

EXPLORING A BRITISH COLUMBIA CULTURAL  
CENTRE: A FOCUS FOR THE SECONDARY ART CURRICULUM

BY

LYNNE ALISON CARMICHAEL

B.Ed., The University of British Columbia, 1972

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
Department of Visual and Performing Arts in  
Education

We accept this thesis as conforming  
to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

July 1983

© Lynne Alison Carmichael, 1983

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS

Department of V. A. P. A. &

The University of British Columbia  
1956 Main Mall  
Vancouver, Canada  
V6T 1Y3

Date July 20, 1983

### Abstract

This study describes and explains an approach to the implementation of the Art Foundations component of the Secondary Art curriculum. The project covered an intensive five month period of preparation and a five week period of implementation. Particular emphasis has been placed on the use of local cultural centres as practical sources for materials in satisfying the Art Foundations learning outcomes.

The program attempts to identify and suggest possible solutions to problems experienced by both local cultural centres and school art educators. In particular, it suggests possible types of materials needed by art educators to make the most effective use of their local arts centre. A teacher manual "More Than Meets the Eye" was devised to assist the teachers in the preparation of their classes for their visit to the local cultural centre. Individual student kits were also developed containing materials to focus pupil viewing at specific exhibits in the Richmond Arts Centre. The proposed learning outcomes suggested in the Secondary Art curriculum have served as signposts in the development of these materials.

The value and potential for using this approach to implementation of the Art Foundations component of the

Secondary Art curriculum was then explored with special emphasis on the statistical data, and personal interviews conducted by the researcher. Results of the data collection indicated that this approach has potential to facilitate integrating the Art Foundations component with exhibits at the Richmond Arts Centre. The majority of the teachers and students as well as the various Co-ordinators expressed highly positive reactions to the project.

Future consideration of this approach to the Art Foundations component of the Secondary Art curriculum is recommended.

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT . . . . .	ii
CONTENTS . . . . .	iv
DEFINITIONS . . . . .	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	ix

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION AND IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
Objectives of the Study . . . . .	3
Justification for the Study . . . . .	3
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	6
Subsidiary Research Questions . . . . .	7
Initial Propositions . . . . .	8
Research Design . . . . .	8
The Setting . . . . .	8
Procedure . . . . .	9
Limits of the Study . . . . .	10
Significance of the Study . . . . .	10
2. DEVELOPMENT OF A CULTURAL CENTRE PROGRAM . . . .	12
Cultural Centres as Educators . . . . .	12

Materials for Implementation . . . . .	15
Planning the Program . . . . .	17
3. FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM . . . . .	21
The Program to be Evaluated . . . . .	21
Evaluation Methodology . . . . .	22
Objectives of the Evaluation . . . . .	22
Researcher's Observations . . . . .	23
4. SUMMATIVE EVALUATION . . . . .	30
Results of the Co-ordinator's Evaluation . . . . .	30
Effectiveness of the Program . . . . .	32
Observations Arising from the Study . . . . .	34
Recommendations . . . . .	37
Conclusion . . . . .	38
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	41
APPENDICES	
I. Results of teacher and student questionnaires . . . . .	43
II. Samples of correspondence . . . . .	105
III. The Teacher Manual, "More Than Meets the Eye," as tested, shelved with copy 1 in Special Collections . . . . .	109

## Definitions

Curriculum - a set of guidelines that define an area of study. The guidelines generally identify the goals, objectives, and learning outcomes to be achieved by students, list the resource materials that teachers will require (e.g., books, hardware), outline some of the activities that teachers and students should go through (i.e., articulate teaching and learning strategies), and give teachers some idea of how to evaluate both the students and themselves. A curriculum will usually also clarify the assumptions underlying the goals, the objectives, the learning outcomes, the use of resources, the activities, and the evaluation procedures (Implementation Services, Ministry of Education, 1982).

Art Foundations - the core of the art curriculum. It is intended to provide students with opportunities to review and develop a basic understanding of art (p. 15). "Its mastery is required of all students entering a secondary school art program for the first time" (Curriculum Guide/Resource, 1982, p. 7). The British Columbian Guide outlines the importance of taking into consideration the individual differences that occur in any given teaching situation while exploring the outcomes of the Secondary Art Curriculum. Emphasis is placed on the mastery of basic skills of a physical and mental nature.

Imagery - is the creation of visual images both in the imagination and in a work of art. It is central to visual learning. It exists in both the mental process and the product of art. There are many levels of imagery, yet all are products of the imagination--products created through observation by the student or from his or her memory. The developers of the new curriculum make a strong case for focusing on the development of personal imagery by the students. It is considered important, for art without an image is not art. Yet it is also acknowledged that a "fuller understanding of (imagery) depends on knowledge gained through effective education preparation" (Secondary Curriculum, 1982, p. 7).

Art Centre - in many communities in British Columbia, local cultural centres consist of a loose liaison between a local history museum and a community sponsored art gallery or art centre, an establishment by and for a community where art lessons are taught, the work of local artists is shown, and other art interests of the community are accommodated.

Museum - an institution where artistic and educational materials are exhibited to the public. There are three principal types:

1. Art Museums: A museum devoted to one or more of the art fields dealing with objects and with an emphasis on the ownership and preservation of important collections (Oriental Ceramics, Sculpture, Painting, etc.).



2. History Museums: Illustrate the historical growth and development of an area, event or time. Their mandate is to collect, preserve, and exhibit for public benefit.

3. Science and Technology Museums: These museums preserve and exhibit displays on the natural sciences and technology.

Gallery - are divided into two broad categories. Art Museums (see above) and Art Centres (see above) are the two main types which are found in local communities.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to extend my thanks to a number of people who helped in the preparation of the thesis and the teacher's manual More Than Meets the Eye.

I especially want to thank my Thesis Head, Dr. Rosalie Staley, for her time, encouragement and enthusiastic support for this project, Dr. Graeme Chalmers for his clear-sighted criticism of the presentation of this thesis, and Prof. Penny Gouldstone for her creative energies and unfailing backing.

Developing this idea was made possible by the physical support offered by the Richmond School Board. Without their aid and especially the enthusiastic contribution of Ms. Kit Grauer, Art Co-ordinator for the Richmond School Board, this study could not have been accomplished.

I appreciate the cooperation of Mrs. Page Hope-Smith, acting Co-ordinator for the Richmond Art Gallery and Mr. John Kyte, acting Curator of the Richmond Museum and Archives.

Financial support for this study was provided in part by a Summer Graduate Fellowship.

I wish to acknowledge the patience of my parents who have encouraged me in all my endeavours.

My gratitude is due my husband, Andrew Carmichael, and sons, Stuart and Mark, who offered continued support and encouragement during the preparation, presentation and completion of this thesis.

## Chapter 1

### INTRODUCTION AND IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

#### Introduction

The British Columbia Art Curriculum Summer Institute, Grades 8 - 12, held at the University of B.C., 1982, brought together art teachers, art administrators, representatives of the Ministry of Education Program Implementation Services, students, and professors of art education as well as practicing artists. From this cross-section, there emerged a view of the art education system in B.C. that recognized the positive aspects of the art activities presently in force.

The British Columbia Secondary Art Curriculum has many excellent features. The goals and objectives, as stated, give a strong mandate to the art educator to implement a comprehensive art program. An attempt has been made to more equably balance the fields of art studio, art history and art criticism. Previously, the emphasis on these three areas has been left to the individual teacher's discretion. Art educators are entrusted to produce programs that enable students to focus on specific areas in art and understand what they see. To take possession of this visual heritage, there is a need to teach strategic skills that include both the critical and aesthetic components of art (Feldman, Quarterly Quorum, University of B.C., October, 1982).

Planners of implementation have an obligation to do more than devise formulas or models for approaching art and art criticism. There is a need to have a solid grounding in the understanding of the nature of art and its potential enhancement of the quality of life for students. This thesis intends to demonstrate that by examining the sources of varying philosophies as exposed through the literature on art education and museum education, art teachers and art education co-ordinators will be able to connect the goals and objectives of the Art Foundations component of the Secondary Art curriculum to the realities of teaching art in the classroom.

In order to achieve the goals set out in the B.C. Secondary Art Guide 8 - 12 Curriculum Guide and Content Resources (1983), more is required than a list of what to teach. There is a need to explore the philosophical roots of these goals. To this end, art educators and planners of curriculum implementation should give closer attention to the philosophical models of art programs. Art educators need to have knowledge and understanding of the means at their disposal. By investigating the practical applications of theoretical approaches to art education and the Art Foundations component of the Secondary Art curriculum specifically, we can open a doorway on new possibilities for art education in our future.

## Objectives of the Study

1. To discover the extent to which local cultural centres serve as practical sources for materials in satisfying the art program's goals in the implementation of the Art Foundations component of the Secondary Art curriculum.

2. To identify means to communicate in the most effective manner between the various facilities located in our communities and the school system.

3. To resolve problems that art museum educators and school art educators experience when trying to rationalize their own goals and objectives with those of their respective institutions.

4. To show that, by giving students individual kits containing material on the particular exhibit they are about to view, their viewing experience may be enriched in specific ways.

5. To investigate the types of materials that teachers need in order to achieve closer liaisons with local cultural centres in their communities.

## Justification for the Study

In order to justify a program combining local cultural

centres and the Secondary Art Foundations, there is a need to explore the philosophical basis for the model to be used in the implementation. When a researcher develops and tests a pilot program it is necessary to have an awareness of theoretical points of view to achieve greater precision and clarity in specifying constructs (Zimmerman, 1982). Deciding the basis for a program through the study of the art education literature may involve a degree of personal choice. To be creditable the selection must first survey the field of art education to ensure that the modes chosen will most readily promote the desired outcomes. Planners of curriculum implementation need to understand what constitutes an intelligent merger between research and practice in arts education.

