20

Artist Roles and Value Systems*

ARTISTS IN THE COMMUNITY

Arts councils have made it more comfortable for artists to work outside New York City. Artists are more valued in their own hometowns; the concept of "feeding the artist in his own pen and home is taking hold."[1]

"Identify valid artistic purposes and combine them with valid public purposes." The arts council in too many cases has used the artist. The arts council leadership has a role in protecting the artist who is asked to serve a public purpose. The musician playing on the mall is playing because he or she loves music, and that is valid; an artist must not be asked to do inartistic things. Artists contribute by *being good artists* and making their art accessible. They need, too, to be in touch with their audience.[2]

We were not very concerned about artists in 1965; today we are concerned for their employment, as well as their integration with the look of the city (public work).

Sophie Consagra, Director of the American Academy in Rome and former Executive Director of the Delaware Arts Council and Visual Arts and Architecture Director for the New York State Council on the Arts, believes that if experimental artists are to be helped, then it will be by federal and state governments.

*Discussion in this chapter centers around the individual creative or performing artist, as opposed to those whose work cannot be accomplished without a group (i.e., theater, symphony, opera).

> Foundations are too cautious, museums only buy what is approved, and patrons increasingly collect art as investment. No one is willing to take a chance on them. I don't see anyone really caring about them except us . . . the government. We *have* to care about the artists coming up, because we are all they have, and all they are going to have if things continue the way they are going.[3]

> But the artist who chooses to commit his or her talent to serving other people seeks to make a more personal difference, by sharing his or her art with others as an instrument of human growth. And the experience . . . shows that whenever artists have reached out this way they have been met by outstretched hands.[4]

In the Southern Tier of New York State, at Binghamton, sits the Roberson Center for the Arts and Sciences. It is both an institution and the Arts Council for Broome County, although it is to assume a full united arts funding role in the future. Until now, it has had services very much like those of many other arts councils. However, the majority of the Center's efforts are directed at the primary functions of Roberson as a museum for research, exhibition, publication, and maintenance of collections. Its relationship with artists has been wide-ranging.

> We are, of course, criticized roundly by local artists since we are very selective in the exhibitions that are shown in our major galleries. On the other hand, when we choose artists for an exhibition, it is extremely well researched, well presented, and includes quality publication. Those who are selected have, in fact, reached the pinnacle of local recognition and support. That has helped mitigate against the other criticism that is going to come no matter what we do. . . .
>
> I believe because of the example that we set and the support that we are providing for the arts generally, people are coming to realize that the arts are not a frill but, indeed, are common to all of our experience.[5]

In other cities, the artists have been given the opportunities presented by the passage of percent for art in public places laws, individual counseling, an "Arts at the Airport" project and others like it, residencies of every kind in community institutions, and support for their careers through workshops on the business of being professional.

The councils have played several roles. Depending on their own priorities and focus on artists' needs, at times they have been the major instigators or, in a good many instances, have worked behind the scenes. The local artist has come to rely on the arts council for a shoulder to lean on, sympathy, and a place to "get one's act together" or do some ideological brainstorming. In the best situations, the local council seems to be filling a

need between formal training and involvement with the real world and a fully professional life. Many councils have expressed a need to do more that is substantial.

Though the National Endowment for the Arts, state arts councils, and private supporters have done more for individual artists ready for grants and fellowships, the local arts councils may have prepared them for, or made them aware of, those opportunities. Not only might they have been instrumental in creating the first opportunities, but some may have helped artists present themselves with confidence and the necessary backup.

In the best situations, an artist-in-residence in the schools or neighborhood finds a potential career direction that uses skills and talents fitting his or her individual temperament. He or she ultimately becomes hired by the institution itself.

Dozens of the best artists in cities, involving all art forms, talk about their relationships to the council. It takes three, five, or more years for some developmental processes to gel, for people to find themselves; but if they trace their experiences, many today would point to the arts councils' assistance along the way.

What is of particular interest is watching these talents develop. It has taken many artists the better part of a decade as they have moved through several phases, gaining maturity as persons and as professionals. They have, for the most part, also gained a knowledge of themselves, a sense of confidence, and a grasp of the wider issues in the world of the arts as they move to make their place in it. They are talented to begin with, but this process has been nurtured by their local support groups, cheering them through the student show, the regional exhibit, the first one-person show, and the first commission.

It is also interesting to watch their training patterns – do they move to New York and back, out West, or South to the newer opportunities? Do they go to special programs to work with identified mentors at the right time? Is this necessary to acquire new ideas and to gain new and multiple experiences? Do they perhaps find ultimately, and naturally, that returning to their original locale is good? The artist coming back is different from the artist who left, and is appreciated differently. Each part of this process has its effect upon the next. Individual development grows from the contacts made, the work accomplished, and the experiences absorbed.

If artists who have been this route and have "made it" are asked these questions, they will give some repetitive replies – personal goals set and well defined, and an organized professional approach. The combination of qualities is seen repeatedly: talent, commitment, focus, success – and luck. Most successful artists admit being at the right place at the right time – for exhibits, publishing, performing companies, readings, mentors, grants, fellowships, or whatever.

Among the oldest organizations that have assisted the creative artists are Poets and Writers, Inc. in New York, the Artists Foundation in Boston, and the New Organization for the Visual Arts in Cleveland, which was created with the assistance of the Cleveland Area Arts Council. These organizations have developed programs in direct response to the expressed needs of the professional creative artist, regardless of discipline. Their goals are to assist all artists who wish to become self-supporting and to increase public understanding and appreciation of contemporary artists' work and skills.

Becoming businesslike and professional in all respects is a major goal for all artists today. No longer is the artists' disdain for such aspects of professional life seen as appropriate; there's too much assistance around. The early work of these support groups in the 1970s has had an influence on the older training institutions serving the artists. Today most institutions include discussions of these topics.

Unemployment figures among artists are still devastating. Statistics point to improvement in the 1970s, but with general unemployment up, the 1980s could see a backsliding as priorities for unemployment are sorted out. For all of the better awareness of the roles and needs of artists today, most of the measures of support are one-time in nature. The one-time grant or fellowship, be it for a year of creative effort or a specific project, is important and not to be underestimated for its impact on opportunities provided. But the question still remains—what about ongoing sustenance?

"Arts weeks" and local festivals are celebrations—fun for artists and the public if well run; they are the best opportunities for craftspersons, mimes, some musicians, and those dancers who can perform. But they are seldom the *best* shows for painters, sculptors, choreographers, playwrights, or composers. Many times budgets are too limited for commissions and exhibitions; other times, the ambience may not be conducive to moving tons of sculpture material, or to trying to paint with the sun in one's eyes or with poor light inside. Furthermore, hanging and selling space is often poorly thought through for those who do display, and performance areas are not conducive to good performance. Finally, it's easy to think the job is done once the celebration is over; of course, it is not.*

A call from an artist recently inquired as to what kind of art was selling. She wasn't interested in any aspect of art except being successful in the marketplace—an "in today, out tomorrow" affair. She could create images on demand, as she said. There are few answers, because she'll make it, but

*Some artists today have created a new support system for themselves by focusing on the festival circuit and making a living by selling their works outside galleries. Also, the larger local or national festivals such as Houston or Spoleto budget and plan for commissioned work. There are also the specialized festivals such as jazz, film, or outdoor sculpture, which are among the most interesting.

her growth as an artist has long since ceased if that is *all* she is planning to do.

