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NATIONAL SPECIALTY PROGRAMS

In 1994, the Getty Center for Education in the Arts asked each of its regional institute grant (RIG) sites to propose a national specialty program which would showcase particular institutional strengths. From its inception, the North Texas Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts (NTIEVA) included five North Texas art museums, the Dallas Museum of Art and the Meadows Museum in Dallas, and in Fort Worth, the Amon Carter Museum, the Kimbell Art Museum, and the Modern Art Museum of Fort Worth, as integral consortium partners. The museums, with collections spanning the centuries from ancient times to the present and from cultures around the world, continue to provide rich resources and fertile teaching environments for teachers and their students. Early partnerships between NTIEVA, its participating school districts, and the art museums included a variety of cooperative programs, and in 1991, a true collaboration developed with the design and implementation of the ArtLinks Study Print Portfolio project. ArtLinks is a set of 25 laminated posters depicting five works of art from each of the five participating art museums, published by NTIEVA with a grant from the Edward and Betty Marcus Foundation. Five hundred sets of 25 prints with a user guide and a teacher guide were distributed to schools in the districts participating in the NTIEVA consortium. Museum educators from each museum wrote information about each object, its maker, and two sets of discussion questions aimed at elementary and secondary school audiences.

During the year-long process that led to the publication of the ArtLinks prints, a close working relationship blossomed among the partners, and continued as NTIEVA, the school districts, and the museums built programs around the use of the prints and their related instructional guides. Based on these successful collaborations,
time demands placed on art museum and school educators. The clearing house would (1) provide museum educators in those art museums that are currently engaged with comprehensive art education an opportunity to network and share resources related to school programs, (2) provide schools and teachers involved in comprehensive art programs with information on how to use art museum resources most effectively, and (3) offer art museums and universities involved in art education a context in which to develop mutually beneficial collaborative efforts.

The involvement of university faculty in art and art museum education would provide the opportunity for an impact on pre-service training for teachers and museum educators. Graduate art history and art education students pursuing the certificate in art museum education in the School of Visual Arts at UNT would make significant contributions to the time and training necessary for research, development, and dissemination of information through networks and publications. All of these services address growing national concerns among art museums, art museum educators, K-12 schools, school administrators, teachers, and universities.

Proposed goals for the National Center for Art Museum/School Collaborations were as follows:

- Assist art museum and school educators in understanding each other's perspectives and in working together.
- Identify models of collaboration among art museums, school districts, and universities.
- Disseminate information about successful models of museum/school/university collaborations.
- Identify and assist in the development of assessment models of museum/school/university collaborations.
- Establish a national advisory board of art museum and art education professionals to guide the NCAMSC's activities.
- Identify and assist in the development of exemplary models of museum/school/university collaborative programs and resources.
Year One

THE NATIONAL CENTER
FOR ART MUSEUM/SCHOOL COLLABORATIONS

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

In fall of 1994, the Getty Center provided a grant of $62,500 to establish the National Center for Art Museum/School Collaborations. Offices adjacent to the North Texas Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts were installed in October 1994, and NCAMSC began operations as the Institute’s specialty program. Nancy Berry, program coordinator for the ArtLinks project and faculty member in the School of Visual Arts, became the program director, with one-third of her time for nine months and 10% during summer months devoted to the Center. Her first task was to advertise a position and interview candidates for a half-time senior secretary, and in consultation with co-directors Davis and McCarter, to identify a graduate student to serve as graduate research assistant (25% time). Deanna Sanchez, an experienced UNT staff member, was hired as administrative assistant, and Cullen Clark, a graduate student in Art History was selected as graduate research assistant.

During its first year of operation, the activities of the National Center for Art Museum/School Collaborations focused on audience research to study the needs and interests of the Center’s primary users: educators and administrators in art museums, schools, and universities. Research took two forms: a meeting of a national advisory board consisting of prominent educators from art museums and universities nationwide, and regional focus groups in key areas of the United States with participants including educators and administrators from schools and art museums.

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

In accordance with the first Research and Development activity outlined in the NCAMSC proposal, a group of eight nationally prominent art museum educators was convened in Denton on November 16-18, 1994, to explore the possible definitions and delimitations of a National Center for Museum/School Collaborations. These
individuals served as national consultants to NTIEVA in planning the national specialty program, discussing appropriate functions for the Center, and suggesting existing resources for possible incorporation in the Center’s resources and databases. The meeting supported proposed objectives 1 and 6 by utilizing a national group to provide the nucleus of an ongoing national advisory committee for the proposed Center to examine means for assisting art museum and school educators in understanding each other’s perspectives and in working together.