It is this focus on art models that Broudy has explored in his career as a theoretician on art. He has pursued a concern for "rigorous methods of analysis and reconstruction of theory by eliminating and extending constructs" (Zimmerman, 1982, p. 39). This drive for a basis for aesthetic education includes the premises put forth by Feldman (1967, 1972), yet extends beyond a formal approach to the study of art. He includes not only formal and technical properties but sensory and expressive as well.

Broudy's theory is best summed up in his published theoretical work, Enlightened Cherishing. Drawing on a definition of art as defined by Silverman (1983), Broudy suggests the community of art experts should compile a body of work determined as

art. Without a selection, he feels there is no mandate to devote school "resources to making happen what would happen anyway" (Broudy, 1978), through exposure to the popular arts. The conductor of curriculum implementation should guide the selection of the works to be used in teaching. These works would direct students through experiences which include opportunities to experience the learning outcomes specified as being central to the Art Curriculum.

A well-developed art program will include opportunities for students to see and feel visual relationships; to develop imagination and personal imagery; to engage in the practical production of art work; to appreciate the art of others; to develop an informed aesthetic and critical awareness; and to evaluate their own work and that of others. (Curriculum Guide, 1983, p. 10)

These experiences require an awareness on the part of the educator of techniques that "increase student sensitivity to perception of the sensory, formal, expressive and technical properties and the extra-aesthetic functions of works of art" (Zimmerman, 1982, p. 42).

Having stated his premise, Broudy develops his theory by enlarging on the importance of the teacher directed connection to the students' approach to art. This involves teaching students to make judgments. Such an approach to the aesthetic mode of experience takes an in-depth view of a work of art. Through teacher-directed actions, the practical application of the

theory is initiated, to where an understanding of the "cultivated authentic appreciation of works of art" (Zimmerman, 1982) occurs through seeing as an artist, judging as an art critic and experiencing as a connoisseur, as defined by Eisner (1979). These processes culminate in "enlightened cherishing."

Broudy's theory may have flaws (Zimmerman, 1982), but whatever discontinuities may have occurred in his approach to teaching the appreciation and the criticism of art, they do not seriously detract from the intent of his humanistic theory. In his address to the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Houston, Texas, March 20, 1977, he re-asserts that "aesthetic experience is basic because it is a primary form of experience on which all cognition, judgement, and action depend" (Broudy, 1977). If educators think of the learner as an open system able to engage in a transformation of input, creating order from the information surrounding him (Ferguson, 1980), art education, and specifically the implementation of the Art Foundations, is approached from a flexible point of view and makes use of several of Broudy's ideas.

#### Statement of the Problem

The major question that this researcher asks is how closer liaison between schools and local cultural institutions, such as art galleries and museums, might effectively promote the



learning outcomes that art educators are seeking in their curriculum implementations.

This researcher has chosen to investigate links between the program goals of the schools and their art programs with the goals and resources of cultural centres. The vehicle for progressing towards these goals will be the new Secondary Art curriculum, with special attention to the Art Foundations component. Local cultural centres offer a rich source of materials on which to build the Art Foundations component of the new 8 - 12 Art Curriculum. Piloting an approach to the course through local cultural centres has provided an opportunity for observing data and collecting data.

#### Subsidiary Research Questions

The researcher's priorities may more clearly be understood if they are expressed as research questions. The study has been developed from three of these:

1. What are the stated goals and philosophies that characterize art education in art centres and art education in schools?
2. To what extent are the goals and philosophies of the two kinds of institutions harmonious?
3. What adjustments could be made to the implementation processes to ensure the most effective introduction of the Art Foundations component of the Secondary Curriculum when using local cultural centres?

These research questions, as developed from this researcher's initial approach to considering ways of implementing the Art Foundations course using local cultural centres, reflect my position and current knowledge.

### Initial Propositions

The proposed Art Curriculum for B.C. offers an opportunity for art educators to explore new approaches to art education in British Columbia schools. There are four major learning outcomes presented in the new 8 - 12 Art Curriculum. These are: developing personal imagery, investigation of historical and contemporary developments in the arts, learning the elements and principles of design, and investigating reasoned criticism.

I proposed to develop materials to be used to focus on these four areas. They were specifically designed for use by students during their visits to a local cultural centre in British Columbia. My proposition was that utilization of our local cultural centres offered a unique complement to the Art Foundations component in the classroom for focusing on the above-mentioned learning outcomes.

### Research Design

The Setting. Four Secondary Schools in the Richmond School District were used to test the developed materials. These

materials focused on a current exhibit at a local cultural centre. Data was collected by observing class visits to the Gallery, interviews and questionnaires.

Procedure. The classes visited the Richmond Arts Centre in Richmond in the week of May 15, 1983, specifically to visit the Gallery's show, "Images," displaying the works of five Lower Mainland artists. There were approximately 20 students in each of the four classes. My role was as liaison between the Richmond School District, the Arts Centre, and the teachers, while supplying direction for the viewing of the exhibit by the students. This also included the issuing of materials to the teachers, such as slide sets of the artist's works and a teacher's manual detailing possible approaches to the local cultural centre with suggestions for lessons. This approach was designed to assist the teachers in preparing their classes to gain the most from their viewing opportunity, both before and after the event.

In order to facilitate a rich viewing experience, individual student kits were also prepared. Information included: biographies on the artists gained from personal interviews by the researcher, a vocabulary list adapted from the Curriculum Guide, worksheets on the art exhibit and the history museum, and miscellaneous information on the Richmond Arts Centre. The students used the kits on their visit as a source of information and as a writing surface while answering the directed study questions which provided a focus to their viewing experience.

### Limits of the Study

1. The sampling for this study was taken from four Richmond Secondary schools.

2. My testing involved interviews with the teachers and a blind questionnaire administered by the teachers to their students both before and after their experience at their local cultural centre.

3. The study was limited to a five week period during which the art classes were actually involved in the project, which included the visit to the local cultural centre.

4. The results are possibly influenced by the Richmond School District's active involvement in the Visual Arts, the Art Co-ordinator--Kit Grauer--being a dynamic force on the art teachers and their programs.

### Significance of the Study

The significance of this study, with respect to the effects of using local cultural centres in the implementation of the Art Foundations component of the Secondary Art curriculum, lies in showing art educators and local cultural centre co-ordinators that there is value in providing an opportunity to explore facets of art using individual handbooks while visiting local cultural centres. The validity of this statement may be tested by examining

results of the questionnaires and interviews with participants. Students reacted positively to an interactive experience at their local cultural centre, while the curriculum remained centered on developing the learning outcomes as required by the Secondary Art Guide 8 - 12. This approach also offers an opportunity for students to develop an awareness of their community and share with their peers a creative alternative to the confines of the school art program.

## Chapter 2

### DEVELOPMENT OF THE CULTURAL CENTRE PROGRAM

#### Cultural Centres as Educators

The Art Foundations component of the Secondary Art Curriculum has a special significance since its mastery is required of all students in the first year of the Secondary School Art Program. A study of the current literature from journals such as the CSEA Annual Journal, Studies in Art Education, and Art Education indicates possible approaches to the use of the local cultural centres in a program designed to achieve this objective. While the Art Foundations component is prerequisite for further study in art it also stands as an independent course. As such it offers an opportunity to the art educator to introduce it for its own sake (Curriculum Guide, 1983, p. 27).

MacDonnell (1980) outlines an art museum educator's concern with the perceived gap between art education for the school child and the lack of apparent preparation of the teacher who is to teach it. This deficiency also encompasses a lack of awareness of the need for co-operation between the co-ordinators in the local galleries and museums, and the school with regards to financing and implementation of visits to the art museum. Newson (1982) addresses the need for art museum and school-based

art educators to join together in looking for ways to increase funding to prevent many of the current and future problems facing both groups. The art museum should not take on the total responsibility for teaching children how to see and to that end Newsom cites several examples of art museums currently working only with school groups who are well prepared for their visits and who commit themselves to returning for several visits to the museum. Through this in-depth approach, the art museum co-ordinator and the school art co-ordinator come to know each other and this in turn leads to a "better understanding both of the people and of the learning process" (Newsom, 1975).

Crucial to the program are the people who are involved in running the events, whether in-house or as visitors to a classroom. They must be congenial and well trained in the materials on display. The exhibits that are on display are of little value if they are not reinforced by the entire school setting. The classroom teacher must provide a coherent program that is able to incorporate or spin-off from the visit. For example, after a visit to the University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology, there are a multitude of areas which could be explored in the curriculum: reading Indian Legends, Dance and Movement, Indian Games, and art lessons on the theme of Indian life as seen through their masks, costumes and symbolism, are but a few.

As well, there must be a working rapport between the staff of the cultural centre and the school. Not only is it important to feel welcome when on a visit, but there must be relevance

between what is being presented and what is needed to fulfill the curriculum requirements. It is up to the art educator in the school to ensure that the cultural centre staff are aware of the needs of the program being offered in the Secondary Art program, in particular the Art Foundations.