A playwright has made a suggestion. If every professional theater incorporated into its structure a playwright-in-residence who would be able to write as an established part of the contract, the ongoing basic need for more stability would be met. This idea could extend to the playwright's counterparts – the choreographer, visual artist, writer, and composer. A model for this can be found in the special residencies of Affiliate Artists, such as the Exxon Arts Endowment Conductors program, the Xerox Pianists program, and the San Francisco–Affiliate Artists Opera program, giving opportunities, extended training, and experience for employment, performance, and community informance* to gifted artists in these disciplines.

Ongoing sustenance needs the focus of private employers and the appropriate educational and performing arts institutions, where artists can be hired as artists – remembering, of course, that no professional in any field creates 100 percent of the time. There are related duties, paperwork, and business. Artist residencies have been tried at schools, colleges, and even factories. There have also been public roles well suited to artists. The success depends on how integral these jobs are seen to be – whether they are staff roles, not afterthoughts, for starters. There could be exchanges among institutions in various other cities, rotations, and other refreshing schemes to renew vigor and creative resources.

If the values represented in the contracts are straight "employer to artist," there could be some additional value for everyone who would consider these possibilities. Then fellowship and grant programs could take a proper place among incentives, instead of being dependency programs.

With the onslaught of government support, short-lived as it was, during the WPA of the 1930s, the artist as worker was compensated at what was thought to be a decent rate for a fair day's work. "Some had the chance to stay alive while learning [and] creating."[6] Today, after 15 years of concern and growing support from a network of the National Endowment for the Arts and state arts council agencies, the artist emerges as a professional to be considered in a different way. In the 1930s, the indigent artist, chosen for talent but also for ability to fit into a public work scheme, emerged as dedicated and serious. Many are well-recognized names. Their works, now emblazoned on the public memory for all time, are, in general, useful and technically adequate social commentaries. They are part of the fabric of our social history, a moment in our artistic history. We are to be reminded

*An "informance" is an informal presentation combining performance and conversation.

that the entire history of the arts projects from 1933 to 1943 was, from the inception, more or less tied to relief. However,

> in spite of differences in politics and esthetics, artists report having experienced a professional communality unique in American art history; in spite of pitifully meager wages, nagging frustration, and bureaucratic harassment, artists were regularly employed at professional tasks. . . . there was a new and positive sense of the artist's place in American society. . . . It still remains for many a "golden age."[7]

Federal support for artists in more recent times seems a catalyst for awareness on the part of other potential supporters of the positive power of creative energy and a blossoming of some of America's best artistic talent and recognition for such. Our arts history, until recent decades, is European-based. Today America's artists are American-trained and assume world leadership roles. Since World War II, many short-lived stylistic idioms have paraded before us; today, artists may work in a multitude of forms and styles, using a multitude of materials available in this contemporary period.

Artists as individuals are just discovering the potential of their roles, rights, and impact on the community – and even on the world. Their anti-institutional bias or individualistic bent on many matters may bring criticism of institutionalized planning and the decision-making process. Rightly or wrongly, the artist is just learning the responsibilities that surround the professional artist. Those responsibilities are juxtaposed with artists' demands for commission, recognition, and opportunities from all kinds of potential commissioners, including government bodies and corporations. The artist looks not only for financial and ongoing support, but also for living and working contexts that are compatible. These may turn out to be studios in steel mills with donations of materials, or outright commissions, protected by good contractural agreements and copyright. Volunteer lawyers' groups in many cities, including Chicago, New York City, Cleveland, and Indianapolis, have become intrigued with the ways in which they can be skillful in assisting the artist and have helped with specific contractual work and other legal matters.

This, for the individual artist, presents some natural dichotomies and dilemmas. The individual artist usually does not create to satisfy a public need. The very marrow of creative effort includes a need to be personal in style and free in expression. This is the kernel of artistic production that is worth anything, and invariably makes the difference between great and acceptable or passable art. Are the two ideas – the need for public response and satisfaction, and the needs of artistic creation – incompatible? This is the age-old problem highlighted in new contexts.

The setting for the artist needs to be supportive, not antithetical. Nothing is ever right about a poet reading in an open park bombarded by the harassment of automobile noise and other urban hostility. It is neither an artistic nor a poetic event. The modern artist rides it out, but the ancient Greek poet reciting in the amphitheater couldn't have imagined a successor fighting such elements. A forum for a poet does include public reading, but the contexts need to be carefully developed to make sense. Some of the most successful have been bookstores, coffeehouses, libraries, and larger well-planned staged events.

There is a common bond among such groups as HAI, Affiliate Artists, Young Audiences, state and community arts councils, neighborhood centers, museums, orchestras, governmental agencies, and corporations—it is that they all have the capability to support the individual artist. Affiliate Artists addresses the need to distribute the talent of performing artists on the way to major careers through residencies, and arts councils are a part of the distribution system (as are regional opera, theater, and dance companies, symphony orchestras, etc.). Since 1966, Affiliate Artists has placed 270 artists in more than 300 communities in 800 residencies. "As a broker, we have enabled the best to create their own new markets."

One assistance program to individual performing artists more recently, including visual artists and writers, has been the Great Lakes Artist Associates program based in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Focused on technical assistance to the artist, the hard questions are asked:

What you've always wanted to know about advancing your career, but had no one to ask!
(Getting the right answers involves asking the right questions)

GOALS:	What do I want to accomplish?
IMAGE BUILDING:	Where am I in my development? How do I see myself? How do I want the public to see me?
AUDITIONS:	Where are the important auditions being held? What materials are the most appropriate for auditioning? What should I wear? What is the most important point to emphasize? Which people should I give as references? What additional visual or audio materials should I include?
PERSONAL REPRESENTATION:	How effectively can I represent myself? Can I project a professional image if I represent myself? What are viable alternatives to commercial management? . . .
CONTACTS:	What personal networks can I tap for valuable contacts? What professional contacts do I already

	have? What political moves will enhance my career? What social events should I attend and create?
CORRESPONDENCE:	To whom should I write, when, and where? When should I use a formal business letter? How is my personal writing style important?
PERSONAL STYLE:	How does my manner of dress and my body language reflect my desired personal image?
RECORD KEEPING:	Are all my professional expenses documented? Which expenses are tax-deductible? Can I afford professional help? What are the available alternative funding sources?
MARKETING:	What is my product? How should I package my product? Who am I trying to reach? What is the most effective way to reach them? How much do promotional materials cost? Can I afford them?
ARTISTIC GROWTH:	How recently has my repertoire expanded or changed? Should I be getting outside coaching? Who's available? How skillful is my programming? What audience am I trying to reach?[8]

Arts councils, by virtue of their diversification, have given less focused, individualized attention. Have they been "tough" enough to be helpful?

There aren't many ways these groups or organizations do work in common. Together they constitute the potential support system, the potential career direction, the potential forum for the contemporary or present artist in today's world. In the framework of these potential "systems" is the artist himself or herself, whose temperament, style and medium of working, personal needs for public display, outlets, work spaces, and supplies may dictate how these systems are seen and work in his or her behalf. No one can speak for every artist.

There is a tendency to expect that a single artist represents all artists in that particular aspect of art form. An artist represents exactly that: an artist — a single individual creatively involved. That individual sees the world from an individual perspective and cannot speak for all artists — not even for all who create in that art form, any more than a person could speak for artists in another art form. A sculptor may have very few problems in common with a performing artist, such as a theater person or even a poet. There are differing sets of needs, skills, supplies, and so on.