The group included Amelia Arenas, School/Museum Educator for the Museum of Modern Art, New York; Dana Baldwin, Director of Education, Portland Art Museum, Portland, Maine; Schroeder Cherry, Director of Education, Baltimore Museum of Art; Anne El-Omami, Director of Education, Cincinnati Art Museum; Susan Hazelroth, Director of Education, The John and Mabel Ringling Museum of Art; Allison Perkins, Director of Education, Amon Carter Museum; Kathleen Walsh-Piper, Head, School and Teacher Programs, National Gallery of Art; and Ray Williams, Director of Education, Ackland Art Museum, University of North Carolina. Several area art museum educators responded to NCAMSC’s invitation to meet and socialize with the advisory committee members, and to attend the meetings and events as observers. Graduate students in art education and art history helped host the group, meeting them at the airport, transporting them to area art museums, and observing sessions.

One change in this activity as originally proposed was the opportunity to engage Sharon Blume, nationally recognized strategic planning consultant, as facilitator. Ms. Blume served as a consultant to the American Association of Museums in the implementation efforts for Excellence and Equity, and at the time, was completing a strategic plan for the Jewish Museum in New York. Her carefully constructed agenda and expert facilitation resulted in a very productive outcome for the meeting.

In the November 1994 meeting, the group helped define the Center’s major activities. Their first task was to examine the goals as stated in the proposal and to refine them. Goal 1 previously read, “Assist art museum and school educators in understanding each other’s perspectives.” The advisory committee revised it to state, “Foster communication and understanding between museum and school art educators.” Two added points under this goal were to identify shared goals and mutual benefits for the two groups, and to create an awareness among both groups about differences in their sites as learning environments. Goal 2 originally read, “Identify models of collaboration among art museums, schools, and universities” and was revised to state, “Examine the nature of existing collaborations among art museums, schools, and universities.”
For other Center goals, the group recommended substituting the words "sample" or "example" for "model".

The agenda for the advisory group meeting included discussions of all the major activities proposed for Fiscal Years 1995 and 1996, and a number of important changes and recommendations occurred. In addition to the clearinghouse/database and networking functions articulated in the proposals, the advisory board stressed the need for a research-oriented third tier. The meeting produced a vision of the Center as a research center/think tank for the field of museum education, with scholarly research by professionals from the field who would visit the Center as scholars-in-residence, and by university graduate students who would travel to other museum locations to initiate and/or implement research projects. Both would result in scholarly publications and presentations sponsored by the Center. One advisory board member said that if she could take a sabbatical for a year's residency at the Center, she could produce the book she has been planning for years. Others expressed interest in residencies for varying amounts of time to complete their research projects.

In their examination of the Center's proposed activities, the committee suggested that NCAMSC substitute focus groups for the proposed weekend meeting of RIG museum and school educators and administrators. The groups would be held at appropriate conference sites to achieve diversity of potential users and geographic locations. Four focus groups could be held for the same expenditure as the weekend meeting of RIG museum and school educators and administrators. Advisory board members volunteered to help in setting up groups in their areas. Participants would help to identify issues, key users, and means of accessing information as well as becoming advocates for the Center. Participants would give an indication of where to focus the Center's resources.

For proposed R&D Activity 3, to conduct a national survey to identify information about collaborations to become part of a database, the committee proposed that the survey should be a two-part one. The first would be similar to that outlined in the original proposal, but with the addition of information which would allow NCAMSC to contact other parties to the collaboration for programs that appear particularly interesting. Certain categories of museum/school collaborations would be identified, and outstanding examples could become case studies based on interviews at their sites by university graduate students. These would be written about or videotaped to be spotlighted by the Center. This service would fill a need expressed by the field with the demise of The Art Museum As Educator, and in a format which could constantly be updated.
The originally proposed R&D Activity 6, a national conference of museum and school art educators, was revised. The group felt the Center should concentrate on regional conferences and focus groups as a means of developing a strong user base and keeping in close touch with its users. However, the need for an issues session where questions could be raised and discussed by experts with varying points of view was a recurring idea. The group’s solution was to request an addition to the Barton Creek Issues Conferences offered by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts. The conference theme would be museum/school collaborations, and the subject would bring together all the national specialty program focuses. They recommended inclusiveness and diversity in the audience — big, small, city, and rural school districts and museums. Such ideas as integrated curricula, distance learning, and other technologies fit within the overarching topic. This format would ensure the desired audience mix, which was uncertain in a format similar to the National Gallery conference of 1992, originally proposed as a model for the Center’s national conference. The group also suggested that it would be interesting to include teleconferencing for both school and museum educators and administrators through downlinks. The Center’s advisory board (and staff) volunteered to help shape and organize the conference.