The school system as well as school teachers need to actively demonstrate that they wish to be equal partners. Ott (1980) addresses the issue of art education in art museums. He refers to his travels in the world of museums and relates how gratifying it is to him that there is now an active movement to promote art education by art museums around the globe. In several cultural centres, he states, the educational role is often placed well above the traditional roles of collecting, exhibiting and preserving. The sensory-based approaches to encountering art, which are emerging in art centres, do not mean that traditional methods are being neglected. Slide shows, lectures and art exhibits, showing periods of time, art processes and art techniques are still actively a part of the institution's repertoire. The trend is towards creative implementation of education programs and the exchange of ideas between educators (Ott, 1980). To this end, the art centre is to be considered more than an art resource. Only when it is considered an art classroom will it be possible to achieve its fullest utilization. This partnership between educators and cultural centre staff can lead to multi-dimensional programs that deal with expression, feeling and personal interpretation plus reasoned criticism,



emphasizing the teacher as the catalyst. The art experience offered by this form of program opens the richness of the cultural centre to a complete art experience (Ott, 1980).

The staff of the local cultural centre must know the audience that they are dealing with. They must realistically tailor the scope of their program to available resources and to the students who will view the available materials. The teacher planning a trip may not have any clear picture of the resources available unless through word of mouth or previous visits. Sheets sent out by art co-ordinators are by necessity limited from lack of funding. Certainly whatever planning a teacher is able to do, whatever pre-visit contact that can be made and whatever after visit follow-up is possible, once is better than no visit at all.

### Materials for Implementation

The basic materials for implementation consist of the Richmond School District, the Richmond Arts Centre, the Secondary Art Guide 8 - 12 Curriculum Guide/Content Resources, and the researcher. The Richmond School District covers a geographic area situated immediately south of Vancouver. The District includes 36 Elementary schools, 6 Junior Secondary schools and 5 Senior Secondary schools. The population mix has rapidly changed in the last ten years with an influx of many students who have English as a second language. The economic conditions are fairly

prosperous with the region being directly and indirectly affected by proximity to a major metropolis, Vancouver.

Richmond School Board administers the school district. The Art teachers are co-ordinated by Kit Grauer, who runs an energetic series of programs to encourage the Arts in Richmond schools. This includes "Artathon," held yearly at the Richmond Arts Centre at which all elementary and secondary students are invited with their teachers to attempt various art projects in an informal relaxed atmosphere.

The Richmond Arts Centre consists of a co-ordinating body, administered by the Community Arts Council. An Art Gallery and a History Museum are contained in the Arts Centre, administered at the moment by acting co-ordinators until such time as permanent co-ordinators can be hired.

The Secondary Art Guide 8 - 12 Curriculum Guide and Content Resources document has recently been brought into effect in the province of British Columbia. Several districts have already implemented the curriculum. In Richmond, the art teachers have been aware of the new curriculum and have had several opportunities to explore the materials, for example, at the Summer Institute held at the University of British Columbia in the summer of 1982.

The Guide is intended to replace previous curriculum guides. It was developed to reflect the expectations set forth in the Aims of Education for Elementary and Secondary Schools in British Columbia (1983). A new area which was developed in the Guide involves the Art Foundations component. Its mastery is required

of all students in their first year of the secondary school art program and is a prerequisite for further study in Art Education. The course is structured to encourage students to develop competence in approaching the arts.

The researcher is a graduate student who has spent several years exploring cultural centres in cities around the world. After attending the Summer Institute at the University of British Columbia, 1982 the researcher perceived a need for secondary art teachers to have a concrete plan to assist the implementation of the Art Foundations component of the Secondary Guide. The use of a teachers' manual and student kits provides a focus for the educator when instructing students both during class time and on visits to local cultural centres. The researcher developed this material from direct input by the teachers and from her personal experience as a teacher. The format closely follows the Secondary Guide. It is supplementary to the Guide as it deals with a specific application of the Art Foundations component in a local cultural centre.

### Planning the Program

Extensive preparations were necessary in developing the program. This section documents the techniques used by the researcher to set up a joint venture between the Richmond School Board and the Richmond Arts Centre. It is important to realize that from the beginning, the researcher has envisioned her role

as a liaison between the two institutions. What follows is an explanation of the steps taken in implementing the program "More Than Meets the Eye."

The reasons for developing such a program have been dealt with in the previous section of this chapter. But the reader should bear in mind that the actions taken to prepare for the visits to the Richmond Arts Centre directly reflect the views expressed on the need to expose young people to original works of art so that they may see the qualitative differences between original art and photographic reproductions. This exposure ensures that they learn the vocabulary of the eye, a lesson that can only be learned first hand. This first hand viewing is a preparation for an adulthood as users and viewers of art, placing into context art and man's relationship to the arts (Zeller, 1983).

The first step involved approaching the Richmond School Board. This initial introduction of myself and my concept for using local cultural centres in the implementation of the Art Foundations component of the Secondary Art curriculum for grades 8 - 10 was met with enthusiasm. Mr. Ken Morris, Supervisor - Administration confirmed the Richmond School Board's interest in the initial concept and suggested that the researcher work with Ms. Kit Grauer, Art Co-ordinator, in planning the details of the pilot project (see Appendix II).

Kit Grauer was extremely supportive of the project and gave the researcher ample scope to develop all facets of the program. The physical support included use of paper duplicating,

laminating, collating and binding facilities. Assistance of this nature was invaluable when preparing a limited run of twenty-five teacher's manuals and student materials for 80 participants.

The Administration of the Richmond School Board kept themselves informed of the progress of the project. The Art Co-ordinator, Grauer, gave a presentation of the proposed project at the Board of Management's weekly meeting. This involved an introduction to the concept of Local Cultural Centres and their potential value to the Secondary Art curriculum as well as a preview of the teacher's manual and discussion of the proposed materials being prepared by the researcher for the students. The presentation was warmly received and the Board supported in principle the innovative approach to a local resource.

The second phase of the project was the introduction of the researcher to the Acting Co-ordinator of the Richmond Art Gallery and the Acting Curator of the Richmond Museum. The introduction of the researcher took place at a meeting at the Richmond Arts Centre, the home of both. Mrs. Page Hope-Smith, Acting Co-ordinator, and Mr. John Kyte, Acting Curator, had divergent views as to the value of the proposed project. Mrs. Page Hope-Smith was very enthusiastic and offered her complete support. After examining the art show schedule for 1983 it was decided that IMAGES would be a good choice on which to focus the project. This show was invitational. Five B.C. artists from the lower mainland were chosen to display their views of the fusion between the outer

reality and the inner reality of the artist, in personal expressions. It was decided that the researcher would contact the artists directly to acquire the biographical information which would be pertinent to the project. This approach to the artist and the students was an area that Mrs. Page Hope-Smith had been intending to develop but due to lack of funds and permanent art gallery staff, had not been able to implement.

There are obvious differences in philosophy between the two Richmond Arts Centre personnel. This is as much the result of personality differences as concern for the stated objectives of each of the facilities. Mr. John Kyte questioned the value of introducing the students to art concepts using the History Museum's displays. After a discussion of the researcher's assumptions as to the value of this proposed study, it became obvious that the Curator was concerned that the Museum's acquisitions should be approached as a serious collection.

Whereas Mrs. Hope-Smith had a relaxed approach to the stated objectives of the Richmond Art Gallery, and was willing to explore various avenues for achieving them, Mr. Kyte was more reserved. His response reflected a life-time career in the caring for, and the preserving and collecting of artifacts for display in museums across Canada. He stated that until recently, he had had little interest in exploring avenues for education programs. After a private tour through the gallery, in which he expressed his regard for the materials on display, we had an opportunity to explore mutual interests and views on the social value of collections such as that of the Richmond History Museum.

### Chapter 3

#### FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

##### The Program to be Evaluated

The teacher's manual, "More Than Meets the Eye," and related student materials were prepared during the winter and spring of 1983 and tested in British Columbia Secondary schools during the period May 1, 1983 to June 1, 1983. Four secondary schools were selected for pilot testing purposes and were provided with a copy of the teacher's manual, "More Than Meets the Eye," and related materials for classroom and field use during a five week evaluation period.

In preparation for this project it was necessary to approach a school board for assistance in obtaining permission to contact teachers who would be willing to participate in the trial testing. It was then important to maintain close contact with the individual teachers to ascertain what they felt were their program strengths and needs as regards the implementation of the new Art Foundations course in the Secondary Art curriculum. The time constraints on each teacher's program necessitated that each timetable of student activities be individualized. While maintaining flexibility, the timetable also had to fit into the time span of the chosen show to be viewed at the local cultural centre.

The researcher also had to be extremely flexible, as a participant and observer in the process.

### Evaluation Methodology

Several evaluation procedures were adopted in order to provide an assessment of the program. Procedures included use of teacher and student questionnaires (Appendix I), teacher interviews conducted by the evaluator, on-the-spot interviews with students during their tour of the local cultural centre, personal observation by the evaluator during these activities, and use of art curator and museum curator questionnaires.

### Objectives of the Evaluation

The intent of the teacher's manual, "More Than Meets the Eye," was to assemble materials which would satisfy the learning outcomes of the British Columbia Secondary Art Foundations course. The evaluation, therefore, is directed at ascertaining if these learning outcomes have been promoted. Furthermore, the formative evaluation provides information on the strengths, weaknesses, organization and concerns of a program and is therefore a means for improving the implementation of such a program. It was hoped, therefore, that the trial testing program would provide useful information on the overall suitability of the manual and materials for use in British Columbia secondary art programs.



## Researcher's Observations

Appendix I contains the summarized results of both student and teacher questionnaires. The results contain a numerical listing of preferences, written statements by both students and teachers, and a summary in which all numerical results have been tabulated to give a broad overview of the result of this pilot program.

The researcher took the opportunity throughout the implementation of the model to speak with the various participants. Interviews were conducted with the teachers before, during, and after the actual class visit to the Richmond Arts Centre. Their responses on these occasions reflected some general concerns.

