for a community of practice to develop.

Reflecting on the museum’s increased presence in the local schools of the community, I think it would be significant to revisit AAM’s Museums and Community Initiative (see AAM, 2002; Igoe & Roosa, 2002). How have priorities in the recommendations changed over the past decade? How have the communities in the initial study changed in their engagement with local museums? Does focus on relations with local teachers and schools (and the school district) make a difference? Revisiting these perspectives could reinforce visitor-centered strategies in museum education and reassess how museums can contribute to community needs.
Recommendations for Museum Educators

This list of recommendations has emerged through my study. These recommendations are intended for museum educators interested in strengthening relationships with local teachers through offering sustained professional development. They are geared towards improving communication with schools.

- There needs to be mutual understanding between museum administrators, museum educators, and school leaders about how the museum and school(s) can benefit each other.
- Roles and expectations need to be clearly defined, particularly when crossing institutional boundaries.
- The facilitator of teacher programs at a museum should have knowledge of both school and museum settings.
- Museum educators need to understand how to grant professional development points to teachers that will count towards recertification. A local school district curriculum specialist may be able to assist.
- Museum educators and the school district should consider working together to promote and offer incentive to teachers for increased teacher participation.
- Museum educators should make an effort to meet the art curriculum specialist in the local district(s). It is beneficial for a museum educator to develop relationships also with curriculum specialists of other content areas and key school administrators. These school leaders can provide a direct avenue to distribute information about museum resources and programming to teachers.
- Museum educators should gather, promote and use curricular resources for interpreting art in visitor-oriented ways, ones that will continue to be relevant rather than ones that are only useful for a short time period.
- Museum educators interested in providing resources to local teachers need to understand current trends in school policy and pressures on teachers. They need to know how to address state mandated standards. When a museum educator visits a school, in addition to meeting with teachers, it is important to meet the administrators.
- To serve local teachers, it benefits museum educators to actively participate in their local and state-affiliated NAEA chapters. Professional organizations such as NAEA provide opportunity for museum educators to meet teachers interested in professional development.
- There should be a space on the museum’s website for educational resources for long-term use. There should be someone devoted to keeping this updated.
- The museum should publicly share successes of teacher programming with the greater community, to increase community relations between the museum and school district.
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**HIRST EDUCATORS 2010: APPLICATION**

*Exploring space and place*

This intensive four-day art educator workshop will take place at the Hirst Museum of Art July 27-30, 2010. Participants will focus on in-depth exploration of the museum’s collection through interactive activities and integrated curriculum writing. A social media site specific for the workshop will be an important component that will extend and further develop community among participants throughout the school year. It will serve as a space to share ideas and curriculum with one another and keep updated on educational opportunities at the Hirst. A follow-up workshop will bring participants back together Saturday, September 11 to present ways in which participants have applied or envision their curriculum in their classrooms, and discuss curricular implications of new fall exhibits. Interdisciplinary teaching teams are encouraged. Workshops are free of charge, but participants should be able to commit to attendance at both workshops (July 27-30 and September 11) and participation in the social media site.

1. **Name:**

2. **Preferred mailing address (please indicate whether this is a home or school address):**

3. **Preferred email (where you can be reached over the summer) and phone:**

4. **Name of school:**

5. **How many years have you taught in PK-12 education?**

6. **How would you describe your interest in and skills in relation to technology (internet, online courses, social media, teaching with technology)?**

7. **Do you regularly use social media in your everyday life? (Facebook, MySpace, Twitter, Ning, Blackboard, etc.) If so, what do you like about social media? If not, what don’t you like about social media?**

8. **How do you (or would you like to) incorporate contemporary art into your teaching practice?**

9. **How important is collaboration to you in your teaching (interactions with colleagues, collaboration among students)? In your opinion, what are benefits of collaboration in teaching and learning?**

10. **Why are you interested in participating in this workshop?**

The application deadline is July 6, 2010. Please type your answers and name the document file with your last name.
Appendix B

Consent Form

Purpose: You are invited to participate in a study of *Museums and Schools: Strengthening Relationships Between an Art Museum Educator and Local Teachers*. This research is part of a doctoral dissertation conducted by Stephanie Danker, art education doctoral student (advised by Dr. Michael Parsons, Department of Art Education) through University of Illinois – Urbana Champaign. I hope to articulate characteristics of professional development and form a community of practice through the experience of the participants, through contexts of the physical museum space and virtual space of social media. Connections with the local community will be examined.

Participant Selection: You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are a local [city, state] teacher, and have expressed interest in professional development based around writing curriculum centered on the permanent collection at the [Hirst] Museum of Art, and the outdoor sculpture collection on [local university’s] campus. Local art teachers, as well as teachers of all subjects and grade levels (PK-12) are welcome to participate in the study. It is hoped to have a balance of art and non-art teachers. There will be no minors participating in the study, and no one from a vulnerable population will be subjected to the study. All subjects will possess a [state] teaching certificate or be in advanced stages of a local pre-service teaching program. In the case that a home-school educator would like to participate, that person will be equally considered with other applicants. You have been invited to participate in the study after being accepted into the professional development workshop program.