On one occasion, ten finalists in a sculpture competition found it difficult to agree on a scale of the model to be presented for final judgment. They chose collectively a scale that was absolutely unfair in terms of cost to one of them, whose piece happened to be aerial and was so foreign con-

ceptually that the others could not grasp her problems. It was a good example of the single artist's view, which is what we get when we ask for an opinion.

There are, of course, some common problems, but they are the largest of issues: the place of an artist in American contemporary society, the general malaise about businesslike and professional attitudes toward artistic business matters, the need for some institutional support, and others that emerge each time we think of the artist.

It may be true that there is no other group in society that is treated as unprofessionally as artists are. They are expected to "donate" to every known cause the very work that is their professional endeavor. What is misunderstood is that for an artist, this work *is* his or her livelihood. If grant systems and artists-in-residence systems (be they for communities in general or for specific institutions such as schools, prisons, hospitals, and cities) did not exist, the situation of artists would be even more difficult. The artist needs the multiple possibilities of support. The artist then also needs to understand that while creative efforts must be free from public intervention, the public has a right to opinions, since some public monies are being used for these systems of support.

Most artists have always combined careers in pursuing their own creative work with teaching or other jobs to help sustain themselves. More are fighting for the full life of an artist, free from other diversion and interruption. One artist, well-known but not sustaining herself solely from her art work, insisted that she was eligible for volunteer legal support because, indeed, the income she lived on did not come from the artwork she created; rather, it came from teaching. "Sources" of income are not divided when delineating eligibility for food stamps or scholarships for anyone else. Why should they be for the artist?

Artists are somewhat ambivalent about wanting exposure and wanting to be judged. For complex reasons, at times they tend to handle themselves badly when it comes to the business aspects of being professional. There may be many good reasons to "cop out" – to "reject" a bad contract, instead of working through it with legal assistance to a compatible conclusion. But how can the artist's potential interrelationship with business, government projects, neighborhoods, and other specific constituents be supported in a manner that is accurate and constructive? The frameworks for careers in teaching and working in the corporate framework as artists-at-large, artists-in-residence, and arts consultants can be developed and nurtured. The arts council could be one of the best agents for setting the groundwork.

One of the most solid ideas is one where the arts council becomes the broker for artist and institution. Prior to a commitment from the council to support the artist, artist and institution have to develop a mutual and workable idea to which the institution can make a commitment. The artist

and the institution then draw up a contract for work. The arts council sees that the artist is funded; the institution is responsible for the supervision, the commitment, and also some of the costs of supplies for the project (or at least the monies for obtaining the supplies). It seems as if the artist is here treated professionally and has the proper support mechanisms assured for successful creative venture. Responsibilities are spelled out clearly. It is when there is less clarity and the artist does not share equally in taking on the responsibility that there is less success all around.

Another interesting type of support program is that of the St. Louis Arts and Humanities Commission, which offers original prints by 16 area artists for sale as an opportunity "to expand your collection of original prints."

In the future, arts councils should encourage artists' inclusion in all phases of community life—from planning and designing with local government to working with transit systems, to getting involved in theater renovations and revitalization programs, and to creating an aesthetic unity with other aspects of a project. Care must be taken to assure that the artist is not "used" for political gain and that there is greater awareness about when this is so.

How is one to summarize the community arts council's role in all of this? Some local arts councils have done the following:

1. Nurtured local artists and probably helped those who were good become more professional, more directed, and more in touch with private and public sources of help.
2. Helped corporations, governments, libraries, and other nonarts institutions become more comfortable with the idea of commissioning and "living" with artwork, by offering guidance and assistance on commissioning processes—juries, contracts, implementation procedures.
3. Made exhibits and performances more widely known through calendars, directories, and phone lines.
4. Tried to understand the individual artist's needs and articulated them.

The state of the arts today shows this nurturing. It also seems apparent to some major critics that little "important" work is being done in almost any field. There seem to be as many artists and as few major and monumental statements as in any period of the history of the arts. The new great music, painting, opera, and plays are not being created and produced at this moment in history—or is it that it takes historical perspective to grasp their value?

What impact the support systems, beginning with those on the local level, have had on this would be impossible to say. But perhaps an artist

cannot create and serve on boards, fight for artists' rights, and think about overriding, earth-shaking community and national arts problems while being the best artist. And perhaps by insisting on their inclusion in such matters, we have done ourselves the greatest injustice of all – robbed them of some of their creative time and energy. It would seem that we are still searching for the best ways to involve them and can do no better than to provide the best opportunities to work.

VALUE SYSTEMS AND NEXT AUDIENCES

> If the arts are for everyone, let us build an educational and societal system in which everyone is for the arts.[9]

With the availability of CETA funds and the possibility of using them to support unemployed artists in their work for schools, it seems as if almost every arts council in the country must have descended upon the doors of its local school system. That, of course, is an exaggeration, but many point to this period, 1974–78, as the time when their artists-in-the-schools programs got their start. What is most disturbing is that too often this impetus has come from an employment incentive, and has nothing to do with the research, planning, training, and implementation of the arts concurrently taking place in education programs.

In the worst instances, the school systems acknowledge the arts councils' assistance, but the projects have little support from the school systems themselves beyond the classrooms they affect; or the projects represent a substitution for arts specialists whom the school systems haven't hired. These council programs are funded from the outside, and, serious as the intentions are, may even be setting back those systems that need to learn the difference between project and program, between arts as basic and arts as expendable "enrichment concepts." The rationales usually end with "not being able to afford it."

Leaders of school systems and councils are basically unaware of the work of the last decade reported here and its potential for application. They are not usually dedicated to research, planning, training, and advocacy in the arts education area. The programs are conducted on a year-to-year, hand-to-mouth basis. Any arts agencies whose efforts have these characteristics – be they arts councils, arts organizations (symphonies, museums, operas, etc.), Junior League chapters, recreation departments, or whatever – should not be involved in work with the schools (or any agencies) that is not well thought out and developed for the right reasons – to improve or support ongoing arts education programs.

The same problem can exist with the motivation of arts organizations involved in the schools:

> When the chief concern of an arts organization is simply to provide opportunities and security for artists to "do their own thing" rather than to translate an arts performance into a learning situation for schoolchildren, such performances are likely to have little lasting significance in the schools. Interest in children and in their capacity to learn [is] very important, as is the ability to relate to the particular age level of an audience. Engaging, outgoing, and enthusiastic visiting artists have made more inroads than have detached, removed performers. Artists who were open to questions and flexible enough to let children participate have had a greater impact.[10]

The schools, we say, are responsible for developing the value systems we want in place when the children are adults. Of course, in the best instances, the arts councils' work with the schools has added significant dimension. But this has come about only because dedicated citizens and professionals from both the schools and the arts have cared about putting it together.

An example of commitment and success has been the Community Resource Center for the Arts and Humanities in Tulsa, Oklahoma. It was founded as a joint project of the Tulsa Public Schools, the Junior League, and the Arts and Humanities Council of Tulsa, so that arts and humanities resources might be orchestrated with school curriculum. The council and the schools jointly fund and administer the project.

The arts council in Buffalo, Arts Development Services, Inc., was asked by the school system to develop a program, Presenting Arts in the Schools; the program was designed to coordinate community activities with ongoing curricula (Emergency School Aid Act funds), with parent groups and community organizations drawing upon the resources of five area professional organizations. Part of what emerged was the use by Arts Development Service of Buffalo Performing Arts vouchers, which are furnished to students and parent organizations to enhance cultural opportunities for students and their families. This allows families to attend a wide variety of dance, music, and drama performances, for the vouchers can be turned in for tickets at the box offices of 40 arts organizations in the area.