In summary, the advisory committee, in its first meeting, envisioned the Center as a three-pronged entity that serves as a site for the collection, analysis, dissemination, and evaluation of information about museum/school collaborative programs and services; as a networking facilitator to foster better communication and understanding between school and art museum educators and administrators; and as a research site to encourage study and innovation in object learning as it relates to museum and school collaborations. They recommended substituting regional focus groups for an originally proposed second two-day meeting in Denton, with the result that many more potential users were queried as to their interest in the Center and to what services it might offer them.

**THE FOCUS GROUPS**

Three focus groups were held during the Center’s first year of operation: at the Dallas Museum of Art on June 29 with twelve art museum and school educators and administrators; at Marymount University in Washington, D.C. with ten team members of principals, art specialists, and generalists from schools attending the Principals’ Initiative Institute at the National Gallery of Art and two NGA
museum educators; and at the Portland Museum of Art in Portland, Maine, with two museum educators from the PMA plus art specialists, art coordinators, and classroom teachers from all parts of Maine. Nancy Berry worked with Dr. Joe Welsh, Professor of Marketing in the College of Business Administration at UNT, and his Dallas marketing firm, Syndics Research, Inc., to develop a discussion guide for the focus groups. At each site, a professional facilitator led discussions which were tape-recorded, transcribed, and formed the basis for a qualitative analysis submitted by Syndics Research at their conclusion. Joe Cooper of Syndics Research facilitated the Dallas group, John Falk, a principal of Science Learning Research in Maryland facilitated the Washington, D.C. group, and a member of a Portland marketing firm led the group in Maine.

Findings from the focus groups reinforced some directions originally proposed by the Center, and suggested alterations for others. Their input gave specific recommendations on the ways the Center gathers, organizes, and disseminates information about art museum/school collaborations through print and electronic media. For example, teachers in the focus groups emphasized their desire for instructional resources from permanent collections of art museums, and suggested establishing regional sites through which Center resources and information could be accessed. All three groups stressed their preference for local and regional meetings as opposed to large, national conferences, causing the Center to alter its originally proposed national conference to a series of regional mini-conferences.

The Maine participants, mostly from rural communities, agreed on many of the needs identified by their colleagues across the country who were queried in earlier groups, and added a perspective of their own. They emphasized their desire for teaching resources, especially poster reproductions — a desire strongly expressed by all the focus group school representatives. They need for communication with their art museum and university colleagues as well as with each other was borne out in their responses. Many lived in isolated areas of Maine where travel was all but impossible in winter months. They sought information about programs and resources built around works of art and museum exhibitions, and suggested ways in which the Center could be a conduit for communication for them.

In its executive summary report to NCAMSC, Syndics Research noted that “the qualitative nature of focus groups does not provide information which can be projected or extrapolated to the total population under study. These group discussions simply consist of an open-ended exploration of ideas, concepts, attitudes, or beliefs. The findings from focus groups should be viewed as suggestive, and not
statistically valid.” The report, written by Mr. Cooper, arranged the findings into three categories, Roles in Collaborative Efforts, Interest in the Center, and Functions of the Center.

In the collaborative roles section, Syndics found that participants viewed the primary role of the art museum in collaborations to be an “extension of the classroom” by providing a “sacred place” for students to view real works of art. It was also suggested that museums coordinate efforts to work with school curriculums and focus on providing resources such as textbooks, visual aides, and bibliographies. As noted above, images from permanent collections were particularly desirable. Museums were urged to help with advocacy efforts for art programs in the schools through involvement with administrators, parent groups, and students themselves in addition to teacher training efforts.

The role of the schools included urging teachers to become aware of museum program offerings and take part in them. School educators can help museums in their program design efforts by keeping them updated on curriculum changes and requirements. School educators suggested that “cross-teaching”, using a museum’s collection or exhibitions to learn about disciplines other than art, would benefit students as well as getting other faculty involved in art museum/school collaborations.

As to interest in the Center, Syndics found that the idea of the Center was well received, with most participants expressing their desire for “one central place used to access information about museum and school programs.” They observed that a Center with national scope provides credibility and validity for school art programs. They added that some felt that museum/school collaborations would not happen unless some agency outside of local or state governments assumed the responsibility for facilitating them.