All four teachers agreed to participate in this project because of a desire to take part with their students in the implementation of a practical application of an approach to the Art Foundations using the Richmond Arts Centre. They all expressed the opinion that their students would benefit from exposure to the materials to be found in the local cultural centre.

Teacher A was interested in the project, as an opportunity for teachers to learn, on the job, a practical approach to a concept. Teacher C expressed this as a desire on behalf of the students to know more about why something is good or bad art. In general all expressed the view that really looking at art works and being able to discuss the qualities of the art works is important for students.

Teacher B enlarged on this theme. The hope was expressed that this program would improve the student's ability to understand what constitutes art and therefore help students grow in appreciation and develop critical skills. Giving students a focus for a gallery visit was a common theme throughout the interviews and remained one of the strong focii for all the teachers. When asked to anticipate what might be perceived as an overall weakness of the program, it was Teacher A who succinctly remarked that this program would be a beginning rather than an end in itself.

After several meetings with the teachers, both in a group and individually, it became clear that all desired material guidance in preparation for their classes' visit to the local cultural centre. Concern was expressed on the variation in ability of all students to express themselves equally in critical terms and just what would be expected from them during the visit. The teacher's manual, "More Than Meets the Eye," is a direct outcome of these expressed concerns.

Each teacher made unique application of the manual. Teacher C took materials out of the booklet and directly utilized them with the class. Teacher B enriched the program by acquiring large blow-ups of the original illustrations and encouraging students to explore the concepts outlined in the manual, concepts which are directly connected to the Art Foundations course in the Secondary Art Guide. Teacher A did not seem to make this connection, but assured the researcher that the manual was of personal value. It gave an opportunity to view the implied relationships

between the various concepts. Teacher A suggested that to see the proposed examples clarified the direction the Art Foundations course might take.

It became apparent during the actual visits that the prototype program required adjustment to provide either more time for the visit or less material to cover. In the researcher's concern to ensure that all the relevant material was introduced, the resulting work sheets became too long. They required of the students a dedicated approach to complete them in an hour and a half. While all students appeared to enjoy the visit, they were of varying abilities, and many were not able to complete their note taking before they were required to return to the bus. This was a common weakness which each class experienced. At the same time, it ensured that all students were fully occupied for the hour and a half.

The researcher did instruct the groups, as they entered the cultural centre complex, that the sheets were to be a guide for focusing their viewing and were not a test. However, students appeared orientated to testing. Several asked about the marks. This is an area that each teacher must introduce in his or her own classrooms.

Included is a diary of events which records the researcher's movements in contacting participants. It illustrates the close liaison which was necessary for program implementation.

DIARY OF EVENTSFEBRUARY 24, 1983 9:15 am

Met with Ms. Kit Grauer, Richmond School Board Art Co-ordinator, to discuss the possibility of doing a pilot program with Secondary Art teachers. The project is to be designed to show whether closer liaison between schools and local cultural centres will promote the responses that art educators are seeking in their implementation of the grade 8-9 Art Foundations component of the Secondary Art Curriculum.

MARCH 1, 1983

Letter from the Richmond School Board granting permission to work in consultation with Ms. Kit Grauer.

MARCH 3, 1983 11:00 am

Ms. Kit Grauer gave a lecture to our Design class about her views on Art and Art Criticism in the classroom.

MARCH 7, 1983 10:30 am

Held a joint meeting with Mrs. Page Hope-Smith, Acting Co-ordinator for the Richmond Art Gallery and Mr. John Kyte, Acting Curator for the Richmond Museum.

MARCH 15, 1983 10:00 am

Met with Ms. Kit Grauer to discuss philosophy and approaches to implementation of the Art Foundations course. This was an opportunity to discuss assumptions as to the value of this study. At this meeting I received the names of four teachers who might like to help in the project: Dorothy Brogan, Donna Grieser, Allan Bone, and Annelies Reeves. Went to visit with each teacher and introduce myself. Arranged a time to meet on March 21, 1983 at 3:30 pm in the Art room at Cambie Secondary.

MARCH 21, 1983 3:30 pm

Held an information meeting at Cambie Secondary School. All present suggested they would like direction as to specific ideas for introducing the material to their students.

MARCH 23, 1983

Arranged over the telephone the specific times for each teacher's visit to the Richmond Arts Centre. Also ensured that the buses had been ordered for the field trip. In the week, the researcher took to each teacher the cardboard for making folders for each student's project materials and individual art work.

MARCH 27, 1983 9:30 am

Visited at Mrs. Adelina West's studio to see her work and receive her slides for the teachers to use in their classrooms before their visit to the Gallery.

MARCH 28, 1983 9:30 am

Took to Mrs. Jane Wheeler, the Richmond Arts Centre secretary, copies of biographies that I had written about each of the artists in the forthcoming show IMAGES.

MARCH 29, 1983 10:00 am

Went to the Richmond Museum to meet with Miss Varick, an employee of the Duncan Forestry Museum, to see what methods they used for approaching Museum education.

MARCH 31, 1983 7:00 pm

Talked on the phone with Mrs. Nora Harris about her work. She had previously sent her slides.

APRIL 2, 1983 10:30 am

Met with the artist, Mr. Carl Merton, to discuss his views on his art and received slides to assist the teachers in their preliminary lessons before the visit to the Richmond Arts Centre.

APRIL 2, 1983 11:30 am

Met with artist, Mr. Richard Tetrault, at his walk-up studio on Powell Street, received his slides and explored his studio.

APRIL 12, 1983 9:30 am

Took slides of artist's works to Colorfast Labs on No. 3 Road, Richmond, to get two sets made for use by the Secondary Art teachers in the classroom.

APRIL 14, 1983 10:00 am

Met with Mrs. Rosemary Currie, the volunteer docent at the Richmond Art Gallery, to discuss her views on student visits to the Art Gallery. She explained that general talks with students had not proved too successful except with older students. She expressed her enthusiasm for my project.

APRIL 15, 1983 1:00 pm

Met with Ms. Kit Grauer to explain my progress to date. She suggested the researcher do a limited run of twenty-five copies of the teacher's manual.

APRIL 25, 1983 9:30 am

Took preliminary worksheets to Mrs. Page Hope-Smith and Mr. John Kyte for their perusal. Picked up the slides.

APRIL 27, 1983 1:00 pm

At the Richmond School Board, ran off 100 copies of the worksheets and biographies of the artists, plus vocabulary lists.

APRIL 28, 1983 4:00 pm

Met with Ms. Kit Grauer at her home to talk with Richmond Secondary Art teachers about my program and gave out samples of the materials to be used in the study. It was also an opportunity to give to three of the teachers the materials for them to use before they visit the Richmond Arts Centre.

MAY 2, 1983 11:00 am

Took Mrs. Dorothy Brogan the teacher's manual and student materials.

MAY 9, 1983

Went to visit the teachers to pick up their student pre-test questionnaires as well as their own pre-test questionnaires.

MAY 13, 1983 9:30 am

Mrs. Donna Greiser brought her class to the Richmond Arts Centre for the tour. Mrs. Adelina West came to speak for five minutes.

MAY 17, 1983 9:30 am

Mrs. Annelies Reeves brought her class to the Richmond Arts Centre for the tour. Nora Harris spoke to the group for five minutes.

MAY 18, 1983 10:00 am

Mr. Alan Bone brought his class to the Richmond Arts Centre for the tour. Mr. Carl Merton spoke to the group for five minutes.

MAY 20, 1983 12:00 pm

Mrs. Dorothy Brogan brought her class to the Richmond Arts Centre for the tour. Mr. Richard Tetrault spoke to the group for five minutes.

JUNE 1-3, 1983

Picked up all materials from the teachers in the first week of June.

JUNE 14, 1983 3:30 pm

Tea at Earl's Place. The researcher invited all participants to a thank-you tea. It was an opportunity to meet once again and to show the teachers the photographs taken of their students while they were at the Richmond Arts Centre.

FEBRUARY - JUNE, 1983

Throughout this period there were numerous occasions where the teachers and researcher conversed about the project. This communication was vital to the success of the Model.

## Chapter 4

### SUMMATIVE EVALUATION

#### Results of the Co-ordinator's Evaluation

Art Co-ordinator of the Richmond School Board, Ms. Kit Grauer, felt the program was worthwhile. Her recommendation suggested that this type of program should be instituted in combination with sound classroom instruction where students understand the overlap between school and gallery experience. In particular, the teacher would need to be aware of the peculiarities within each class and adapt the program accordingly. She expressed the appreciation of the Secondary Art teachers at having had the opportunity to be involved in the program. Kit Grauer suggested that the success of this integration of the Art Foundations with the Richmond Arts Centre was due to the researcher's direct involvement with the teachers. The extensive nature of this involvement is indicated in the Diary, Chapter 3. While this was personally a flattering statement, it should be borne in mind that any program would only work to the best of the individual teachers and students involved. It was fortunate that all who participated offered their interest and enthusiasm.

As a result of the class visits to the Art Gallery, the acting Gallery Co-ordinator would like to see an extension of this



program. To that end, the Gallery has advertised for a volunteer to work under the docent. The duties would encompass many of the tasks that the researcher performed. These include contacting the artists for upcoming shows, and interviews, preparing a brochure and information sheets for the public, as well as investigating films and speakers to enhance the exhibitions (Appendix II).

The Gallery views its role as being freer and more relaxed than that of the schools. Emphasis should be placed on the need for an open approach to the Gallery. Mrs. Page Hope-Smith was concerned that it be made clear there are no wrong answers when viewing art. To aid in achieving this goal, the Gallery Co-ordinator would like to see smaller groups come to the Gallery to participate in experiences organized by the staff in conjunction with the school. It was concluded that this program had provoked the Gallery personnel to an awareness that this was an area in which they should be involved.