Explanation of Procedures: If you decide to participate, digital still images will be taken during each activity (within the museum and on [university] campus—sculpture collection and [university buildings]), to document the processes and capture visual representation of the experience of the professional development workshops. There may also be audio and/or video recordings, surveys and observations. The research will include one-on-one interviews, which will primarily seek to gain participant reflection and experience of the process. The purpose of collecting written comments and capturing images through digital pictures, video and audio recording is to be able to refer to patterns in participants’ actions and social interactions during the workshops, and through our closed social media site. You will have access to all images at any time.

Discomfort/Risks: There is a chance you may feel self-conscious about being observed and about being photographed or audio or video recorded. You may request that recordings be turned off at any time. In order to minimize your potential discomfort, you have the right to request to review the tapes and transcripts resulting from the professional development activities and personal interviews, and request that the tapes or photographs be erased in whole or in part any time.

Benefits: Potential benefits of the study to you include: potential support system of colleague PK-12 educators; new curricular and pedagogical ideas and resources designed for practical classroom use; access to museum educators and resources at the [Hirst] Museum of Art. There is a possibility that participant-developed curriculum produced at the workshops may be promoted at a local public school art teacher inservice. Benefits to human knowledge include description and analysis of a situated experience among a group of practitioners and museum staff. The benefits will mainly be to the local [city] area, but may benefit others interested in adult professional development in museum education and / or art education.

Confidentiality: Any information obtained in this study in which you can be identified will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. If it is acceptable for images of you to be used to promote [Hirst] educational programming, you will be asked to sign a separate photo release form. You will be notified about particular images being considered for use and asked for permission prior to use.

Refusal/Withdrawal: Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your future relations with [university], [Hirst] Museum of Art, or University of Illinois – Urbana Champaign. If you agree to participate in this study, you are free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.
Contact: If you have any questions about this research, you can contact me at: Stephanie Danker [address, phone, email]. In addition, you may also contact: [Lisa], curator of education, [Hirst] Museum of Art, [address, phone, email]. In addition, you may contact Dr. Michael Parsons, research advisor, University of Illinois, [phone, email].

If you have questions pertaining to your rights as a research participant, or about research-related injury, you can contact the Office of Research Administration at [university], [address, phone]. You may also contact the University of Illinois Institutional Review Board at 217-333-2670 (collect calls accepted if you identify yourself as a research participant) or via email at irb@illinois.edu.

You are under no obligation to participate in this study. Your signature indicates that you have read the information provided above and have voluntarily decided to participate.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep.

• I give permission to be photographed, and understand that there is a possibility of dissemination, for purposes related to this research. _____ Yes _____ No

• I give permission to be audio recorded, and understand that there is a possibility of dissemination, for purposes related to this research. _____ Yes _____ No

• I give permission to be video recorded, and understand that there is a possibility of dissemination, for purposes related to this research. _____ Yes _____ No

• I give permission for written comments I post on our closed social media site to be referenced by the researcher, and understand that there is a possibility of dissemination, for purposes related to this research. _____ Yes _____ No

____________________________________________________
Signature of Subject ________________________________

____________________________________________________
Witness Signature ________________________________

____________________________________________________
Date

____________________________________________________
## Museum Teacher Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time / Date</th>
<th>Descriptive Notes</th>
<th>Reflective Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>What are you learning about the subject matter?</em></td>
<td><em>What strategies might you use in your classroom?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E
Initial Semi-structured Interview Questions

Questions to ask museum educator(s) based on perception of teacher workshops

• How do teacher workshops held within the museum impact your workload?
• How many staff members become involved in planning for a teacher workshop, and what are their specific roles, tasks that they are responsible for?
• Do you feel that the general attitude about teacher workshops among staff members is positive, negative, or indifferent? What makes you think this?
• How do you connect teacher workshops to the mission of the museum?
• How are teacher workshops and other school-based initiatives marketed to the community?
• Has there been any evidence that past teacher workshops / school-based initiatives produced by the Hirst Museum have increased use of museum collection to educational audiences?
• How do you decide what to offer in terms of professional development for educators at the museum?

Questions to ask museum educator(s) based on collaborating with teachers

• Can you describe some of the difficulties you have faced when collaborating with teachers?
• What do you see as hindrances to effective communication between educational efforts of the museum and area teachers?
• When you were first approached about collaborating on this project, what were some of your reservations?
• What advice would you give to a colleague (museum educator) about collaborating with teachers?
• How has this collaboration effort affected your perspective of collaborating with local teachers?
• What are benefits of this effort to your work?
• What should be given more attention when working with teachers?

Questions to ask museum educator(s) about incorporating social media into educational efforts

• What role do you think social media should play in your own museum education efforts?
• What are limitations you face when considering social media implementation?

Questions to ask teacher participants

• Does the experience of writing curriculum based on artwork in the Hirst Museum collection motivate you to incorporate the artwork into your teaching? Why?
• How did the experience with the other teachers in the workshop affect your approach to teaching with / about contemporary art?
• Do you feel like art museums in the area recognize the practical needs of local art teachers, or do you sense a disconnect? If you sense disconnect, how do you think this could be improved?
• What is it like for you as a teacher to be in a museum setting collaborating with teachers of other subjects?
• What are hindrances to forming community between teachers and museum staff?
• What are ways you can think of to promote connectedness between community teachers and the Hirst Museum?
HIRST EDUCATORS 2010
SUMMER TEACHER WORKSHOP PROGRAM

Participants

Participants will include a combination of local K-12 art teachers and content specialists from other disciplines interested in incorporating the Hirst Museum permanent collection (and contemporary art, in general) into their teaching. Pre-service art teachers from area certificating programs may be considered.