Functions of the Center, information gathering and dissemination, networking, and research brought out several key issues in discussions. Participants liked the concept of an information clearinghouse, a central location for accessing information about collaborative programs. It was perceived as a source for identifying research or literature on subjects such as funding opportunities, internships, institutes, seminars, workshops, curriculum materials, art organizations, and events. They urged that good programs could be validated and publicized, as well as integrated curriculum ideas and information about advocacy.

As to networking formats, participants favored local or regional conferences as opposed to national ones, and face-to-face meetings such as the focus groups themselves were preferred as means of facilitating dialogue and discussion. Most felt that a
national print publication, such as a newsletter, might not generate the readership necessary to justify its use of resources.

There was mixed interest in electronic publications, primarily because of uncertainty as to how they might be accessed, given the current state of technology in schools and museums. Nevertheless, most felt a growing need for computer-assisted communications or electronic media resources in the near future.

Documented programs and case studies emerged as key research issues. Suggestions for case studies included those that featured applications of new technologies or theoretical studies of the learning process that differentiate how people learn differently in art museum and school environments. It was suggested that interns could conduct the research in museums and schools, but most felt that only universities have the time to conduct in-depth and well-documented studies.

The Syndics report was unpublished, but many of its findings were discussed in an article by Ms. Berry, "A Focus on Art Museum/School Collaborations" in the March 1998 issue of The Journal of Art Education, published by the National Art Education Association.

NETWORKING ACTIVITIES

In addition to audience research activities, program director Nancy Berry and research assistant Cullen Clark presented reports on art museum/school collaborations and/or distributed information about the Center at state and national conferences including the Texas and National Art Education Associations, the American Association of Museums, and the Getty Center's January 1995 conference in Washington, D.C. At the 1995 AAM annual conference in Philadelphia, over 200 museum educators attended Ms. Berry's session, The Teacher Audience: Training Expert Multipliers, and were made aware of the Center, given brochures, and invited to become part of its mailing list.

Ms. Berry attended a conference on museum/school partnerships co-sponsored by the Institute for Museum Services November 9 - 12, 1995 in Washington, D.C., and met with IMS executive director Diane Frankel to discuss possible future partnerships to sponsor regional conferences on art museum/school collaborations. Meeting with colleagues from museums and schools in Washington offered a final opportunity in FY95 to gather information from the Center's primary audiences.
SURVEY DESIGN

The Center's final task in its first year was to initiate the design of a survey to be mailed to art museum educators early in the second fiscal year. Its results would be organized into the Center's database of information about art museum/school collaborative programs and services and would serve as a springboard for identifying issues to be further explored in case studies and at the Center's mini-conference to be held in partnership with the Dallas Museum of Art in November 1996. Consultation with Dr. Jim Glass, director of the Information Systems Research Center at UNT, was initiated on July 7. Dr. Glass met with Nancy Berry and Cullen Clark to discuss a format, types of questions, and a form of analysis for the survey to be sent to art museum educators. The group agreed on a two-part survey to include responses from collaborators for programs identified for further research. The survey draft was circulated to advisory committee members for their comments, and Dr. Glass made necessary corrections and revisions before the survey was mailed.

Year Two

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

During September and October, NCAMSC altered the makeup of its permanent national advisory committee according to the guidelines established in the proposal for Phase II. Members were extended invitations to serve on the committee and to attend its weekend meeting October 27–29 in Denton; travel and meeting arrangements were completed. At the meeting, the group acted as national consultants to NCAMSC in planning its proposed activities and refining its mission, purpose, goals, and objectives.

Members of the national advisory committee were museum educators Dana Baldwin, Director of Education, Portland Museum of Art; Schroeder Cherry, then Director of Education, Baltimore Museum of Art; Susan Hazelroth, Director of Education, John and Mabel Ringling Art Museum; Allison Perkins, Education Director, Amon Carter Museum; and Ray Williams, Director of Education, Ackland Art Museum, University of North Carolina; University of Cincinnati Adjunct
Professor Anne El-Omami, also Director of Education, Cincinnati Art Museum; museum administrator Kathleen Walsh-Piper, Associate Director in charge of Education and Public Programs; school administrator Sandra Wysong, principal of Mitchell Elementary School, Plano ISD; and school educator Cynde Riddle, art specialist of North Hi Mount Elementary School, Fort Worth ISD. Additionally Amelia, Arenas, Visual Arts Curriculum administrator at the Museum of Modern Art agreed to serve as editorial consultant for print and electronic publications.

Those named above with the exception of Arenas, Cherry, and Hazelroth met in Denton on October 27 – 29. Agenda items included an update on NCAMSC’s audience research including the three focus groups described earlier; a demonstration of the Center’s progress in establishing an electronic communications network; an examination and analysis of the survey draft; a discussion of plans for the mini-conference proposed for fall, 1996; and a session devoted to the refinement of the Center’s mission, purpose, goals, and objectives.