The Museum Co-ordinator would also like to see materials developed for the public. His focus is more on the preservation and explanation of the function of the works on display, not their form, but he did concede that the form did affect the choices he personally made when selecting works for display. This approach to form and function is central to the well-developed art program which should include opportunities for students to see visual relationships (Curriculum Guide, 1983, p. 10).

The relationships that the researcher and the Museum Co-ordinator developed highlights the notion that personal contact

is of the utmost importance if a program that makes use of multiple personalities is to succeed. The researcher maintained personal contacts over the two month period while developing the actual Arts Centre program.

### Effectiveness of the Program

The researcher has developed a natural model for the description of practice in the implementation of a component of the Secondary Art curriculum. Techniques most suited to this method include open-ended, in-depth interviews, personal observations and questionnaires. The data collected was in several forms. It was incorporated into descriptions of the environments, direct and paraphrased language quotes, and statistical analysis. These results have been validated or refuted by the participants.

In assessing the overall effectiveness of the program, it was important to ascertain if the broad and specific objectives (intent, ends) of the program have been satisfied (Davis, 1981). This study set out to show that local cultural centres serve as practical sources for materials in satisfying the art program goals in the implementation of the Art Foundations. To this end, the researchers, through personal interviews, explored ways that the various staff members of the facilities, including the Richmond Arts Centre and the Richmond School Board and teachers, could communicate and resolve mutual and distinct problems.

The researcher developed materials for the Secondary Art

teachers which introduced the Art Foundations component with a specific application to use on an art gallery and/or history museum visit. These materials gave specific guidance to particular shows at the local cultural centre, yet remained on target towards a basic understanding of the four learning outcomes: developing personal imagery, investigating historical and/or contemporary developments in the arts, learning the elements and principles of design, and investigating reasoned criticism.

A review of the results of the questionnaires, comment sheets and art work generated as a result of and during the visit to the Richmond Arts Centre indicates that this program could be considered a success. It contained the three key elements considered imperative to motivate learning: effective sequencing of the material, validation through repetition, and self-motivation of the learner through pleasure (Drucker, 1978). The enthusiasm generated by the pilot project is evident in the written results in Appendix I. Positive outcomes include the reaction and action of the Art Gallery in their advertising for a volunteer to immediately implement a portion of this program (see Appendix II), in the acting Museum Curator asking this researcher to assist in developing museum materials this summer, and in the local Secondary Art teachers active planning to repeat the experience next term.

The students' responses were also encouraging. There were a few who did not find much merit in the experience, but they were the minority. A quick perusal through the written student

questionnaires indicates a new awareness of what is available in the Richmond Arts Centre. Of the sixty-nine completed questionnaires, sixty-three felt the experience of visiting the Arts Centre broadened their knowledge about their local cultural centre. Over fifty percent also found valuable listening to their teacher, watching the slides of the artist's works, doing the study as a group, listening to what other students have to say, and expressing their own opinions (see Appendix I, Combined Student Response for more information).

The majority felt the program was worthwhile and valuable as it gave them a viewing opportunity at an art show and history museum which they would not normally have undertaken on their own initiative. What was liked best about the program was the exposure to art. The least enjoyed was answering the questions. There was a general feeling expressed that from their point of view, more time for viewing with less writing and drawing would improve the program.

#### Observations Arising from the Study

1. There appears to be a need at the university level for instruction in implementation skills for new programs. Several teachers expressed a lack of confidence in their ability to implement such a program on their own initiative.

2. The guide for the Art Foundations component of the

Secondary Art curriculum needs to give specific guidance on which the teacher may build a total program. Ideally, this format would include a focus on the local cultural centre as a vehicle for achieving the learning outcomes of the Art Foundations component of the Secondary Art curriculum.

3. All teachers expressed a concern that there is no effective presentation available to the art teachers in the Richmond School District indicating the services currently available at the Richmond Arts Centre.

4. The schools have not reached out to the community, specifically the Richmond Arts Centre, to make them aware of the schools' needs and how the local cultural centre might best serve these needs. This was implied by the teachers' interest in having a chance to participate in a program such as "More Than Meets the Eye."

5. The choice which was made by the planners in locating the Richmond Arts Centre indicates that it was intended to be a focal point in the community. With its ideal location between the library and ice rink it is entirely possible to reach beyond implementing student programs to include activities and materials to attract the community at large.

6. The Acting History Museum Co-ordinator had an initial interest in the researcher's approach to the Museum. The actual

implementation of the tours, due to lack of time, were not as successful as he had hoped. He expressed concern that the actual visit, other than fulfilling the mandate that any visit was better than no visit, did not serve any effective purpose from the History Museum's point of view in furthering the aims and objectives of the Museum. The data implies that students were intrigued at their glimpse of the history of their community. Several made the comment that if it was history "forget it," but this "stuff" was different. This was in reference to the Museum's display of materials related to the development of the Richmond community.

7. The overall poor quality of written responses and the comments on the questionnaires indicated that the students were not comfortable with a written format. This suggests that future worksheets should explore alternatives to expression. Perhaps have the groups use a tape recorder to record their responses, or possibly have a general discussion at the visit. The difficulty with the last suggestion is that it is a public facility and as such has other patrons viewing at the same time. Alternatively, have each member of a group take a small segment of the worksheets. This was suggested by the researcher but the students seemed reluctant to attempt this approach.

8. This project was a success as implied by the general enthusiasm and support given the project by students, participating artists, acting Gallery Co-ordinator, acting Museum Co-ordinator,

and School Board staff and Art Co-ordinator. This statement is validated by the written responses by the various Co-ordinators and students as well as direct interviews with the various participants.

9. There is a need for closer liaison between the Art Co-ordinators of the Richmond School Board and the Richmond Arts Centre. This could be accomplished by regular telephone contact, followed up by exchanging written material on needs and program opportunities each would like the other to know. This liaison could also be implemented by individual teachers taking the time to meet the Co-ordinators and expressing their needs.

#### Recommendations

1. The University of British Columbia should ensure that there is a component in the degree program which deals with the importance of and preparation for field trips to local cultural centres in art teachers' communities. This would serve the purpose of preparing teachers to explore alternative avenues in their implementation of the Art Foundations component of the Secondary curriculum.

2. The Richmond School Board should consider preparing a basic program which could be adapted by the individual Secondary Art teachers for the implementation of the Art Foundations

component of the Secondary Art curriculum. It would offer guidance as to the desired learning outcomes required of the students.

3. The Richmond Arts Centre should place a larger billboard, in the concourse between the library and its building, to draw to the public's attention the unique features that they have to offer. Considering the location of the Richmond Arts Centre within the municipality, it is evident that the Richmond municipal planners intended it to be one of the focii for the community.

4. And, finally, the students themselves had a number of recommendations from which the researcher has selected the following. It is recommended that the gallery personnel should not smoke in the gallery, that the actual trip to the cultural centre should be by car or public bus, not a school bus, and that the labels put up for the show should be larger, darker, and written with more information about the piece named. Their strongest recommendation came from a feeling of frustration that the time allotted for the program did not allow them to complete the worksheets, and to that end they recommended that more time be given or less material be covered.

## Conclusion

This case study, undertaken for a period of five months,



described and explained an approach to the implementation of the Arts Foundations component of the Secondary Art curriculum. Particular emphasis has been placed on the use of local cultural centres as practical sources for materials in satisfying the Art program goals. The structured setting of the program as implemented may not allow enough space for the individual's personal enjoyment but unless art educators arrange experiences that focus on the desired learning outcomes there can be little common ground on which to build an understanding of art. This understanding is the focus of the Art Foundations component of the Secondary Art guide.

All the learning outcomes could be taught in the classroom by the teacher but the learning experience of viewing and examining art in a gallery or museum setting cannot. To educate the eye to see subtle differences in function and form is best accomplished in the local Arts Centre. Ultimately it would be desirable to have a population which visited their local cultural centre as a matter of course and derived personal satisfaction and pleasure from experiencing the arts. Towards that end, art educators must make every effort to ensure that students achieve a working knowledge of the learning outcomes--a knowledge based on the arts as vibrant, vital elements in their lives.

One practical approach to fulfilling this aim for art education is the exposure to a variety of experiences. Visits to a local cultural centre would provide an enormous scope for exploring the process of educational practice. It offers a unique laboratory for students to test their individual preferences

in the development of their personal imagery. The atmosphere in the local cultural centre is one that would be extremely difficult to duplicate in the classroom. Fortunately, it is not necessary to attempt this duplication with the facilities available in the Richmond Arts Centre.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barkan, M., Chapman, L.H., & Kern, E.J. Guidelines: curriculum development for aesthetic education. St. Louis: Central Midwestern Regional Laboratory, Inc. (CEMREL), 1970.
- Broudy, H.S. The arts as basic education. Journal of Aesthetic Education, October, 1978, 12(4), 21-24.
- Broudy, H.S. Enlightened cherishing: An essay on aesthetic education. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, March, 1972.
- Broudy, H.S. How basic is aesthetic education? or Is 'RT the fourth R? Paper presented at the annual meeting, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Houston, Texas, March 19-23, 1977.
- Broudy, H.S. The whys and hows of aesthetic education. St. Louis, Missouri: CEMREL, Inc., July 1977.
- Chapman, L.H. Approaches to art in education. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978.
- Clark, G.A., & Zimmerman, E. A walk in the right direction: A model for visual arts education. Studies in Art Education, 1978, 19(2), 34-49.
- Connelly, F.M., Dukaca, A.S., & Quinlan, F. Curriculum planning for the classroom. Ontario Teachers Federation & O.I.S.E., 1980.
- Davis, S. Development of a built environment program for application and use in the B.C. secondary curriculum. Vancouver, British Columbia: University of British Columbia, 1981.
- Drucker, P. The age of discontinuity. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1978.
- Eisner, E. Educating artistic vision. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1972.
- Eisner, E. The educational imagination: on the design and evaluation of school programs. New York: Macmillan, 1979.
- Ferguson, M. The aquarian conspiracy. Los Angeles: J.P. Tarcher, 1980.
- Feldman, E.B. Varieties of visual experience. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1972.