The idea of a voucher system is to create new audiences from the potential audiences by underwriting a portion of the cost of a ticket over a specific period of time. The theory is that every empty seat is a loss of revenue. The system has worked, and those on voucher move off into the regular art-going audience at regular prices with enough regularity that evaluation shows this to be an effective method in audience building, partially because it allows for frequency in attendance.

The Arts Development Services' Performing Arts voucher program is an audience development project that encourages attendance at theater, dance, and musical events through reduced price for those who would not ordinarily attend. Applications for the vouchers are available to students, senior citizens, handicapped persons, municipal employees, service workers, labor union members, and members of other groups in western New York. In addition, the program benefits participating performing arts or presenting organizations by subsidizing these performances at a modest level.

To circulate vouchers more fairly, households that have had vouchers for the previous two consecutive years are rotated off the program, except that senior citizens and handicapped persons on fixed limited incomes are exempt from the rotation. The performing or presenting organizations redeem the vouchers by returning them to the office. The redemption fund is made possible by grants from the National Endowment for the Arts, the New York State Council on the Arts, corporations, and foundations.

Voucher systems started in New York City with the Theater Development Fund, and they have been operating independently in some form in other cities, including Minneapolis and Houston. Lack of funding has affected ongoing programs in Boston, Chicago, and San Francisco. (The Theater Development Fund also started the first half-price ticket sale program, which has been a successful audience development system. It too has been adopted in other cities.)

The Arts Development Service voucher program was an important step for the fledgling Buffalo organization in 1973, for it meant that their board and corporate community had to commit themselves to raising proper funds to get it rolling, and that a visible program that would involve many arts organizations directly was being launched. The New York State Council on the Arts was responsible for urging Arts Development Service to undertake this activity – a fortuitous move for both. It is an example of important efforts that have emerged from persuasive state arts council leadership.

There is now enough experience with such systems to know that, for all of the talk about new audiences and the development of new habits and behavior patterns for portions of the community that would otherwise not be responding, some systems do seem to be working where there is adequate funding to keep them going. Does it work best in conjunction with other marketing programs designed to be directed to the potential known audiences? This is like comparing apples and oranges; the newer systems are designed to reach the untested groups. Both types of programs are valid and needed.

The term "audience development" evokes many definitions. It means looking at the potential of new attendance groups for performances and ex-

hibitions, and usually refers to the ways of encouraging that attendance. The main factors inhibiting attendance have been identified as economics, educational level, simple preference, priority, and awareness. However, it has long been felt that behavior patterns established early are the most reliable indicators of those that will be lifelong. Thus the relationship to arts and education is significant.

Arts councils might have another role, which is one aspect of the development of general arts advocacy on the community level – a role as arts-in-education advocates. But they must be clear about goals, purposes, roles, and processes, as in the other areas of arts concern. Otherwise, in the development of value systems, we give out mixed signals.

A review of the efforts to bring about change in the relationship between the arts and education in the country over the past 15 years will show that if any program is to serve the mutual interests of arts *and* education, it must contain several elements that are basic to ensuring that programs expected to extend beyond a trial period become absorbed by the school system. Too few have. The efforts to identify them and communicate about them have been made by people whose names are well known to anyone who has been involved in arts in education over that time. Two people who have documented and reported the progress have been Junius Eddy, an independent consultant for education and the arts (formerly the arts education specialist with the Arts and Humanities Program at the U.S. Office of Education and Education Advisor to the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations), and Charles B. Fowler, a journalist and consultant in the arts. One single document by The Arts, Education and Americans panel, *Coming to Our Senses,* pinpoints why "arts education is struggling for its life" in terms of broad national impact, and points to some of the arts education programs that would serve as models. There are three principles that underlie the panel's nearly 100 recommendations: (1) Only when the arts become central to an individual's learning experience in and out of school and at every stage of life can the goals of American education be realized; (2) the arts must be considered a basic component of curriculum at all levels; and (3) the schools should draw upon all available human and human-made resources in the community for their arts programming, which gives almost any part of the community of education and the arts the right to begin working on accomplishing these ends and the process of seeing that it is done.[11]

Everything we have found out supports and reiterates the need to supervise, plan, and train advocates in order for anything to happen that will have impact. This process must continue with the same vigor as any other aspect of the community's efforts does; or, as teachers move, children graduate, and parents become less involved, so the support groups will move on. The effort at strengthening the role of arts in education can be

synopsized by showing where its thrust began, and enumerating the contributions of several organizations who grew in response to the needs projected.

From the 1960s and first at the federal level,

> the pattern of support evolved in a random fashion rather than resulting from systematic analysis of all the components which together make up the extremely complicated arts education picture, . . . yet, whatever the gaps in this field . . . it seems likely that they will need to be informed by, and made operationally effective through, the ideas, methods, approaches, and strategies which have characterized the best arts education developments of the recent past.[12]

Critical to a sound beginning were the research and development activities of the Office of Education, carried on by many of the people who later had major developmental and administrative roles in the agencies and organizations doing major work in arts and education; these individuals included Stanley Madeja, Kathryn Bloom, Junius Eddy, Gene Wenner, Lonna Jones, and Martin Engel. Harold Arberg, still with the U.S. Department of Education in 1982, has been involved there since 1962.

Starting in the 1960s, when the groundwork was really built for the work that succeeded the wide range of arts education activities motivated and undertaken under the various titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965), it seems that there has been a short-term program to match every style of school administrator, every community configuration, and everyone's taste.

They have been generated under various rubrics and auspices and with varying degrees of concentration and ongoing commitment. The 1960s programs are characterized by Junius Eddy in his report as the

> first arts education seeds of the modern era in the educational garden. The problem was, of course, that the garden was largely uncultivated and the seed were broadcast randomly; little attention was paid to preparing the ground adequately; seldom were all the other factors necessary for nourishment and ultimate flowering taken into account; and, as a result, many of the crops died when the first flurry of governmental support ended [ESEA (Elementary and Secondary School Act)-supported developments and early National Endowment for the Arts and National Endowment for the Humanities].[13]

The late 1960s and early 1970s brought the development of programs from the Office of Education. These programs are described as better planned, more systematically carried out, and more effectively evaluated than the preceding programs. In some of these systems, the plans, extended by other sources of funding and absorbed somewhat by the individual school systems, lasted a good part of the 1970s. Only a few programs of this era were

given continuing support by their states, but some states began to look at their educational priorities and to start to include the arts among them.

In the evaluation report of one of the Office of Education programs, IMPACT, involving models of interdisciplinary arts programs at the elementary level in five areas of the country – California, Georgia, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Ohio – one observation substantiated the complexities of administering such a program. In this program, as in others, teams of specialists in the arts integrated their work with that of the classroom teachers.

> The congruence of administrative style with the IMPACT process is important to the overall success of the program. This is most true in terms of how the principal uses the resource team and how the principal integrates the team efforts with regular classroom activities. Improvement in this integration would probably be the single most effective strategy for overall program improvement.[14]

The evaluation acknowledged that IMPACT was a solid educational idea dependent, among other things, upon supportive and flexible school administrators and instructional leadership of the resource team. It was also seen as creating a positive school climate, and parents were very supportive of it.[15] This particular program ended in 1977 due to the financial state of the school system. It ended quietly with no protest, but its effects on the system can still be seen.

A program's moving from the status of a project to that of an integral part of the system is often misunderstood. Projects always do and should end. But their effect on the regular school program is often overlooked. This often leads to the belief that the project, because it died, was not valuable.