During its first morning meeting, the committee reviewed the Center’s progress toward its clearinghouse functions including the survey, the database, and dissemination media. Nancy Walkup, NTIEVA program director, demonstrated the newly established home pages on the World Wide Web, and instructed the committee on ways of accessing information through various art networks. A mock-up of NCAMSC’s home page site was discussed as to ease of accessibility.

The survey prototype was distributed to members before they traveled to Denton, so that they arrived with suggestions for refining its content. Some questions were slightly altered, and others were added; in particular, the committee was sensitive to areas covering assessment of programs and diversity of targeted audiences. A matrix to aid Center staff in analyzing survey results was designed by Anne El-Omami and presented to the group, who approved it.

The committee made a number of contributions to the plans for the November 1996 regional mini-conference, then in its early stages of development. Their offer to combine their fall 1996 meeting with the conference so that they could serve as faculty and facilitators was enthusiastically accepted. The committee continued to urge NCAMSC to maintain a research capacity in addition to gathering and disseminating information. They suggested such activities as think tanks and fellowships for visiting scholars as possibilities.

The committee felt strongly that focus group findings should be heeded. In their discussion of the proposed conference on museum/school collaborations, they indicated that the focus group participants’ preference for small, regional conferences should be
followed, not only to accede to their wishes, but for reasons of economy and efficiency. As to content, the group theorized that a few subjects of concern to audiences would be indicated by the frequency of their appearances in survey results, and that from those issues, conference themes should be developed. An interesting direction emerged during the discussion of conference format. The group felt that conclusions drawn during plenary sessions would lead to areas of concern that should become the basis for study at a think tank of assembled experts. Committee members indicated that proceedings of both the conference and the think tank should be published and made available to the fields of art and art museum education.

At its final meeting, the committee helped the Center refine its mission statement, and began a discussion of purpose, goals, and objectives.

THE NCAMSC NATIONAL SURVEY, PART ONE

The second year of the Center's activities continued to center on audience research. In Fiscal Year 1996, another form of research methodology was added to the advisory committee and focus groups initiated in FY95: a national survey of art museum educators to determine the extent of their participation in collaborations with school and university partners. The survey was designed by research assistant Cullen Clark with assistance from senior secretary Kris Westerson, who joined the Center's staff in July 1996 after the resignation of Ms. Sanchez, and in consultation with Dr. Jim Glass, director of the Information Systems Research Center at UNT. At their October 1995 meeting, Advisory committee members reviewed the draft and made suggestions.

Questions were designed to elicit both quantitative and qualitative responses, and covered a range of topics including program concept and management, collaborators, audiences, formats, marketing, evaluation, and program content. Museum educators were encouraged to submit collateral materials from their programs. The survey and its cover letter went to press on November 23.

The survey was sent out on December 6, 1995 with a cover letter from Berry to 600 art museum educators, gleaned from the rosters of the NAEA museum division and the AAM's EdCom. Return postage paid envelopes were included in the packet. Even though the deadline for return was January 15, 1996, responses were still arriving weekly at that time, along with requests for additional copies of the survey. The cut-off date was extended to May 15, at which time NCAMSC had received responses containing information on 180 programs from 100 museums in 35 states, plus the District of Columbia and Montreal, Canada. The responses were summarized
in a format suitable for access either by hard copy or electronically via the NCAMSC home page. They described programs with varying degrees of collaboration ranging from simple programs for school tours to elaborate partnerships between multiple institutions over several years. In response to qualitative questions, museum educators were candid in their answers as to why their programs were successful and about problems they encountered.

The report on the results of the survey was planned to include statistical data, anecdotal responses to open-ended questions, and an elaborate chart which encouraged comparisons of programs across a number of categories. Analysis and the writing of the report was completed by Cullen Clark during early summer 1996, and was edited and proofread by Ms. Berry and Ms. Westerson. Findings were compiled, and a two-part format for the report was designed by Ms. Clark. In part one, data for each question were analyzed and reported quantitatively in several pages of text. Qualitative responses to open-ended questions were edited to ensure anonymity and revised for conformity, then added to the report. Part two takes the form of a fold-out chart to be inserted in the body of the printed report. The chart gives specific responses for every program of each responding museum, allowing for easy comparisons of categories of information. Through the end of August, Ms. Clark, Nancy Berry, and Laura Lee Utz prepared the data for final editing and for the design of the published report.