- Hurwitz, A., & Madeja, S. The joyous vision. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.
- MacDonnell, Carol. From the gap: the view from the art museum. C.S.E.A., The Annual Journal, 1980.
- McFee, J., & Degge, R. Art, culture and environment. California: Wadsworth, 1977.
- McKim, R.H. Experiences in visual thinking. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1980.
- Newsom, B., & Silver, Adele. The art museum as educator. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.
- Ott, R.W. Museums and schools as universal partners in art education. Art Education, January 1980, 33(1), 7-9.
- Secondary Art Guide 8-12. Curriculum Guide and Content Resources. Victoria, British Columbia: Curriculum Development Branch, 1983.
- Silverman, R. Career education in art. Unpublished manuscript, 1983.
- Smith, R. The "deschooling" of art education: how it's happening and what to do about it. Art Education, March 1980, 33(3), 8-10.
- Smoke, J.G. Expressionism and phenomenology in aesthetic education. Journal of Aesthetic Education, 1974, 8(4), 91-103.
- Smoke, J.G. Metaphor in art education: some Heideggerian origins. Visual Arts Research, Fall, 1982, 16, 68-74.
- Stake, R. Evaluating the arts in education: a responsive approach. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1975.
- Toffler, A. Future shock. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Zeller, T. Let's teach art with originals. Art Education, January, 1983, 36(1), 43-46.
- Zimmerman, E. Digraph analysis and reconstruction of Broudy's aesthetic education theory: An exemplar for aesthetic education theory analysis and construction. Studies in Art Education, 1982, 23(3), 39-47.

## APPENDIX I

Results of teacher, art co-ordinator, gallery co-ordinator, museum co-ordinator and student questionnaires administered at completion of the five week pilot program period. Teacher, art co-ordinator, gallery co-ordinator and museum co-ordinator responses are reproduced verbatim as hand written on evaluation questionnaires.

Student responses represent a compilation of individual responses on a single questionnaire form for each group with number of students responding in each category shown numerically on the questionnaire form. Responses of a written nature from the students are summarized by listing all individual responses to a given question by a test group.

The overall results of the student questionnaire have been compiled into one questionnaire.

Questionnaires modelled and adapted from Davis, S. Development of a built environment program for application and use in the B.C. secondary curriculum. Vancouver, British Columbia; University of British Columbia, 1981.

RICHMOND SCHOOL BOARD ART CO-ORDINATOR

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

This survey is to obtain your view of the materials prepared for the visit to the Richmond Arts Centre as well as your response to the effectiveness of the actual program. As you are piloting this program, please make notations on the following questions as they apply to the objectives, content and teaching-learning strategies. Your comments will be treated confidentially.

Program Title: Richmond Arts Centre Program Grade level 8-12

Characteristics of the classes (eg. - English as a second language, interest level in art and the arts, etc.)

N.A.

1) Comment on the significance of the program. Can time allotted to the program be justified? Is the content worthwhile for the students to pursue?

In combination with sound classroom instruction where students understand the overlap between school and gallery experience, the program is clearly worthwhile.

2) Comment on the appropriateness of the program. Is it appropriate to the grade levels? Does it accomodate students of varying abilities and interests?

Again, the program is appropriate for secondary students when the teacher is aware of the perculiarities within each class and adapts to them.

3) What is your overall assessment of the unit?

From the remarks of teachers involved, they were pleased with the experience.

4) Please complete the following questions by placing an "X" on the response that best fits your assessment:

The program is:  
satisfactory/unsatisfactory

Objectives

Are they explicit and complete?

Are they clearly stated and easy to follow?

Are they suited to your time and resource restraints?

Are they developed satisfactorily throughout the program?

#### Content

Is there evidence of bias (ethnic, sex roles, stereo-types)?

Are there mistatements or omissions of fact?

-sources should have been acknowledged on the same page.  
Does it match stated objectives?

Is the readibility appropriate (vocabulary, sentence structure)?

Is it well organized and easy to follow?

Are a variety of resource materials provided or suggested?

Is the subject treated in sufficient depth?

Is the content new rather than redundant to students?

#### Teacher-learning Strategies in Handbook

Is variety provided for approaches to the program (opener, developmental, closure)?

Are they suited to the objectives?

Are there alternatives for different teaching-learning styles?

Do they encourage creativity:

Do they encourage a variety of student responses?

Do they facilitate enquiry rather than rote learning?

Do evaluation activities suit the objectives?

Do evaluation activities accommodate student differences?

Do students have opportunity for self and group evaluation?

6) Did you require help from someone (eg. consultant, development team member, teacher) to clarify some aspect of

the program?

Yes, help was required  
 X No

7) Comment on the involvement of the student in the unit. Do students become actively involved and interested? Do they perceive it as relevant, attractive and meaningful? Does the program build on the student's own experiences? Is it student or content oriented? Is there enough variety? Is student decision-making encouraged and choice accommodated? Does it allow for individualized pacing, or must all students do the same thing at the same time and in the same way?

Answered in interview.

8) Comment on any additional aspects which you feel would be helpful to the person revising this program. Suggested areas for comment could include selected aspects from the following: completeness, clarity, scope, realism, internal consistency, bias, accuracy, currency, readability, interest, organization, variety, depth, redundancy, flexibility, creativity, sequence, individualization, open-endedness.

What would the direction be in implementing this program? Much of the success in Richmond was due to your involvement with teachers and facilitating role.

How could these features be ensured in a revised program that was complete in itself?

9) What in your opinion, is the overall strength of this program?

The strength of the program was in developing a workable format and materials to use to meet the criteria of the secondary art guide and by involving teachers directly in applying those criteria.

10) What in your opinion, is the overall weakness of this program?

Answered above.

11) Do you recommend that this unit be produced for classroom use and distributed throughout the entire province? (check one)

- |     |                        |     |                      |
|-----|------------------------|-----|----------------------|
| (a) | without revisions      | (c) | with major revisions |
| (b) | X with minor revisions | (d) | not recommended      |

If you checked (b) or (c), what specific suggestions for improvement do you recommend?



See question 8 (response).

A few brief comments on how to relate the sections on Imagery, Design, etc. to the Gallery experience might be helpful.

MORE THAN MEETS THE EYE by L.A. Carmichael

SCHOOL A

GRADE 8

PRE-TEST

TEACHER

1. Why did you agree to participate in this project?

Because I wanted to experience a practical application of critical theory in relation to the new curriculum guide and because I believed the students would benefit from the experience.

2. Do you agree with the statement below? Yes

If so please tell what you as a teacher have implemented in the past to achieve this aim.

Nothing - it has always bothered me that I have not offered more field trips but the procedure of arranging them is difficult, costly and time-consuming - can't find people to cover your classes while gone.

"early and regular use of art museum facilities based on aesthetic principles is in a very real sense preparation for life-long learning and enjoyment of the visual arts" (Art Education, January, 1983, 36(1)).

3. Do you take your classes to local cultural centres throughout the school year? No

If so, where have you taken them in the past school year?

PRE-TEST

TEACHER

4. Given the choice which would you prefer, to visit a local cultural centre using materials to guide the student's viewing or having a qualified docent visit your school with selected materials?

We had the V.A.G. visit our school and I was very pleased with the results. This second option solves all of the problems noted in #2.

5. Do the local cultural centres in the Richmond area keep you well informed of their activities? No

If not, what would you suggest they do to correct this?

Monthly bulletins to the schools that are more highly descriptive than simply naming artists and titles, i.e., more visuals.

6. Slides have been made available for the teacher to show to the students before the visit. They are examples of the artist's work. Do you feel it is an advantage to have this preview of the works to be seen at the Arts Centre? Yes.

What are the specific merits for your class?

Gives them background experience in particular styles or themes, etc., so viewing in the gallery takes on a slightly more sophisticated nature (reviewing).

7. What do you anticipate will be the overall strength of this program?

Teaching the teachers.

PRE-TEST

TEACHER

8. What do you anticipate will be the overall weakness of this program?

Students often seem unwilling to put forth extra effort to gain closure in a short period of time. I suspect that this program will be a beginning rather than an end in itself.

MORE THAN MEETS THE EYE by L.A. Carmichael

SCHOOL B

GRADE 9

PRE-TEST

TEACHER

1. Why did you agree to participate in this project?

It sounded very worthwhile for both myself and my students.

2. Do you agree with the statement below? Yes

If so please tell what you as a teacher have implemented in the past to achieve this aim.

Grade 9 and 10 go to Granville Island to the Emily Carr College of Art and also visit the local galleries in that area. Grade 8 visits the Minoru Gallery.

"early and regular use of art museum facilities based on aesthetic principles is in a very real sense preparation for life-long learning and enjoyment of the visual arts" (Art Education, January, 1983, 35(1)).

3. Do you take your classes to local cultural centres throughout the school year? Yes

If so, where have you taken them in the past school year?

Minoru Art Gallery Student Show  
Granville Island Tour

4. Given the choice which would you prefer, to visit a local cultural centre using materials to guide the student's viewing

or having a qualified docent visit your school with selected materials?