In "A Decade of Change," in *The Arts in Education: A New Movement*, Kathryn Bloom explains the developments that have "encouraged more positive attitudes towards the values of the arts in education." In addition to those already mentioned, there is the Artists-in-Schools program of the National Endowment for the Arts, officially launched in 1969 as a pilot program placing visual artists in school residencies in six states. Before this time, the Endowment had sponsored a poets-in-the-schools program that "was quite successful." Because of the success of these pilots, commitment was generated from all involved – artists, teachers, school officials, parents, and state agency staffs. The program expanded to include dancers, musicians, craftspeople, folk artists, filmmakers, video artists, architects, and environmentalists, as well as poets, writers, photographers, sculptors, painters, and graphic artists – working in all 50 states and five special jurisdictions.[16]

Today the Artists-in-Schools program has evolved into the Artists-in-

Education program after a full assessment of the impact and potential of the program. Of the year 1980, its director wrote the following in February 1981:

> The program exits the year broadened in vision, renewed in vitality, heightened in value, and enriched by a sense of mutual trust and commitment to cooperation on the part of agencies and individuals at every level. The planning process resulted in more than a new program. It established a climate for respect and advancement in the years ahead.[17]

Financial support for the Artists-in-Schools program has come from the Endowment and other sources, including the U.S. Office of Education, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, state and local arts agencies, and state and local education agencies. The Endowment's financial support had been viewed as "advocacy" or "seed" money for a concept whose nationwide acceptance would eventually generate the substantial funds necessary to place artists in a majority of the schools in this country.

The first steps were taken in 1967 to establish two programs that have the same goal in common – making aesthetics and the arts in education an essential part of the total educational programs of school systems and state education departments. They are the Aesthetic Education program of the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory (CEMREL) and the arts-in-education program of the JDR 3rd Fund.

> Both approaches may be viewed as major research and development programs. That is, each program was concerned with a particular concept and rationale, identified goals and objectives, worked closely and cooperatively with local and state education and arts agencies to develop successful practices, documented and evaluated steps taken to reach their goals, built upon knowledge as it accumulated, and disseminated information regarding outcomes to a wide audience.[18]

A comprehensive curriculum in aesthetic education for kindergarten through sixth grade has been designed by the Aesthetic Education program and works with school and community representatives in the implementation of aesthetic education programs that are appropriate for their particular communities.* In 11 sites, Aesthetic Education Learning Centers were established to provide services such as various types of technical assistance and training of teachers and administrators. These Learning Centers were linked together by a network called the Aesthetic Education Group. Two of the original 11 are now operated by CEMREL; several of the others are

*The many CEMREL publications on the Aesthetic Education program are valuable to those who wish to examine program content.

staffed and operated independently, as originally intended. The idea is that the arts should be an integral part of elementary and secondary school programs.

Wide national visibility has been given through the Arts Education program of the U.S. Office of Education, which is administered cooperatively with the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts through the Alliance for Arts Education (AAE). The AAE, with national offices at Kennedy Center, is a network of 55 communities, one in each state plus the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Samoa and the Virgin Islands.

Each committee (as a rule, composed of representatives from organizations involved in arts education, such as the state department of education, the state arts agency, the state-level professional arts education groups, and others) sets its own goals, objectives, and activities. Most often these activities focus on forums, state-level advocacy work for arts education, development and implementation of state plans for comprehensive arts education, and provision of consultation services to individuals and organizations conducting arts education programs and projects.

The state committees are assigned to one of five regions (Northwest, Gulf-Atlantic, North Central, Western, and Pacific), each headed by a regional chairperson. These five individuals, who are present or former state AAE committee chairpersons, form the AAE Subcommittee, with the Kennedy Center Director of Education, the AAE Director, and a Department of Education representative serving in ex officio roles. The chairperson of this advisory committee serves on the National Education/AAE Committee. The national AAE office publishes and disseminates information pertinent to arts educators and others interested in providing quality arts education experiences.

In addition, four professional associations representing education in the visual arts, music, theater, and dance in the United States have given "support to the arts in education through activities initiated within the individual associations, as well as through programs carried on cooperatively with the U.S. Office of Education and the Alliance for Arts Education."[19] The Emergency School Aid Act, administered by the U.S. Office of Education, spent $1 million on grants to public agencies, such as state arts councils, for Emergency School Aid Act-Special Arts Projects designed to reduce minority group isolation in elementary and secondary schools through placing practicing artists of various racial and ethnic groups in day-to-day contact with school children.[20]

Under the Education Consolidation Act of 1981, which revamped or repealed many programs of the U.S. Department of Education through a "block grant" system, arts educators must take action at state and local levels if they want to be considered for funds. There are many questions as to how these funds will be useful to the arts and education.

During this time, several foundations broadened their interests in the arts and humanities. The JDR 3rd Fund addressed the question of whether the arts could be made a part of the education of all the children in our schools with a unique focus and commitment. John D. Rockefeller III (whose death in 1978 caused the program to be suspended a year later) believed that exposure and training in the arts had to be part of the educational program of all children. In 1967, Kathryn Bloom, director of the U.S. Office of Education's Arts and Humanities program, and formerly Virginia Lee Comer's successor as Consultant on the Arts for the Association of Junior Leagues, and Supervisor of Art Education at the Toledo Museum, was asked to head the program and did so for the 12 years of its existence. According to the JDR 3rd Fund's own report, the Fund's Arts-in-Education program had the following characteristics and impact:

1. It was exemplary in showing how to get the maximum amount of impact from small amounts of money. The total amount given to 30 different projects or programs over the 12 years was $3 million.
2. It articulated and gave credence to such ideas as the arts are an area of curriculum as important educationally as any of the others.
3. It expanded the former notion that "the arts" were basically art and music; the arts encompass dance and movement, theater and creative writing. Artists and community arts organizations and resources were involved as major resources for teaching and learning about the arts.
4. It demonstrated the importance of support from the state department of education and, of course, from the school districts themselves. This idea was supported by the creation of a network of states and cities that could share mutual concerns. Through the Ad Hoc Coalition of States for the Arts in Education (Arizona, California, Indiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Washington) and a League of Cities (six school districts—Hartford, Little Rock, Minneapolis, New York City, Seattle and Winston-Salem), key administrators and staff could meet, share information, and gain detailed insight about the other programs. They could help each other with the working definitions and make on-site observations that were important to support the philosophy and concept. These networks received money only to support their meetings. One of their mutual efforts has been "to develop authentic and tangible demonstrations of how the arts *can* serve the basic educational, social, and emotional needs of children and youth, given the current cry 'back to basics' with no clear understanding of what is basic."[21]

The Fund's report keeps circling around the major question: "What procedures could be identified or developed by which schools or school districts could plan and implement arts in education programs most effectively and efficiently so that they would be solidly institutionalized?"[22]

At the same time, it was addressing the issues concerning the arts in general education – emphasizing that the arts can be part of general education for all students as well as specialized education for a few students, and dealing with how to build these concepts around organizational structures in conceptual frameworks that had staying power beyond the initiators of projects.