Ms. Clark, the Center's first research assistant, completed her course work for her M.A. degree in art history in May and worked in the Center office through July, when she left to become Curator of Education at the Art Museum of Southeast Texas in Beaumont. Now Cullen Clark Lutz, she is presently Director of Education at the San Antonio Museum of Art. In August, Laura Lee Utz assumed Cullen's duties in the Center's office, and on September 1 became the Center's research assistant, assuming duties related to publishing the report. A member of the School of Visual Arts' Communication Design faculty, Carla Tedeschi, designed the publication, located a printer, and the report was published by NCAMSC in November 1996. Three hundred copies of the report were distributed late in 1996.

OTHER AUDIENCE RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

A fourth focus group grew out of a speaking engagement when NCAMSC director Nancy Berry was asked to address the education committee of the Association of Art Museum Directors on the subject of school audiences. Transforming the session into a
focus group brought about the opportunity to learn what art museum directors from the country's most prestigious museums thought museums and schools should do to bring about successful collaborative programs. Their lively participation yielded both anticipated and unexpected results. Their responses to the same questions posed at focus groups consisting mostly of educators from schools and museums were closer to those voiced by school teachers than those expressed by their own staff educators. This posed interesting questions: Do museum directors have a better handle on the school audience than museum educators have? Or are they that out of touch with the needs and interests of their staff educators? Further research was suggested. Responses from all the focus groups continued to give direction and shape to the Center’s activities.

NETWORKING
ELECTRONIC NETWORK

A permanent home page was established for NCAMSC by Jana Gutierrez, a work study assistant for NTIEVA, and went on-line early in April 1996. It offered users a fact sheet on the Center as well as descriptions of successful art museum/school collaborative programs of various types. Limited categories of programs were offered as choices on a screen preceding their descriptions, giving users the opportunity to focus on their particular interests. The program listings were later augmented by the program summaries compiled from survey responses. The NCAMSC home page was linked to NTIEVA's, and, in April, was linked to ArtsEdNet and the Museum Computer Network. Research continued toward additional links as well as possible additional electronic services. The fact sheet listed NCAMSC's home page and e-mail addresses.

CONFERENCE PLANNING

During this fiscal year, planning took place for the Center's first major networking program, conceived as a regional invitational mini-conference, "Learning from Works of Art through Museum/School Collaborations," to be held November 7 - 9, 1996 at the Dallas Museum of Art. Leilani Lattin Duke agreed to give the keynote address for an expanded audience of area art, art education, and education leaders in addition to conference participants. David Perkins was asked to be the content specialist, speaking on his theories purported in The Intelligent Eye. Dr. Perkins declined the invitation due to an overcrowded schedule. Terry Barrett was
invited to assume that role, and he agreed to speak on “Learning from Works of Art.” Room reservations were confirmed at the Fairmont Hotel, located near the Museum, and spaces in the DMA were reserved for programs events, and meals. The NCAMSC Advisory Committee members agreed to attend as faculty and facilitators for presentations, break-out, and plenary sessions, and remain for their fall consultation at the end of the conference. Survey results were evaluated to determine which groups to invite to attend. It was determined that groups would consist of teams of two or three from outstanding programs within a region of Texas and surrounding states. There would be a museum and a school educator in each team, complemented by a strong representation of school administrators.

NCAMSC staff worked with Kathleen Walsh-Piper, NCAMSC advisory committee member and associate director in charge of education and public programs at the DMA, to finalize plans for the conference. Other key personnel involved at the DMA include Alycen Cuellar, administrative assistant; Stone Savage, audio-visual technician; Mary Lampe, manager of adult programs; and Ginger Reeder, director of public relations. The DMA provided space and audio-visual resources free of charge, as well as helping with the reception preceding Lani Duke’s lecture and a dinner afterward. Terry Barrett’s lecture on Saturday morning was opened to the public, followed by a tutorial in the galleries for participants. Members of the advisory committee were contacted to ensure their participation as facilitators. Museum/school collaborators were chosen as participants from outstanding programs identified from survey responses.

OTHER NETWORKING ACTIVITIES

Additional networking occurred at state and national conferences, where staff presented several programs in lecture, panel, and poster session formats to several hundred potential users. Opportunities to market the Center’s services in marketplace sessions took place at both NAEA and AAM national conferences.
Year Three

NETWORKING

LEARNING FROM WORKS OF ART
THROUGH MUSEUM/SCHOOL COLLABORATIONS

The highlight of the third year of the Center's activities was the mini-conference, "Learning from Works of Art through Museum/School Collaborations", held at the Dallas Museum of Art November 7 - 9, 1996. At the same time the survey report was in its final stages before publication, concentrated work on the NCAMSC regional invitational mini conference took place. The conference was held in partnership with the Dallas Museum of Art, who made spaces and some staff time available, as well as extending their in-house discounts on food services to us.