Logistics

• Tuesday, July 27 – Friday, July 30: Workshops (9 a.m. – 3 p.m.) will be held at Diller University / Hirst Museum of Art with online social media follow-up throughout the fall semester of the 2010 – 2011 school year, where curriculum could be shared along with Hirst Museum educational programming updates.
• Participants will apply for the program, with the understanding that they will be expected to attend all four days of workshops in July, and participate in the online learning community, including monthly follow up professional development. Introduction to social media theory and practice related to teaching will be addressed, as well as practical application and development during the week-long physical workshop experience.
• A follow up one-day workshop will take place in September on a Saturday (tentatively September 11).
• Participants will receive continuing education credits towards re-certification, and potential VIP status into a Hirst Museum opening reception. (This is being looked into at the moment.)

Components of the week-long workshop

• Each day will include extensive time with the collection in the museum setting
• Tuesday, July 27 and Wednesday, July 28
  o Focus on Outdoor Sculpture Collection
• Thursday, July 29 and Friday, July 30
  o Focus on exhibit: Artists Explore Space and Place
• Tours of the galleries: focus on a different part of the collection each day
  ▪ Interactive activities with the artwork in the galleries and outside
    • Participation in personal aesthetic experiences
    • Thinking about our personal experiences with contemporary artwork in terms of relating to our students with art history, art criticism and aesthetics
Teachers will create gallery guides for their particular students and share with other participants
  - Each participant will leave with a collection of gallery guide questions, gathered from the group – emphasis on collective knowledge and constructive learning
Teachers provide short insights to potentially be displayed as additional wall text in galleries during workshop week
Teachers (possibly) create iPod or cell phone educational tour for educators, or other education technologies applications

- Talks with curators and education director
  - Insights into the collection and the artists, as well as gaining a better understanding of the working contemporary art museum
  - Local artists or other community leaders / donors / docents talking about stories about particular pieces in the collection – community history of the artwork

- Connections with community
  - Nurturing a community of practice among the participants
  - Strengthening relationships between practicing art teachers in the community with the Hirst Museum and Diller University
    - Would benefit visibility of Hirst Museum and Diller University in community through delivery of curriculum
    - Could potentially strengthen Diller University art education program
  - Strengthening relationship between Hirst Museum Education initiatives and alignment with practicing teachers’ teaching needs
    - Establishing and sustaining meaningful two-way dialogue between teachers and museum education initiatives
      - Teacher consultants for Hirst Museum educational programming??
  - Connecting pieces from the permanent collection to understanding issues in the greater [city] area (issues identified by participants)

- Writing curriculum
  - Differences in viewing original artwork in museum setting vs. viewing the same images online or reproductions
  - The power of the museum visit
  - Making the museum visit cross-curricular, applicable to real-world problem-solving, examination of process, extension into inquiry-based artmaking, community connections, theme-based learning
  - Connections to state and district standards

- Daily Blogging
  - Time will be incorporated into daily programming to allow for participants to update their personal blog within the social media site created
specifically for Hirst Educators 2010, documenting reflection and active learning (computer lab in Art and Design Building, Diller University)

- Participants will be encouraged to take digital pictures frequently and post to photo section of the closed social network site, providing multiple visual perspectives of the same event
- Curriculum will be shared through this closed online venue

- Art making
  - Exploration of curriculum design through making the art projects planned by teachers related to the museum collection
  - Teachers may lead an artmaking session with other participants
    - This would provide teacher participants with teacher exemplars for classroom teaching in the fall
  - Evaluate issues that students (or other teachers) may face with materials or content
  - Create instructional videos for use in the classroom based on lesson plans developed by participants, which would then be posted to the social media site
    - Potentially linked to Hirst Museum website and [district] Public Schools visual art site

- Social media monthly follow up
  - Personal reflections by participants
    - How has this affected your teaching? (specific ways)
    - Have you grown from this experience? How?
    - Suggestions from teachers about other ways to bridge gaps between the Hirst Museum, Diller University, practicing teachers and the greater community

- Reports on curricular applications in the classroom
  - Documentation through images of process and products
  - Tip sheet for educators from teacher

- Spreading the word – ways this may be affecting outreach in the community

On social media site:

- Post images and have discussion based on it through tagging and commenting online, user-submitted history, stories based around works of art in the collection
- Pictures taken of participants in front of work from the collection, and then posting stories about their experiences and how they have interacted with the work…
- Creating a mind-map based around an artwork – map out how it connects to the community and issues within the community, how those issues can be addressed through study in multiple subjects
• Theoretical readings, articles on local issues

Fall 2010 follow up:

• It would be wonderful for participants to share the curriculum created during a fall in-service for art teachers in [the district]. (Is this a possibility?)
• It is imagined that all Hirst Educators 2010 will be invited back to the museum for a reception to present curriculum created prior to the in-service (as a practice run and a celebration).
• There will be a follow up one-day workshop in September for Hirst Educators 2010 participants to be introduced to new exhibits and gather together again in the physical space of the museum. Further gallery guides will be created and there will be collaboration towards developing new curriculum. (tentative date: September 11, 2010)

Facilities
• Use of computer lab in Art and Design building with internet access / printing capabilities, access to Powerpoint and Photoshop software
• Artmaking space
• Conference room in Hirst Museum for discussions / presentations
• Lobby area in Hirst Museum or outside area for lunch / snacks
Appendix G
Discussing Sculpture with Teachers

**Discussing Sculpture with Teachers**

**Basic Information:**

Title of sculpture:
Artist:
Date it was created:
What is this sculpture made of?
When the artist lived, or when they were born if still alive:
Origin of culture of artist:

What information can you find out about this artist that might be meaningful background for teachers?