The JDR 3rd Fund's efforts were focused on the school districts in University City, Missouri; New York City; Mineola, Long Island, New York; Jefferson County, Colorado; Ridgewood, New Jersey; and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. As the work in these systems evolved and matured, the strengths and weaknesses of the various plans emerged until it was obvious that the information gathered was of potential value to those in other systems ready to absorb it.*

In 1975, a survey conducted by the Winston-Salem Arts Council indicated that

> The people of Winston-Salem are overwhelmingly in favor of arts courses being taught in the public schools, not just as a noncredit activity but as part of the core curriculum like English and mathematics. Furthermore, they believe the courses should be taught at all levels of the public school system and that the funds to pay for them should come from the regular school budget.[23]

At the initiation of the Winston-Salem Arts Council, concerned by the survey results, the JDR 3rd Fund personnel assisted the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County school system in developing a comprehensive arts-in-education program. There was a clear understanding of the difference between an arts enrichment program and a school development program focused on the arts. This concept is a basic one, and underlies everything that those involved in arts in education are trying to accomplish.

> The ABC program concentrates on having all children experience the arts as an integral part of their education. Emphasis is placed on the entire curriculum and on incorporating new dimensions of awareness through the arts. . . . The interdisciplinary approach to the arts in education prepares the individual

*Jane Remer's *Changing Schools through the Arts: The Power of an Idea* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1982) chronicles the history and development of the League of Cities for the Arts in Education, a network sponsored and coordinated by the JDR 3rd Fund until August 1979. The book deals with the birth and development of the Arts in General Education program in New York City and the adaptation and refinement of the idea and process in Hartford, Little Rock, Minneapolis, Seattle, and Winston-Salem.

> to utilize, throughout his [or her] life, the emotional, intellectual, and aesthetic fulfillment found in the arts.[24]

The Arts Council's role is to work "with" the school system through the Education Committee of the Council. Ultimately, the Council has coordinated community arts groups and artist activities with the schools and has matched funds provided by the school system for these services.

> The use of community resources has been interpreted broadly to mean more than the use of artists-in-residence. Arts groups work cooperatively with the schools; the schools make intelligent decisions and plan collaboratively with these groups. And just as important, the schools are not afraid to blow the whistle when things don't work out.[25]

The concept that the arts should be basic to, and integrated with, curriculum for all children has been an important idea that started to take hold in many ways during the 1970s. The JDR 3rd Fund's contribution was that of working with the processes in depth, so that clarifications of how to integrate the arts were developed. Their information base could be translated to those with serious intent in making significant progress in this area of education. No little credit belongs to the expertise of the Fund's staff members, who shared wherever possible. For instance, the Cleveland Area Arts Council's Education for Aesthetic Awareness Teacher Training program, which took four years to plan and three pilot years to implement, used the Fund staff's expertise (particularly that of Gene Wenner and Jack Morrison) all through the planning phase. Additional consultants for this and the other education programs included such others as Junius Eddy, Harry Broudy, Robert Stake, Allan Sapp, and Bernard Rosenblatt, who had been involved in the development of the arts-in-education concepts since the 1960s. Local leadership included Bennett Reimer, who has had a long involvement with the arts and education.

This program, geared to "teams" of teachers from individual schools, followed methodology suggested by national educators such as John Goodlad for creating change in the schools. Ideally, classroom teachers and arts specialists would be involved in learning about discrete arts, ways to relate them to each other and to subject matter, and ways to help all of their students to become aesthetically aware. Among its goals, the program sought to help the arts specialists become more effective in developing the aesthetic skills and understanding of all of their pupils; to promote close cooperation between arts specialists and classroom teachers; to investigate means by which the community's institutions and arts experiences could become more educationally effective; and to provide help for the teams in establishing their own models for change within the individual schools. The focus

was on the qualities that make a thing artistic, and included as many types and styles of art for study as possible. Given 16 Master's degree credits in the pilot stages at four area colleges and universities, the program was placed at one of them after that time. The faculty team of nine represented several art forms. This program was initiated, coordinated, and codirected by the Arts Council to address a perceived, well-discussed, and well-documented "gap" in teacher training. It was supported in the pilot phase by local school systems, in which "the concern for aesthetic education was at the highest administrative levels backed up by school principals, teachers, and parent-community support."[26] The clientele soon expanded beyond the pilot group by word of mouth and by formal communication about the program. In the first 5 years of the program, 914 teachers and administrators in the Greater Cleveland area participated in year-long credit work, single quarter work, or workshops.

Thus arts councils have played important roles in some arts-in-education programs. It must be added that they are not the only community organizations with this interest, and in some cities Junior Leagues have assumed unusual responsibilities because they believe in the value of the arts in education for every child. Programs in Birmingham and Pittsburgh are examples.

In Oklahoma City, the Junior League's role in the Opening Doors program was also substantial.

> Members of the Junior League were acquainted with the idea of a comprehensive approach to the arts in education through attendance at a national conference on this subject sponsored by the Associated Councils of the Arts and visits to CEMREL and the first pilot program established by the Fund. . . . the school system, which was under a desegregation order, perceived the cultural organizations as neutral sites where students from different ethnic backgrounds could be brought together in learning situations. . . . The Arts Council of Oklahoma City was in its earliest stages, but its representatives had a strong desire to play a catalytic role between the cultural organizations and the school district. . . . this is the first instance, to our knowledge, in which an arts council has developed a successful approach to the coordination of services of arts organizations for their most effective use by the school system.[27]

Young Audiences, Inc. was one of the first organized groups to place artists in the schools. Others include the Contemporary Music Project, involving composers, and other programs involving college and university personnel and individual artists. Young Audiences, Inc. started in the early 1950s with a philosophical conviction that music could somehow be conveyed better in small groups in intimate settings. The settings at first were in living rooms, as was the first national office in New York—that of

Rosalie Levintritt. There the finest of musicians would cross-fertilize ideas about music and children and settings. Young Audiences, Inc. today has more than 37 local chapters in 24 states, and its programming extends far beyond music into other art forms. The dimension of programming has expanded beyond a single event, and the style and methodology has changed with the times. The settings are no longer only schools. In the most effective local chapters, the one-shot performances have gradually been replaced with sequential performances and classroom visits, which provide a depth of experience and freer interaction between artist and audience.

The Young Audiences' auditioning process seeks "artists of professional performing ability as well as creative skills in presenting programs." In 1980 there were over 1,500 artists employed in a program reaching 2.5 million children in 5,200 schools. More than 12,000 performances and residency workshops are given each year.

The support systems of the state departments of education, the state education associations, and the Alliance of Arts Education have been critical to the success of many of the school programs reported here. One other important support organization has been the Musicians Performing Trust Fund, which has been the backbone of most local music programming. Arts councils on the state level have been significantly involved in the arts and education in multiple ways. Their relationship with Endowment programs relating to education is the most significant; a review of the programs emphasized their importance in working with community programs. But more than that, within the separate states some councils have had a strong relationship to the state departments of education, the state education associations, and the AAE. The nature and strength of this relationship varies widely, but where it is best, as in Oklahoma, North Carolina, and Michigan, it has spawned programming that is also strong.

Community arts councils, on the other hand, have not reported a significant relationship with the state education institutions by and large. Exceptions exist,* but arts councils have not been the catalysts for educational change that they conceivably could be. However, when the Office of Education's 1979 regulations included the possibility of funding to community groups in coordination with school systems, there seemed to be recognition on everyone's part — arts councils and state departments — of the potential role of councils in this network.

The issue of who is going to pay for an arts-in-education program is only resolved when a school system, acknowledging that the arts are indeed as integral as any other area of curriculum, considers them basic.

*The Westchester Council on the Arts (Westchester County, New York) is an example of a community organization that has been involved in comprehensive planning with the area school systems, and its program interfaces with the state education agency.