All the planning details, however, fell to the NCAMSC staff. Letters were sent to museum educators at sites in Texas and surrounding states whose programs were identified as appropriate for inclusion at the conference. They were asked to indicate their interest in participating in the conference as described in the letter. Several museums indicated interest, and a second letter invited them to apply. This letter included more detailed information about food and housing, as well as a preliminary agenda. Application requirements specified a list of team members, including one museum educator and one school educator, with preference given to teams that included a school administrator. Fifteen teams applied, and eleven were invited to the conference. Choices were made by Kathleen Walsh-Piper and Allison Perkins, NCAMSC advisory committee members, with Berry and Westerson.

Walsh-Piper and Perkins also worked with Berry to finalize details of the conference content, choosing two major issues to be examined in breakout and plenary sessions: the process of collaboration and interpreting works of art. The group determined an overarching question and five subquestions for each major issue, chosen from suggestions sent by advisory committee members. Instructions were written and mailed to advisory committee members who served as facilitators for breakout sessions and to UNT graduate students in Art Museum Education who served as recorders. Details concerning requirements for spaces, equipment, food
functions, hotel accommodations, travel arrangements, and conference packets were handled by Westerson and Utz, with help from Catherine Proctor, administrative assistant for Education at the DMA.

The conference was held November 7 – 9, and due to considerable preplanning, went very smoothly. Conference “playbooks” with detailed information about every component were prepared by Westerson, and given to Blanche Rubin and Julie Abel representing the Getty Education Institute, as well as to Berry. Invited speakers, whose lectures were open to the public, were Leilani Lattin Duke, who spoke on “New Perspectives in Art Museum/School Collaborations”, and Terry Barrett, who spoke on “Learning from Works of Art”. The conference dates were in conflict with the annual meeting of the Texas Art Education Association held in San Antonio the same weekend, resulting in a poor turnout from area art teachers. The conflicting dates occurred because Pacific Visions, the public relations firm employed by the Getty Education Institute, required early information to be included in their catalog. NCAMSC set the dates for the fall 1996 conference in the summer of 1995, well before TAEA’s dates had been determined. The speakers’ talks, Barrett’s tutorial, and Ray Williams’ gallery experience were particularly well-received.

Evaluations of the meeting by participants, NCAMSC staff, Getty evaluator Blanche Rubin, and the NCAMSC advisory committee were overwhelmingly positive, with most evaluations calling for additional meetings with the same format to be held throughout the nation. Throughout the year, information pertinent to a report on the conference proceedings was gathered, analyzed, and synthesized for publication in November 1997. NCAMSC staff members Berry, Westerson, and Utz divided the responsibility for writing up conference sessions, and Lani Duke sent a copy of her talk with permission to publish it in the report. Advisory Committee members who acted as facilitators in breakout sessions wrote up their recorders’ notes so that NCAMSC staff could synthesize that information for the published report. Utz transcribed sessions led by Terry Barrett and Ray Williams, and they edited and returned the transcriptions for publication. Evaluations and correspondence from conference participants continued to arrive throughout 1997, frequently citing examples of how conference content was being put to use.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE ANNUAL MEETING**

As stated above, NCAMSC advisory committee members served as facilitators for breakout and plenary sessions at the conference, as well as table topic discussion
leaders at the opening dinner. One member, Ray Williams, led a gallery experience for the group. He chose to present "World Religions", demonstrating his objective and engaging approach to the subject in the DMA's recently reinstalled collections of art from Africa, Asia, and the Pacific. On the Sunday morning following the conference, the group met at Berry's home to evaluate the conference and to suggest future directions for NCAMSC. Responses to the conference were generally positive, and the consensus of the group was to hold similar conferences annually in different parts of the country, keeping the same general format with slight alterations to the content to address current issues and to take advantage of regional art collections. The group indicated that NCAMSC should maintain its information collection, analysis, and dissemination function, as well as its networking role through regional meetings and conferences. The group urged the Center to continue its research, with several suggestions for forms it might take.

ELECTRONIC NETWORK

Rebecca Arkenberg, NTIEVA graduate research assistant, put the survey program analyses on-line during the Christmas break. Over 200 program summaries are accessible through the site. NCAMSC hired a work studies student who is trained to keep the site updated and functional. Kara English, who handled web page assignments for both NTIEVA and NCAMSC, added the report on part one of the survey, as well as a blank copy which could be downloaded and printed by museum educators who wish to add their collaborative programs to the databank. When the report on the regional conference is complete, it was planned to be added, at which time all the menu choices on our menu (Information Clearinghouse, Networking, and Research) would be operable.