What information can you find out about this artwork that might be meaningful for teachers?

**Constructing meaning:**

What big ideas could be connected to this sculpture when talking with students?

How could it the big ideas be explored through various disciplines in the classroom?

List 3 – 5 discussion questions to explore with students, related to this sculpture.
What are some possible projects or meaning-making activities that could come from studying this sculpture with students?

If you were bringing students to see this artwork, what would you want them to see or study in preparation for the visit?

Transitions: If you were arranging a sculpture tour, which piece would you show students prior to this one? Why?

Transitions: Which piece would you show students after visiting this one?
Appendix H
Itineraries for Hirst Educators Workshops

Itinerary for Hirst Educators 2010
9 a.m. – 4 p.m. each day, then Sept. 11 – 9:00 a.m. – 12 p.m.

Tuesday, July 27, 2010
(focus on outdoor sculpture collection)

9:00 – Welcome and introductions, overview and purpose of workshop
Identification of what participants hope to gain from workshop
Explanation of approach to inquiry-based learning, integrated curriculum
Explanation of participant log

9:30 – explanation of research / invitation to join research

9:45 – group definition of collaboration
(secondary: defining how goals of collaboration connect with ideals of social media)

10:00 – group definition of a community of practice
(elaboration of characteristics defined by research)

10:15 – group identification of themes that are important in all of our curricular areas, big ideas
(Walker, 2001)

10:30 – introduction to Form+Theme+Context (Sandell, 2006) framework, introduction to ideas of “performing the museum” (Garoian, 2001)

10:45 – tour of outdoor sculpture collection (take cameras!)
(clipboards, maps of outdoor collection, online info & map)
Throughout tour, discuss strategies for facilitating conversation with students connected to theme, take turns leading discussion and collaboratively forming questions

12:00 – lunch hour (on your own)

1:00 – Debriefing from tour, reflection

1:30 – Collaborating on a plan for action

2:00 – computer lab time (rest of afternoon), introduction to our closed social media site, navigation, tools, resources, delicious, twitter hashtags

2:30 – uploading pictures from tour, expanding meaning from images posted

3:00 – envisioning curricular applications in the classroom
**Wednesday, July 28, 2010**  
(focus on outdoor sculpture collection)

9:00 – meet outside conference room inside museum  
Visit Marshall and Addison’s sculptures, then visit Andy Goldsworthy and Jesus Moroles  
(Stephanie)

10:00 – debriefing from tour – articulating disciplinary connections and relationships

10:30 – exploring social media: jumping in art museums blog and tag clouds as educational tool  
– relate to Luke Dubois art (exhibit will open in September)  
http://jumpinginartmuseums.blogspot.com/  
http://www.wordle.net/  
http://www.tagcrowd.com/  
http://hindsightisalways2020.net/

11:00 – jumping photos!

12:00 – lunch – (to be delivered)

1:00 – Discuss concepts related to what a community of practice is. Talk about teacher  
collaboration in curriculum writing. What kind of lesson format is most practical?

Remainder of afternoon – Delicious (social bookmarking), upload jumping photos and other  
photos from sculpture tour, write up curricular ideas, participant log, copying F+T+C for each  
esculpture we discussed, discussion of practical issues & limitations in classroom, more sculpture  
photos (if time)

**Thursday, July 29, 2010**  
(focus on *Place & Space* exhibit – work from the permanent collection)

9:00 – visit to the Exploring *Place & Space* exhibit (first visitors to the exhibit!!)  
Bring computer upstairs – Quickwrite activity

Let’s jump!! (How does jumping with art have to do with education? Let’s chat about that.) Also  
discuss performing with art and narrative implications – language arts / historical connections…

Take other jumping photos outside with sculpture.

Upload jumping photos to Ning and tag them as “jumping.” Decide which ones we want to send  
into the Jumping in Art Museums blog.
Look together at the images we each posted about a special place that has been influential in our lives. Tag your image: my_special_place
Then when you click on that link, you will only see those tagged images.
(Timed photography activity related to this)
Separate activity: Connect one of the pieces in the new exhibit with some of your feeling associated with your special place. Write a paragraph about how the artwork relates to your special place. How could an activity similar or inspired by this be used with students?

Starting on our gallery guide / curriculum: choosing five sculptures to focus on. Will we select one big idea that might tie the pieces together? Should we each focus on research for one of the particular pieces, and then collaboratively add discussion questions? Other ideas?

Bring lunch today, but let’s decide on a lunch destination for tomorrow.