Two examples stand out among several of the few who have done this. The Montgomery County public schools in Rockville, Maryland, stimulated by curriculum revision, developed a whole portion "geared to fit an aesthetic mode." Aesthetic expression is, along with physical development, intellectual development, scientific understanding, and career development, spelled out as a goal of this school system. In the year examined, of the $300,000-plus budget for the program, only $10,000 came from the outside. The system has been dealing with minimum competence in the arts, such as it requires in English, math, and social studies.

In Seattle, before 1974, there was a very traditional art and music program. After much discussion and planning, and working with all the local, state, and national resources possible, Seattle emerged as a story of an 180-degree turnaround. Through the combined interests of the Junior League, the Seattle Arts Commission, the State Department of Public Instruction, and the Office of Education through the Kennedy Center Education Programs and the JDR 3rd Fund, the professional leadership in this system has been given the support needed to be able to propose that all children in all of the school system be "wholly educated." In looking at what children should know in the arts, and who should teach it, one present professional endeavor is to clarify for teachers and artists what teachers should be teaching and what artists should be contributing to education in a planning guide that teachers can work from.

> Student and teacher attendance have both increased since the beginning of Seattle's Arts in the Schools program. . . . Principals and teachers have said that when students are turned on to the arts, it changes their attitude about school as well as their ability to be successful achievers.[28]

> In Seattle as well as [elsewhere] . . . pilot projects have explored the role of the arts in education. Though the strategies and emphases of the various programs have differed because of local strengths and needs, the basic goal has been:
>
> "To improve the quality of education for all children, by making the arts an integral part of the basic curriculum through specialist, interdisciplinary, and community programs."
>
> The most successful of these projects have involved administration, teachers, and parents in planning arts programs related to ongoing educational priorities, and have developed new, mutually beneficial working relationships with professional artists and other community arts resources. Through in-service [sessions], artists-in-residence, all-school projects, arts resource centers, and model programs, an attempt has been made to define and practice learning *in* the arts (specialist programs), *through* the arts (interdisciplinary approaches), and *about* the arts (cultural and professional roles of artists and arts organizations). . . .
>
> [In order to accomplish these programs,] a clear statement of the objectives

> for each arts discipline in terms of the knowledge and sequential skills to be learned, [has been needed] so that every teacher, including those not directly involved in teaching arts subjects, can know of and understand the overall objectives for students. . . .
>
> The Instructional Framework [a project of Seattle] is an attempt to create [a] foundation block for arts in education, to provide a planning tool for teachers which can lead to a comprehensive program [with] . . . student objectives, level indicators, and measurable examples . . . for each of six arts disciplines (music, dance, drama, visual arts, literary arts, and media). . . . The arts process components of *perceiving*, *responding*, *understanding*, *developing skills*, *creating*, and *evaluating* are continually evolving in a circular effect as students are exposed to a wide variety of arts experiences.[29]

This work, initiated by the school system, is all too rare. Such professional work will provide guidelines that can be helpful to other systems.

It is not that in Seattle there haven't been hurdles all the way. CETA funds made it possible for the Arts Commission to provide community resources. Through planning and a demonstration project, Arts for Learning was the beginning of the exploration of the way in which the arts could become an integral part of the school program.

> The intention was to develop a strong community/school arts partnership. . . . CETA artists (100) in the schools have had a great deal to do with the new relationship of arts and learning. . . . they have proved to be very independent, competent, reliable and exceptionally qualified people who have really worked out well. . . . Some schools have found funds on their own to rehire them when CETA contracts ran out. One was hired to be the arts resource coordinator, and as part of her charge has been writing a curriculum incorporating all of the activities of artists working with special education students.[30]

The state's Cultural Enrichment program, a 12-year-old, $1,501,000 program that has supported professional arts experiences for children in both urban and rural schools, has been in jeopardy in spite of the fact that it was a nationally recognized pioneering program of state support. As in many other states, there are financial difficulties in Washington, reflected in funding for the schools and also for the arts.[31]

Thus there remains the need for an advocacy that can be articulate about the need for the inclusion of the arts in basic education and for solid funding to implement it. Meanwhile, groups like the Alliance for Arts Education continue to bring together the "potent forces for the development and advancement of arts education nationwide" (as in the 1979 meeting of the leaders of the state Alliance for Arts Education committees and the chief state school officers) and to develop state and regional networks.

Arts, Education and Americans, an organization emerging out of the work on the report *Coming to Our Senses*, pledged to make itself "a vital instrument of change and model of collaboration in the field." It has developed approaches to advocacy for arts in education and has focused on educators, school board members, artists, arts administrators, parents, and legislators – those who together can establish the arts as essential to the education of every child. It is now disseminating information through a national information center at the Education Facilities Laboratory.

The programs mentioned here are only a few of those that have been involved in programming over the past years. The success stories exist in communities of all sizes and shapes, rural and urban, yet "the typical school district in this country spends less than 2 percent of its total annual budget on arts programs."[32]

In 1979, Vince Lindstrom, then Special Counsel for Arts and Education to the National Endowment for the Arts and the U.S. Office of Education, summarized his work when he said:

> I am really amazed how many people are committed to the importance of the arts in education. The problem is not building a case for the arts and their place in education, but rather to get all of the programs and people going in the same direction. That can only happen with good communication bridges. In that way the concept of the new position between the two agencies has proved successful.[33]

In some respects, he summarized the critical need for communication among all who have a role in the arts-in-education picture.

Education is an ongoing process. It is a proven reality that the quality of what we do when children are young affects adult behavior; arts in education in the schools are a necessity. It is a beginning, and if there is no beginning at those early ages, a lot of catching up must be done, and a very wide gap must be bridged. There are too many places where there is no beginning at school ages, where programs in the arts start in seventh grade and end in seventh grade except for the few students actively involved as performers or artists. And if the beginning is spotty or badly thought out, overcoming the effects may be even more problematic. One sentence in the report *The Humanities in American Life* sums it up: "Students are ill-served if their education excludes the arts and humanities, which contribute in important ways to skills, personal fulfillment, and participation in the life of the community."[34] If the value system and behavioral patterns are not in place by adult life, the chances are that the remodeling is a renovation project that must be done with some care.

Ruth Glick, founder and former Director of the Institute for Retirement Studies, Case Western Reserve University, discusses the relationship

of education to the behavior of older Americans in relationship to cultural opportunity:

> One unequivocal finding about education in later life was the existence of a direct relationship between the amount of previous education in earlier life and the extent to which it would be sought in later life. Not *valued*, but sought. It was valued very much . . . But . . . it was revealed that many older people with very skimpy educational backgrounds, [when] asked to indicate what kinds of things they wanted to learn, gave basic education their lowest priority. As for the arts, they were not even on the agenda.
>
> So it was the middle class, already at home in cultural settings (whether formally educated in college or not), who availed themselves of the opportunity to enter into the life of community arts very fully . . . the institutions became more hospitable as the decade advanced and funding for community arts was made available. The new participants and partakers, gray-haired and gray-bearded, were perceived usually correctly as the old participants grown older. . . . In short, older people are welcome if they can get to the programs on their own, if they can study or perform adequately by themselves or in a group, and if they can pay if necessary. As a matter of fact, "Discounts for Students and Seniors" is a commonplace sign outside many box offices and all seniors – poor, rich, and medium-poor – are eligible.
>
> Still totally absent from the arts scene was a large portion of the older population which was not educated, whose exposure to symphony concerts and museums, the theater and ballet, had been nil and to whose value system these were foreign. Many, but not all, were poor, but all were needy in other ways. It is these elderly people who constitute the clientele of the Senior Centers (in some places still called Golden Age Centers), the nutrition sites and the retirement homes. . . . It was not exclusively in behalf of this segment of the older population, but certainly with a keen awareness of their circumstances, that the earlier mentioned effort was undertaken in 1973 by the National Council on the Aging to invite and encourage decision makers in the aging agencies, and artists, arts educators, and arts administrators, to come together to work out a partnership.[35]

If adult life is a constant catching-up process, it takes special effort – probably related to leisure time – and requires looking at a great deal of art, listening to music, hearing and seeing opera and theater, reading literature, and the like. Some people have been involved in this kind of process in recent years, with some success. They are, by and large, the population that swells the audience figures and has caused "the renaissance of the arts." This catching up is done in many ways – travel and selective television among them. The bank of images, visual and aural, creates the ability to progress to new understandings. The acceptance of the color system of a Matisse, popularized in clothing and decor, has caused people to accept the popularization and the art itself, and to pass beyond it.