The actual visit.

5. Do the local cultural centres in the Richmond area keep you well informed of their activities? Yes

If not, what would you suggest they do to correct this? N.A.

6. Slides have been made available for the teacher to show to the students before the visit. They are examples of the artist's work. Do you feel it is an advantage to have this preview of the works to be seen at the Arts Centre? Yes

What are the specific merits for your class?

Answers a lot of their questions about the visit. They finally have a chance to see how the original compares to a copy (slide).

7. What do you anticipate will be the overall strength of this program?

Improve their ability to understand and therefore better able to appreciate and criticize others and their own works of art.

8. What do you anticipate will be the overall weakness of this program? None

MORE THAN MEETS THE EYE by L.A. Carmichael

SCHOOL C

GRADE 10

PRE-TEST

TEACHER

1. Why did you agree to participate in this project?

I agreed to participate partially because I was asked to by Kit Grauer, but mainly because I thought it would benefit myself and my students in using the new curriculum.

2. Do you agree with the statement below? Yes

If so, please tell what you as a teacher have implemented in the past to achieve this aim.

We have visited the Richmond Arts Centre, and the Vancouver Art Gallery in the past.

"early and regular use of art museum facilities based on aesthetic principles is in a very real sense preparation for life-long learning and enjoyment of the visual arts" (Art Education, January, 1983, 35(1)).

3. Do you take your classes to local cultural centres throughout the school year? I try to.

If so, where have you taken them in the past school year?

Well, not too many places, as field trips have been severely limited this year because of restraint. (No bus funds! and no substitutes!)

PRE-TEST

TEACHER

4. Given the choice which would you prefer, to visit a local cultural centre using materials to guide the student's viewing or having a qualified docent visit your school with selected materials?

Both are good ideas. I've never actually had a visiting guide to the museums, but I've had the V.A.G. come in with materials. I can't really choose yet.

5. Do the local cultural centres in the Richmond area keep you well informed of their activities? Yes

If not, what would you suggest they do to correct this? N.A.

6. Slides have been made available for the teacher to show to the students before the visit. They are examples of the artist's work. Do you feel it is an advantage to have this preview of the works to be seen at the Arts Centre? Yes

What are the specific merits for your class?

I think it is a good idea to prepare students by previewing the artifacts. Some students do not like slides that much. But I feel that it prepares them by allowing them to be more familiar with an artist's style.

7. What do you anticipate will be the overall strength of this program?

I think that really looking at the works and being able to discuss the aesthetic qualities is important for students. They really seem to want to know more about why something



is good art (or bad). I think that a lot of them are looking forward to meeting the artist.

8. What do you anticipate will be the overall weakness of this program?

It's difficult to say at this point. The materials have been well prepared. I think my students will enjoy it.

MORE THAN MEETS THE EYE by L.A. Carmichael

SCHOOL D

GRADE 11/12

PRE-TEST

TEACHER

1. Why did you agree to participate in this project?

To see how someone else approached gallery visits and connected them to the new curriculum.

2. Do you agree with the statement below? Yes

If so please tell what you as a teacher have implemented in the past to achieve this aim.

Gallery visits have been primarily an adjunct to classroom work, but also to explore aesthetic discovery.

"early and regular use of art museum facilities based on aesthetic principles is in a very real sense preparation for life-long learning and enjoyment of the visual arts" (Art Education, January, 1983, 35(1)).

3. Do you take your classes to local cultural centres throughout the school year? Yes

If so, where have you taken them in the past school year?

Vancouver Art Gallery

4. Given the choice which would you prefer, to visit a local cultural centre using materials to guide the student's viewing or having a qualified docent visit your school with selected materials?

Go to a cultural centre.

5. Do the local cultural centres in the Richmond area keep you well informed of their activities? No

If not, what would you suggest they do to correct this?

By mail/phone, Richmond Review, and other papers.

6. Slides have been made available for the teacher to show to the students before the visit. They are examples of the artist's work. Do you feel it is an advantage to have this preview of the works to be seen at the Arts Centre? Yes

What are the specific merits for your class?

For discussion.

7. What do you anticipate will be the overall strength of this program?

Giving students a focus for a gallery visit.

8. What do you anticipate will be the overall weakness of this program?

Variation in student ability to express themselves in critical terms.

## SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR GRADES 8, 9, 10, 11/12.

## PRE-TEST

## STUDENT

1. Have you been to an Art Gallery or History Museum?

Yes: 68      No: 14

If so, where?

2. Have you ever felt you would like to know more about how a critical decision about art or artifacts is reached?

Yes: 48      No: 31

3. Do you feel the statement "I like it," or "I don't like it," is adequate when telling what you know about a work of art?

Yes: 15      No: 66

4. Do you know what activities are taking place in the local cultural centres in Richmond? (Art Gallery, History Museum, Library, Community Centre, Movie Theatres, etc.)

Yes: 44      No: 35

If so, how?

Community Centre:	8	Movie Theatre:	19	Papers:	19
TV/Radio:	9	Flyers:	7	Posters:	4
				Library:	3

5. You will be seeing slides of the artist's works before going to visit the Arts Centre. Do you like seeing slides?

Yes: 51      No: 27

6. Which do you prefer, to work in small groups - 34;  
pairs - 25; or alone - 24?
7. What do you think will be the best part of this visit?  
Seeing Art - 48; Missing School - 10; Learning about  
Art - 9; New Experience - 7; History Museum - 6.
8. What do you think will be the least enjoyable part of this  
visit?

Talks/Lectures - 14; Answering Questions - 9; Taking  
Notes - 8; Bus - 8; None - 6; Slides - 5; Some kinds  
of art - 6.

## TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

This survey is to obtain your view of the materials prepared for the visit to the Richmond Arts Centre as well as your response to the effectiveness of the actual program. As you are piloting this program, please make notations on the following questions as they apply to the objectives, content and teaching-learning strategies. Your comments will be treated confidentially.

Program Title: Richmond Arts Centre Program Grade level 8

School: A

Characteristics of the classes (e.g., English as a second language, interest level in art and the arts, etc.).

Normal grade 8 class who chose art as elective subject.

1) Comment on the significance of the program. Can time allotted to the program be justified? Is the content worthwhile for the students to pursue?

Content is quite worthwhile. However the four classroom hours I used to prepare for the visit were not quite sufficient.

2) Comment on the appropriateness of the program. Is it appropriate to the grade levels? Does it accommodate students of varying abilities and interests?

Both appropriate and accommodating to grade level and students' interests.

3) What is your overall assessment of the unit?

Good in conjunction with new curriculum guide. Students must be well prepared to handle the volume of content material in a short time frame.

4) Please complete the following questions by placing an "X" on the response that best fits your assessment:

Objectives	The program is: satisfactory/unsatisfactory
------------	--

Are they explicit and complete?

Are they clearly stated and easy to follow?

Are they suited to your time and resource restraint?

Are they developed satisfactorily throughout the program?

#### Content

Is there evidence of bias (ethnic, sex roles, stereotypes)?

Are there misstatements or omissions of fact?

-sources should have been acknowledged on the same page.

Does it match stated objectives?

Is the readability appropriate (vocabulary, sentence structure)?

Is it well organized and easy to follow?

Are a variety of resource materials provided or suggested?

Is the subject treated in sufficient depth?

Is the content new rather than redundant to students?

#### Teacher-learning Strategies in Handbook

Is variety provided for approaches to the program (opener, developmental, closure)?

Are they suited to the objectives?

Are there alternatives for different teaching-learning styles?

Do they encourage creativity?

Do they encourage a variety of student responses?

Do they facilitate enquiry rather than rote learning?

Do evaluation activities suit the objectives?

Do evaluation activities accommodate student differences?

Do students have opportunity for self and group evaluation?

5) Comment on how long it took you to cover the program in class time.

7 hours was not quite long enough.

6) Did you require help from someone (e.g., consultant, development team member, teacher) to clarify some aspect of the program?

X Yes, help was required.

No

7) Comment on the involvement of the student in the unit. Do students become actively involved and interested? Do they perceive it as relevant, attractive and meaningful? Does the program build on the student's own experiences? Is it student or content oriented? Is there enough variety? Is student decision-making encouraged and choice accommodated? Does it allow for individualized pacing, or must all students do the same thing at the same time and in the same way?

8) Comment on any additional aspects which you feel would be helpful to the person revising this program. Suggested areas for comment could include selected aspects from the following: completeness, clarity, scope, realism, internal consistency, bias, accuracy, currency, readability, interest, organization, variety, individualization, open-endedness.

9) What in your opinion, is the overall strength of this program?

- involving students in art criticism
- getting students to look at art in their communities

10) What in your opinion, is the overall weakness of this program?

Lack of student and/or teacher preparation.

11) Do you recommend that this unit be produced for classroom use and distributed throughout the entire province? (check one)

- |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (a) without revisions    | (c) with major revisions |
| (b) with minor revisions | (d) not recommended X    |

If you checked (b) or (c), what specific suggestions for improvement do you recommend?

There are far too many communities in this province with little or no access to proper galleries or museums.



## TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

This survey is to obtain your view of the materials prepared for the visit to the Richmond Arts Centre as well as your response to the effectiveness of the actual program. As you are piloting this program, please make notations on the following questions as they apply to the objectives, content and teaching-learning strategies. Your comments will be treated confidentially.

Program Title: Richmond Arts Centre Program Grade level 9

School B

Characteristics of the classes (e.g., English as a second language, interest level in art and the arts, etc.).

Drawing and painting 8. 2nd year art students. The majority of students are highly skilled technically and very keen.