Morning – introduction to the exhibit and tour, forming discussion questions based upon participant-identified themes, quick writes, gallery guides

1:00 – Debriefing from tour, reflection

Afternoon – connecting curricular ideas with online resources, collaboration time

**Friday, July 30, 2010**

9:00 – everyone list their top five sculptures (in Outdoor Sculpture Collection) for discussing with students

Participant logs – please fill out a participant log for two activities that we did yesterday: jumping inside the artwork (quickwrites and reciting the writing in front of peers); and jumping in art museums (with sculpture and in the galleries)

Focus on gallery guide – determining objectives / making a plan for a sculpture tour for teachers at the September 11 workshop (time allotment: 45 minutes – is that reasonable?)

Museum pre-visit logistics (Lisa)

12:00 – lunch out on the town

Reflective practice – Why is this important?

Community of practice – What is it? Can Hirst Educators be the beginning of one?

Evaluating our program

Looking forward: keeping connected to the museum and one another through social media
HIRST EDUCATORS WORKSHOP ITINERARY
Saturday, September 11, 2010

9:00 – Welcome and introductions (Conference Room)
- Introducing Participants
- Purpose of workshop
- Agenda for the morning
- Explanation of handouts and participant log
- Teachers as researchers
- Very brief introduction to how the sculpture tour was developed (by one or two of the teachers)

9:20 – Explanation of research
- Community of practice definition
- Using social networking as tool for professional development, and a way to build community between the teachers and the museum
- Show Hirst Educators site
- Irene’s introduction for her sculpture
- Consent form for new participants

9:30 – 10:45: Sculpture Tour

Museum Etiquette and Rules for sculpture tour when leading student groups (teachers)

Tour (take pictures!)

Debriefing:
- What are some practical considerations for leading discussions about sculptures with your students?
- How is engaging in dialogue about a sculpture in person different than looking at a 2-D image of it?
- How does social interaction and discussion with others affect your experience with the sculptures?
- How is teaching in a museum space (inside or outside) different than teaching in a classroom setting?

10:45 – 10:55: break
- Show a few quick video clips – Intro to Ed Tech (1:21 min)
• Luke DuBois video clip (2:34 min)

10:55 – 11:55: gallery time

LUKE DUBOIS: HINDSIGHT IS ALWAYS 20/20

Discussion questions:
• What does the title of this exhibit infer?
• How does power shift perception of values?
• What does this work say about the development of our country?
• How could this work be used in the classroom? What ages would it be most appropriate for? How would you talk about this work differently with various age groups?
• How could this work be relevant to a curriculum based on big ideas or a theme? Choose a big idea from Sydney Walker’s list (Walker, 2001), and explain how this work fits in.
• How does Luke DuBois use rhythm and pattern in his work? How does this differ from the way that Andy Goldsworthy or some of the other artists we’ve seen today use rhythm and pattern?

ART ON SPEED exhibit

Discussion questions:
• After seeing the video clip of Luke DuBois and the sound algorithms he creates in addition to the algorithm used to create the Presidential “eye charts,” how is his work related to the video title wall piece for Art on Speed (by Jason Opat)?
• Pieces in this show have to do with human fascination of speed: controlling speed, capturing speed, and experiencing the sensation of speed. Choose two pieces by different artists and compare / contrast the idea of each piece with the aesthetic choice of presentation (how the artist presented the work—what it looks like). How does each artist deliver his / her message through the medium?
• Look at Paper Planes (2009) by Robin Rhode. How do you imagine this mural was created? Can you hear sounds related to the textures that you see? How do the children in the photographs—interacting with and performing with the mural—add to the artwork? Imagine you were one of the children in the artwork, and have a conversation with the other kid in the images, associated with the sequencing of the images.
• How have new technologies enabled us to capture, visualize and control speed? What are benefits and risks of these new technologies?
• How is speed and movement discussed and explored in other subject areas?
• What kind of performative or kinesthetic activity could you have students engage in prior to or after viewing these two exhibits? How could you direct your students to explore capturing speed?

11:55: written evaluation of workshop / turn in participant log

12:15 / 12:30: lunch off-site with any participants that want to join
Hirst Educators
Teaching Tolerance Workshop
Saturday, January 22, 2011
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon

9:00 a.m. – Welcome; explanation of packet materials and curricular resources posted on the Hirst Educators site

9:05 a.m. – PeaceEssay Art Challenge Experience – Caprice, Peace and Social Justice Center of [region within the state]

9:20 a.m. – Introductions – Who we are, and why we are here together

9:30 a.m. – Teaching about tolerance in the classroom
  • Why do you think it is important to teach tolerance in our classrooms?
  • What strategies do you currently employ?
  • How do you approach (and / or how does your administration suggest you approach) world issues such as human rights or violence in your classroom?
  • How does visual imagery (positive and negative) influence our students?
  • How can we learn from contemporary artists about topics such as these?