But there is another population for whom there is too little we can do – the culturally and financially impoverished; we have not started them off well from the beginning, nor nurtured their needs as adults. The one place there is a chance is in the public education programs. The outreach programs are eclectic and could do more if there were beginnings long before these experiences.

There is still another problem affecting most Americans without access to the arts on an ongoing basis: growth and development. Growth and development of taste – the world of enjoyment beyond the *Nutcracker* ballet. Testing new areas is problematic for those on tentative grounds. So modern dance for some, abstract art for others, and nudes as subject matter for still others remain barriers for too many, even though the first two have existed for almost 80 years, and the last has been with us since the inception of cultural history. Only if these areas are tackled early enough, and with sureness of process and the progressive development of skills pointed to lifetime perception goals, would we ever succeed. For these are the tools for the development of judgment, taste, and dimension, *and* the demand for quality.

It is curious when polls, such as the 1980 Harris *Americans and the Arts* series, tells us that Americans now "value" the arts in education. This "valuing" may be related to their "awakening to their values." It has not translated into action beyond participation in and attendance at arts events. It has not translated into a demand for arts education in the schools, for quality curriculum for everyone, or for vouchers to make it possible for all to attend events.

There has been no real translation of what this "valuing" calls for in the way of support. There should be a support link between those who support the arts institutions themselves and those who generate the next audiences for those institutions. The traditional arts supporters have been supporting arts institutions for all the reasons one supports a civic project – and not always for the art itself. How do we make arts education a part of the value system? Community and arts leaders who are also parents must see that link. The schools must do it as vigorously as they do other things.

Arts councils, concerned with the development of awareness and audiences, as well as new and future advocates, are in the position to do the following:

- Become the link between the arts supporter and the need for support for school arts budgets. They are as important as budgets for arts organizations.
- Become the link between the community and the institutions of learning. School administrators and teachers in elementary schools and in the nonarts secondary school disciplines need to feel comfortable with, to be educated about, and to value the arts as they do

the other basic subjects. This will include a better grasp of their role in relationship to the art teachers and visiting artists and the way in which they relate.

- Become a link between the community and the state department of education so that state laws affecting the arts can be reviewed and relevant ones considered and enacted.
- Become a link between the artist and the school system in more concentrated and substantial ways, so that there is an educational impact consistent with ongoing basic humanistic educational goals.
- Become the link between the work and the behavior – that is, to clarify the issues and processes for those who wish to advocate or participate in the arts but have no clear picture how to proceed. (Every child has a parent who is a potential advocate!)

These foci should be included in the arts council challenges of the 1980s.

NOTES

1. Interview with Charles C. Mark, 1980.
2. Interview with James Backus, May 1980.
3. James Backas, "The State Arts Council Movement" (background paper for the National Endowment for the Arts National Partnership Meeting, June 23–25, 1980), p. 19.
4. Ross Altman, "Creativity is Ageless" (brochure relating highlights of an arts program for older adults, San Fernando Valley Arts Council, 1980).
5. Letter from Duane Truex to Nina Gibans (July 14, 1980).
6. Milton Meltzer, *Violins and Shovels* (New York: Delacorte Press, 1976), p. 22.
7. Milton W. Brown, "New Deal Art Projects: Boondoggle or Bargain?" *Art News*, April 1982, p. 87.
8. Great Lakes Performing Artist Associates, Ann Arbor, Michigan, "What You've Always Wanted to Know about Advancing Your Career, but Had No One to Ask."
9. Harld Taylor, "The Transformation of the Schools," in *The Arts and the Gifted: Proceedings from the National Conference on Arts and Humanities/Gifted and Talented* (Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1975), p. 26.
10. Gene C. Wenner, "Arts-in-Education Program," in *Dance in the Schools: A New Movement in Eduation* (National Endowment for the Arts and the U.S. Office of Education, 1973) p. 3. (Description of use of dance in schools as developed through the Dance Component of the Artist in Schools program of the Endowment and the Office of Education.)
11. Junius Eddy, "Toward Coordinated Federal Policies for Support of Arts Education" (position paper of the Alliance for Arts Education, with the assistance of the National Arts Education Adivsory Panel, 1977), pp. 3–4.
12. Ibid., pp. 12–16.
13. Ibid., p. 17.
14. Columbus City School District, Department of Evaluation, Research and Planning, *Arts Impact* (Columbus, Ohio: Author, 1974), p. 5.
15. Ibid., p. 7.

16. Kathryn Bloom, "A Decade of Change," in *Arts in Education: A New Movement* (New York: Georgian Press, 1977), pp. 12–13.

17. *NACAA Newsletter*, February 15, 1981, p. 2.

18. Bloom, "A Decade of Change," pp. 13–14.

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid.

21. Charles B. Fowler, ed., *An Arts-in-Education Source Book: A View from the JDR 3rd Fund* (New York: JDR 3rd Fund, 1980), pp. 16–20.

22. Ibid., p. 18.

23. Ibid., p. 121.

24. Ibid., p. 124.

25. Ibid., p. 126.

26. Bennett Reimer, "Education for Aesthetic Awareness: The Cleveland Area Project," *Music Educator's Journal*, February 1978, p. 67.

27. Bloom, "A Decade of Change," p. 45.

28. Margaret B. Howard, "The Arts Are Basic: Have We Come to our Senses?" (keynote speech at the National Guild of Community Schools of the Arts, St. Louis, Mo., October 29, 1979), pp. 22–23.

29. Carolyn Anderson, *An Instructional Framework for the Arts in Education*, (draft – "Strengths Assessment Component," Title IV-9, Seattle School District, 1980). This basic philosophy comes from the arts education work of Charles B. Fowler.

30. Seattle Arts Commission, "Artists in Education," *Seattle Arts*, April 1978, p. 1.

31. Walter C. Wilson, "CEP May be Wiped Out," *Northwest Arts*, February 6, 1981, p. 8; also, 1981 and 1982 issues of *The Arts*, newsletter of the King County Arts Commission, Seattle, Washington.

32. Arts Education and Americans, Inc., "Something's Missing" (brochure, 1979).

33. Vince Lindstrom, "Priorities for the Year Ahead," in *Summit Conference on the Arts and Education: A Report* (Washington, D.C.: Alliance for Arts Education, 1980), p. 17.

34. Commission on the Humanities, *The Humanities in American Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), p. 37.

35. Ruth Glick, "The Arts and Older Americans: A Progress Report" (paper prepared for the Symposium on the Arts, the Humanities, and Older Americans, Philadelphia, February 1–3, 1981), pp. 6–7.