AUDIENCE RESEARCH
SURVEY OF ART MUSEUM/SCHOOL COLLABORATIONS
PART ONE

In September and October, Nancy Berry, Laura Lee Utz, and Kris Westerson worked on final rewrites and editing for the 1996 survey of art museum educators. As stated above, over 100 museums responded with data on 187 programs. The published report presented the qualitative and qualitative responses to the survey questions, with analyses of each of the 187 programs in an insert format. In October, Carla Tedeschi,
a professor in the Communication Design area of the School of Visual Arts, took the completed survey text on a computer disk and worked up several designs for the publication. After several proofreadings, the final design went to the printer in late November. The insert was photocopied in a flexible format so that programs can be easily studied and compared. The first mailing of 200 copies occurred in mid-December, with 300 additional copies made available for distribution to interested parties. NCAMSC advertised the availability of the reports in several print media as well as on our web page.

PART TWO

Audience research continued in the form of part two of a survey of art museum/school collaborations. Part Two of the survey, querying school collaborators identified in part one, was mailed in April 1997. School educators were asked to respond to issues of concept, content, time commitment, program sequence, spin-off programs, use and life of materials, their role in the program, preparation and training, meeting academic and educational goals, and student assessment. In addition, school educators were asked to note whether they would use the NCAMSC database, and how they could access NCAMSC in the future, including at state and national art education conferences.

Of the programs documented in Part One of the survey, 118 listed the school educator involved in the collaboration. Even though the survey stated a due date of May 30, 1997, responses were accepted until June 15 in order to maximize their number. NCAMSC achieved approximately a 43% return rate with 51 of 118 school educators responding. Many of the surveys were completed by educators other than those solicited by name from Part One of the study. While making it difficult to match responses with each of the respective museums from Survey I, this finding supported responses to Survey I in which museum educators cited personnel turnover in schools as a hindrance to sustaining programs. During the summer, findings were analyzed by Laura Lee Utz, who prepared a statistical report. Ms. Utz, graduate research assistant from August 1996 to September 1, 1997, was awarded her Master of Arts degree in Art Education on August 9. Ms. Utz continued to work on compiling the results for the second part of the survey that went to school collaborators.

Kay Wilson, ABD in art education, began duties as the final graduate research assistant for NCAMSC on September 3. Ms. Wilson assumed the primary role in writing, editing, and publishing the synthesized survey report. In fall 1997, findings
from the two surveys were studied and analyzed by Berry, Westerson, Wilson, and Allison Perkins, Education Director of the Amon Carter Museum and NCAMSC Advisory Committee member. Wilson prepared an addendum that synthesized findings from both surveys as a part of the report which was published and distributed in November 1997. A letter was written by Wilson and mailed to all museums who have programs described in the written report and on the Web site, requesting updated information. Those who did not respond by the deadline were contacted by phone.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Early in 1997, Nancy Berry was asked to serve as guest editor for an issue of the Journal of Art Education, published by the National Art Education Association, which would have as its theme art museum/school collaborations. Throughout summer and fall 1997, Ms. Berry recruited authors from across the United States, all of whom had responded to the first part of the NCAMSC survey. Ten authors were selected to write for the issue, with Berry writing the lead article, which defined museum/school collaborations and reported on research findings from NCAMSC focus groups and part one of the survey. Berry’s article and five others were chosen for the final issue, published in March 1998.
Future Plans for NCAMSC

The data gathered in Surveys I and II will serve as the basis and focus of continued research and study in art education, art history, and museum studies.

With the publication of the conference and part two survey reports, the Center's program activities came to a close. The web site remained as a separate entity until late December 1997, when it was absorbed by the NTIEVA site. NCAMSC staff continued to service requests for information about programs until January of 1998, and Ms. Berry and present NTIEVA staff members attempt to respond to requests at present. These activities continued as the Center prepared to close.

NCAMSC and NTIEVA staffs met on several occasions to brainstorm ideas for future funding, applying creative thinking toward possible combinations of programs related to NTIEVA. One proposal which would give the Center a statewide focus exists, and initial contact is underway with a potential funder. All NCAMSC and NTIEVA staff members, as well as the NCAMSC advisory committee and many of its users remain hopeful that the positive results achieved during Getty funding can carry forward to a newly conceived center.

Nancy Berry, November 1998