9:45 a.m. – Background of the Rwandan genocide and background of the artist (Marshall and Lisa) *Take a laptop with you upstairs

10:00 a.m. – viewing of the exhibit: Alfredo Jaar, We Wish to Inform You That We Didn’t Know

10:30 a.m. – Personal blog response on Hirst Educators closed network; Debriefing

10:50 a.m. – introduction to One Million Bones project (conference room)

11:00 – 11:45 a.m. – creating individual bones to contribute to the project / use as teacher exemplars (art education room)

11:45 a.m. – Sharing

11:55 a.m. – Closure, invitation to continue dialogue and community of practice through Hirst Educators networking, Workshop written evaluation (conference room)

**Please don’t forget to turn in your workshop evaluation and participant log before you leave. Thanks so much for coming. Your contribution to the discussion is highly valued!
HIRST EDUCATORS WORKSHOP
Friday, June 10, 2011

Hirst Educators teacher workshop
Join us at the Hirst Museum for a teacher workshop on Friday, June 10: 9 a.m. – 4 p.m. The topic of the workshop is: A Focus on [state-based] Artists: Explorations of Where We Live. Area K-12 teachers learn from fellow teachers about cross-disciplinary strategies related to subject matter and themes presented by contemporary [state-based] artists. The workshop is free, and lunch will be provided. Register with the Hirst Museum curator of education. Reserve your spot by Tuesday, June 7.

A FOCUS ON [STATE-BASED] ARTISTS
Explorations of where we live

9:00 – 9:30 coffee, breakfast snacks, getting acquainted with one another and informal looking at art scavenger hunt on first floor

9:30 – 10:00 Welcome: Introductions, Overview of Hirst Programming (Lisa), overview of day’s activities (Stephanie)

Museum Memories activity (Stephanie)

10:00 – 10:30: Visit with Curator
Logistics: How does a museum acquire a piece of art? How do you decide which [state] artists should have work in the Hirst Museum collection?

10:30 – 11:15 Outsider Art 101
Local art teachers Cynthia, Irene and Bronwyn share lesson ideas and experiences of studying Outsider art and [state] artists

11:20 – 12:00 Fisch Haus show
Strategy: working with art criticism techniques using word cards

12:00 – 12:45 Lunch (provided by museum)

12:45 – 1:20 Artist conversation in the gallery with Kent Williams, Fisch Haus artist
Looking at big ideas / themes in work that are cross-disciplinary
personal work / public work / connections to community;
Maps and land changes over time (possibly?)

Discussion questions related to big ideas – come up with ideas for activities with students based on the images
(need laptops: post ideas on Hirst Educator site)
1:30 – 3:00 Learning from primary sources and historical images about where we live – Lucy, Director of Education and Outreach, [state] Historical Society (could meet in conference room with access to internet and projection screen for presentation; mobile laptops with internet access available to all teacher participants – can be used in conference room, and also in upstairs galleries. We also have a Hirst Educators Ning site (password-protected) that we can post digital documents on, if we want teachers to create and post documents on to be able to share with one another after workshop concludes.)

Lucy is going to begin the session with an introduction to [state] Historical Society resources. She says she is thinking of using landscape images (including Dust Bowl), portraits (John Brown), and Bird's Eye View maps. She also has a lesson on comparing communities past and present to share. Lisa and I will then connect this to work of contemporary artists.

Presentation / discussion from [state] Historical Society
- Connecting art and history through primary sources
- How to navigate [state] Historical Society website – what is there?
- Strategies for teachers – visual literacy skills using primary documents ([state] Memory site); connecting to standards; resources available

Potential activities for teachers during this time:
- Comparing landscape images from [state] Historical Society site to landscape images from current day to see how land has changed over time
- Contemporary [state] artists that wrestle with societal issues – making connections to the past through [state] Historical Society website / images
- Comparing historical [state] maps to maps of present day – how technology has changed look, style, content of maps and how we “read” them; different ways that contemporary artists are using maps and mapmaking in their work, and potential meanings / alternative purposes of maps

3:00 – 4:00 Review, Sharing, Closure, Evaluations
Connecting to Community
- How do contemporary artists assist us in connecting with community?
- How do we as teachers assist our students in connecting with community?
- How can resources like the [state] Historical Society aid teachers in connecting with community?
- How can teachers and museums support one another in connecting with community?

(Optional afterwards): Happy Hour together off-site
Appendix I
Museum Memories Activity
Hirst Educators Workshop
June 10, 2011

**MUSEUM MEMORIES ACTIVITY**

Throughout the day, we will be talking about interdisciplinary connections related to using museum resources in teaching. We have to assist our students in making these interdisciplinary connections. For us, as teachers, to be able to assist our students, it is important that we also experience these connections ourselves.

Let’s start the day by connecting to our own personal history and memories, related to our individual experiences in museum settings.

While you are watching the video clip (Ferris Bueller’s Day Off museum scene: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XaJrtRZIT5o](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XaJrtRZIT5o)), think about your own experiences in museums. What experiences stick out in your memory? Where were you? What were you encountering? Who were you with?

- Choose one experience that is most vivid in your mind to expand upon. Close your eyes and visualize it in your mind.
- Write: five adjectives (feelings, colors, sensory words) that bring back the experience

- Write: five nouns that describe what or who was there

- Reflect: What was it about that experience that made an impact on you? Did you learn something? Did you realize something? Were you able to appreciate something or someone in a deeper way? How did the museum setting contribute to this experience?

Share your experience with another person. Try to imagine their experience as they share it with you.

- What are the differences between your experiences?
- What connections can you make?

How could this lead to an artmaking experience – with (or without) students?

How could this activity connect to other disciplines?

How / why are personal memories significant to learning about social studies?

How / why are personal memories in museums significant for the museums to know about?
Appendix J
Curriculum for Terry Evans Exhibit

**Terry Evans: Matfield Green Stories**
*Photography exhibit at Hirst Museum of Art: August 20 – November 27, 2011*

To schedule a fieldtrip, contact curator of education
*Hirst Museum of Art offers 100% bus reimbursement for school visits!

Matfield Greens series online:

“I want my photographs to show the nature of prairie in a way that reminds us that it matters.” ~ Terry Evans

**Discussion questions:**
- Terry Evans is mainly known for her landscape photographs. Why do you think she would want to photograph the people of Matfield Green?
- How are portraits of people who live in a small farming community related to images of landscapes?
- Does the fact that the community of Matfield Green is nearby to Wichita affect the way that you view the photographs? Why?
- This exhibit is called *Terry Evans: Matfield Green Stories*. Why do you think it would have the word, *story* in the title?
- How does the land change with population increases or decreases in small farming communities?
- Evans says that she is fascinated by “contemporary human ruins.” What issues might a community face when there are only a small amount of inhabitants?
- What is aerial photography? What has aerial photography been used for over time?
- How does the aerial photography that Evans has created of the Matfield Green area show a relationship between the land and the people who are there?
- What are some challenges you can imagine photographers might encounter when taking aerial photographs?
- What is a portrait? When you look at the images of the people, what do they have in common in the way that Evans composed the pictures?
- Why would Evans title the images with the people’s names?

Image 13/55 and Image 24/55. *(Click on an image to enlarge, and the number of the image will appear below the image.)* Why might have Evans photographed these two people with their tattoos as a prominent part of the images?
- Evans shows images of abandoned houses and abandoned schools. What are some reasons why these places might be abandoned in a small farming community?
• Evans captures some images of prairie burnings.  

Image 4/55, Image 51/55, Image 52/55. What is the purpose of intentional prairie burnings? How is this act helpful to farmers? Why might Evans want to include images of prairie burnings in the series?

• Evans captures a train moving along the prairie land in the Matfield Green area:  

Image 25/55 What function do train tracks have in a small town? How has the role of trains changed over time?

• Why would Terry Evans be interested in documenting cattle paths?  

Image 36/55 What makes this photograph interesting? (hint: discuss elements and principles of design, including line, shape, color, contrast, focal point, etc.)

• Look at the image, South Creek.  

Image 43/55 What does this image tell you about how the land once was? How do the budding trees at the top of the image contrast with the dried up creek?

• How does Terry Evan’s Empty Room?  

Image 5/55 compare / contrast to Larry Schwarm’s [one of the images from the Greensburg Tornado series:  
  http://www.larryschwarm.com/tornado.html ] ?

• The pictures in this exhibit were taken over the span of many years. How do they work together as a series to capture the artist’s perspective of a community?

• How does the use of color affect the way you look at the images?

**Vocabulary:**

- **Aerial photography** – a photograph taken from an aircraft or a satellite in flight
- **Portrait** – a likeness of a person, especially of the face, as a drawing, painting or photograph
- **Landscape** – a section or expanse of rural scenery, usually extensive
- **Focal point** – the point at which all elements or aspects converge; center of activity or attention
- **Home** – a geographical area where a person feels that they belong
- **Community** – a social group of any size whose members reside in a specific locality, share government, and often have a common cultural and historical heritage; a locality inhabited by such a group
- **Urban** – characteristic of or accustomed to cities
- **Rural** – characteristic of the country, country life, or country people; rustic
- **Proximity** – nearness in place, time, order, occurrence, or relation
- **Abandon** – to leave, desert
- **Restoration** – a return or bringing back to a former, original, or normal condition
• **Empathy** – the ability to understand and share the feelings of another

**Potential Pre-visit and Post-visit activities:**

- Have students research the small town of Matfield Green.
  - Use a digital mapping application to find out how far away is it from where you live.
  - What is the current population of the town? How has the population of the town changed over time?
  - Where do the children that live in Matfield Green go to school?
  - Discuss differences in daily life between urban and rural communities.
- After viewing Terry Evan’s images, create a journal entry of a typical day from first-person perspective as if you lived in Matfield Green. Use descriptive language to show your understanding of what it might be like to live in a rural area. It might help to choose an image from the exhibit to base your story on.
- Imagine that you have a friend that lives in a rural area that is coming to visit you in the city for the weekend. Create an itinerary of places you would take your friend. On your itinerary, include location addresses, hours of operation, and prices for the activities you would want to do together. Create a comic format drawn narrative of how you envision and visualize this experience.
- Use a Venn Diagram to show differences and similarities in rural and urban living. Create a drawing or collage that juxtaposes characteristics of rural and urban life.
- Based on your experiences and after viewing Terry Evan’s Matfield Green photographs, create a persuasive argument for living in either a rural or urban area.
- Create a visual representation to show how local rural and urban areas are interdependent.
- Research primary sources attributed to Matfield Green through the [state] Historical Society. What can you tell about the history of the town and its people by looking at primary sources?
- Aerial photography can be used as a geographical tool. Using Google Maps, find an aerial image of a place you consider to be home. This can be your actual home, or a place that makes you feel like home. What can you learn about this place by looking at this image? Print out your image and write a short reflection about this place. Make sure to include a map key with your image. Re-envision this map through interpretation in a drawing or painting. Use scale to represent significant features to you.
- On a localized level, analyze the push-pull factors that Matfield Green residents might face.

**Very special opportunity:**

- Terry Evans will be at the Hirst Museum of Art on Friday, Nov 18, 2011. She will speak about her work at 6 pm, with Q & A following her talk. The artist talk is open to the public.

**Art Curricular Connections:**

**Standard 1:** Understanding and Applying Media, Techniques, and Processes
**Standard 2:** Using Knowledge of the Elements of Art and the Principles of Design
**Standard 3:** Creating Art Works through Choice of Subjects, Symbols, and Ideas
Standard 4: Understanding the Visual Arts in Relation to History and Cultures
Standard 5: Reflecting Upon and Assessing the Characteristics and Merits of Art
Standard 6: Making Connections between the Visual Arts and Other Disciplines

**Local Social Studies Curricular Connections for 1st and 2nd Quarters:**

**6TH GRADE:**

**Humans, their society, and their environment interact**

How have location, place, human-environment interaction, movement, and regions influenced civilizations?

- Geography ▲G 1:1 The student explains and uses map titles, symbols, cardinal and intermediate directions, legends, latitude, and longitude.
- Geography G 5:1 The student explains how humans modify the environment and describes some of the possible consequences of these modifications.
- Economics ▲E 1:1 The student explains how scarcity of resources requires communities (and nations) to make choices about goods and services.
- Geography G 4:1: The student examines reasons for variation in population distribution (e.g., environment, migration, government policies, birth and death rates).

**7TH GRADE:**

**Humans interact with their environment**

How have location, place, human-environment interaction, movement and region influenced the way people live?

How has geography shaped economy?

- Economics 1:2 Understands how limited resources require choices
- ▲3:1(A) Describes factors that influence trade
- 3:2 Explains costs and benefits of trade
- Geography 1:4 Explains reasons for using different geographic tools
- Geography ▲2:4(K) Identifies criteria that can be used to define a region
- Geography 4:1 Describes and analyzes population characteristics
- Economics 1:2 Explains how people choose to use resources
- ▲3:1(A) Describes factors that influence trade
- 2:3 Identifies and explains how Kansas, U.S. and world regions are interdependent

**8TH GRADE:**

**Humans, their society, and their environment interact**

How have location, place, human-environment interaction, movement, and region influenced the history of the U.S. as it developed?

**Cultures have similarities and differences which change over time**

How does where you live determine who you are and who you can become?

- Geography 4.2.▲(A) analyzes push-pull factors including economic, political, and social factors that contribute to human migration and settlement in United States (e.g., economic: availability of natural resources, job opportunities created by technology; political: Jim Crow laws, freestaters; social factors: religious, ethnic discrimination).
• History 4.2. (A) examines a variety of different types of primary sources in United States history and analyzes them in terms of credibility, purpose, and point of view (e.g., census records, diaries, photographs, letters, government documents).
• Geography 1:2 creates maps, graphs, charts, databases
• Geography 2.1 identifies and explains changing criteria used to define a region;
• Economics 2:1.▲ (K) explains how relative price, people’s economic decisions, and innovations influence the market system (e.g., cotton gin led to increased productivity, more cotton produced, higher profits, and lower prices; steamboat led to increased distribution of goods, which brought down prices of goods and allowed goods to be more affordable to people across the United States; development of railroad led to transportation of cattle to eastern markets, price was decreased and profit was increased, timely access to beef).

9TH GRADE WORLD HISTORY:
Humans, their society and their environment interact
How have location, place, human-environment interaction, movement, and region influenced the growth of nations?
• Geography G1:2.(A) interprets maps and other graphic representations to analyze United States and world issues.
• Geography G1:3.(A) analyzes ways in which mental maps influence past, present, and future decisions about location, settlement, and public policy .
• Geography G1:4. (A) produces maps and other geographic representations, using data from a variety of sources to answer questions and solve problems.

10TH GRADE US HISTORY:
Humans, their society and their environment interact
How have location, place, human-environment interaction, movement, and region influenced the history and development of the U.S.?
• Geography G2.1 The student identifies and explains the changing criteria that can be used to define a region,
• Geography G2.2 The student explains why labels are put on regions to create an identity,
• Geography ▲G4.2 The student analyzes push-pull factors including economic, political, and social factors that contribute to human migration and settlement in U.S.
• History H4.2 The student examines a variety of different types of primary sources in U.S. history and analyzes them in terms of credibility, purpose, and point of view.

11TH GRADE US HISTORY II:
Humans, their society and their environment interact
How have location, place, human-environment interaction, movement, and region influenced the history and development of the U.S.?
• Economics 1:4. (K) explains how economic choices made by individuals, businesses, or governments often have intended and unintended consequences (e.g., individual: build a house in a flood plain; business: car, need for roads, railroads, ecosystems; government:
isolationism at beginning of WWI, Prohibition Act, Space Race, building of atomic bomb).

- History 2:1. ▲(A) uses primary source materials to explore individual experiences in the Dust Bowl in Kansas (e.g., diaries, oral histories, letters).
- Geography G1:2(A) interprets maps and other graphic representations to analyze United States and world issues (e.g., rural vs. urban areas, development vs. conservation, land use in the world vs. local community, nuclear waste disposal, relocation of refugees).