1) Comment on the significance of the program. Can time allotted to the program be justified? Is the content worthwhile for the students to pursue?

This program can be an important part of art education. Image development is an important part of the curriculum; must be taught--the questions in this unit focus the students' attention to this area. Justifiable criticism is necessary to consumers and producers of Art.

2) Comment on the appropriateness of the program. Is it appropriate to the grade levels? Does it accommodate students of varying abilities and interests?

All the students got something worthwhile out of the program. A few out of the group are below average in ability. These students had trouble understanding and answering questions from "More Than Meets the Eye." Non-verbal answers were good for varying abilities.

3) What is your overall assessment of the unit?

Excellent.

The guide is well planned and could be adapted into a lot of subject areas to ensure that the students get the most out of the cultural centre visits. As an Art teacher, I found the guide contained a lot of necessary and pertinent information needed to direct the learning situation towards meeting the objectives of image development and justifiable criticism. Critiquing will inevitably lead to significant improvement in the students' technical skills.

4) Please complete the following questions by placing an "X" on the response that best fits your assessment:

The program is:  
satisfactory/unsatisfactory

#### Objectives

Are they explicit and complete?

Are they clearly stated and easy to follow?

Are they suited to your time and resource restraints?

Are they developed satisfactorily throughout the program?

#### Content

Is there evidence of bias (ethnic, sex roles, stereo-types)?

Are there mistatements or omissions of fact?

-sources should have been acknowledged on the same page.  
Does it match stated objectives?

Is the readability appropriate (vocabulary, sentence structure)?

Is it well organized and easy to follow?

Are a variety of resource materials provided or suggested?

Is the subject treated in sufficient depth?

Is the content new rather than redundant to students?

#### Teacher-learning Strategies in Handbook

Is variety provided for approaches to the program (opener, developmental, closure)?

Are they suited to the objectives?

Are there alternatives for different teaching-learning styles?

Do they encourage creativity:

Do they encourage a variety of student responses?

Do they facilitate enquiry rather than rote learning?

Do evaluation activities suit the objectives?

Do evaluation activities accommodate student differences?

Do students have opportunity for self and group evaluation?

6) Did you require help from someone (eg. consultant, development team member, teacher) to clarify some aspect of the program?

Yes, help was required  
X No

7) Comment on the involvement of the student in the unit. Do students become actively involved and interested? Do they perceive it as relevant, attractive and meaningful? Does the program build on the student's own experiences? Is it student or content oriented? Is there enough variety? Is student decision-making encouraged and choice accommodated? Does it allow for individualized pacing, or must all students do the same thing at the same time and in the same way?

Answered in interview.

8) Comment on any additional aspects which you feel would be helpful to the person revising this program. Suggested areas for comment could include selected aspects from the following: completeness, clarity, scope, realism, internal consistency, bias, accuracy, currency, readability, interest, organization, variety, depth, redundancy, flexibility, creativity, sequence, individualization, open-endedness.

Answered in interview.

9) What in your opinion, is the overall strength of this program?

It gives art students the skills necessary to become better critics of their own and others works of art. Since the visit, I have noticed an improvement in the students quality of images and technical skills. Fantastic aid for teachers in planning and preparing cultural center visits. It ensures that the students get maximum benefits during the prescribed time.

10) What in your opinion, is the overall weakness of this program?

The only weakness I found was the lack of time at the gallery. There was far too much work for the students to cover in 1 1/2 hours.

11) Do you recommend that this unit be produced for classroom use and distributed throughout the entire province? (check one)

- |     |                        |     |                      |
|-----|------------------------|-----|----------------------|
| (a) | without revisions      | (c) | with major revisions |
| (b) | X with minor revisions | (d) | not recommended      |

If you checked (b) or (c), what specific suggestions for improvement do you recommend?

Less work sheet material for the students to cover would ensure more quality of work as opposed to quantity.

## TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

This survey is to obtain your view of the materials prepared for the visit to the Richmond Arts Centre as well as your response to the effectiveness of the actual program. As you are piloting this program, please make notations on the following questions as they apply to the objectives, content and teaching-learning strategies. Your comments will be treated confidentially.

Program Title: Richmond Arts Centre Program Grade level 10

School: C

Characteristics of the classes (e.g., English as a second language, interest level in art and the arts, etc.).

My class is pretty much average. There are no really unusual types. One student has some difficulty with English, but all others are fine. Two or three are not terribly interested in art.

1) Comment on the significance of the program. Can time allotted to the program be justified? Is the content worthwhile for the students to pursue?

Yes, I think it is very worthwhile and my students did enjoy it. I really helped me plan more gallery visits for the future as I had always been a bit hesitant to go about it before. It is important that students visit museums regularly and learn to view the past and present in a critical manner and adult fashion. It was a good idea to include the vocabulary preparation and slides as students felt familiar with the concepts of design and some of the works before the visit.

2) Comment on the appropriateness of the program. Is it appropriate to the grade levels? Does it accommodate students of varying abilities and interests?

I took grade 10 students and I think it is quite appropriate to their level. Various abilities are accommodated through the questions and activities. I think there is something for everyone.

3) What is your overall assessment of the unit?

I enjoyed it!

I have used some of the materials on my other classes. The students enjoyed it overall. It would be nice to do this unit early in the school year. There were some things I could have taught better had we done this earlier this year.

4) Please complete the following questions by placing an "X" on the response that best fits your assessment:

The program is:  
satisfactory/unsatisfactory

#### Objectives

Are they explicit and complete?

Are they clearly stated and easy to follow?

Are they suited to your time and resource restraints?

Are they developed satisfactorily throughout the program?

#### Content

Is there evidence of bias (ethnic, sex roles, stereotypes)?

Are there misstatements or omissions of fact?

-sources should have been acknowledged on the same page.

Does it match stated objectives?

Is the readability appropriate (vocabulary, sentence structure)?

Is it well organized and easy to follow?

Are a variety of resource materials provided or suggested?

Is the subject treated in sufficient depth?

Is the content new rather than redundant to students?

#### Teacher-learning Strategies in Handbook

Is variety provided for approaches to the program (opener, developmental, closure)?

Are they suited to the objectives?

Are there alternatives for different teaching-learning styles?

Do they encourage creativity?

Do they encourage a variety of student responses?

Do they facilitate enquiry rather than rote learning?

Do evaluation activities suit the objectives?

Do evaluation activities accommodate student differences?

Do students have opportunity for self and group evaluation?

5) Comment on how long it took you to cover the program in class time.

Approximately 8 class sessions of 1 hour including gallery visit.

6) Did you require help from someone (e.g., consultant, development team member, teacher) to clarify some aspect of the program?

X Yes, help was required just to go over some preparation.  
No

7) Comment on the involvement of the student in the unit. Do students become actively involved and interested? Do they perceive it as relevant, attractive and meaningful? Does the program build on the student's own experiences? Is it student or content oriented? Is there enough variety? Is student decision-making encouraged and choice accommodated? Does it allow for individualized pacing, or must all students do the same thing at the same time and in the same way?

Yes, I felt my students were involved and interested. I think that it is relevant to their experiences. They enjoyed the visit with the artist. They found the handouts attractive and liked having their own folders. I feel this is a student oriented program. They can go at their own pace and I feel the worksheet questions drew some thoughtful answers.

There was good opportunity for them to make their own decisions about the artwork and there was a good choice of artwork. Pace was very good. Each person or group could work at their own speed. Some work could be finished in the classroom too.

I feel students can take what they've learned and use it to their advantage in planning ongoing work. A clown unit, painting, drawing, sculpture, prints could all be the next step after or during this visit.

8) Comment on any additional aspects which you feel would be helpful to the person revising this program. Suggested areas for

comment could include selected aspects from the following: completeness, clarity, scope, realism, internal consistency, bias, accuracy, currency, readability, interest, organization, variety, individualization, open-endedness.

I wonder about combining the museum visit with the gallery. Students are seeing the artifacts of the past and images of the present and I suppose these can be related by drawing comparisons.

I'm a bit unsure how to work the museum in with the gallery.

9) What in your opinion, is the overall strength of this program?

Terrific art work! I liked the criticism section and the fact that the questions were thought-provoking.

The visit from the artist is a real highlight. Students think about the art work differently after meeting him/her.

10) What in your opinion, is the overall weakness of this program?

I found that there was not enough time to cover all of the things that the students should see in the gallery. The museum section and the gallery show might be split up. My students found that they did not have enough time to do the worksheets at the gallery.

I would have liked to have had them do the gallery work first and then go on to the museum. It seemed like a lot to see in two hours. They wanted to stay to finish up, but we had to leave. Or, perhaps the museum could be done at a later date in another unit.

11) Do you recommend that this unit be produced for classroom use and distributed throughout the entire province? (check one)

- |                            |                          |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| (a) without revisions      | (c) with major revisions |
| (b) X with minor revisions | (c) not recommended      |

If you checked (b) or (c), what specific suggestions for improvement do you recommend?



## TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

This survey is to obtain your view of the materials prepared for the visit to the Richmond Arts Centre as well as your response to the effectiveness of the actual program. As you are piloting this program, please make notations on the following questions as they apply to the objectives, content and teaching-learning strategies. Your comments will be treated confidentially.

Program Title: Richmond Arts Centre Program Grade level 11/12

School: D

Characteristics of the classes (e.g., English as a second language, interest level in art and the arts, etc.).

Art 11 and 12 with some ESL. Several students have taken many art courses in Senior and Junior school, while some are taking their first art course since grade 8.

1) Comment on the significance of the program. Can time allotted to the program be justified? Is the content worthwhile for the students to pursue?

Time to the gallery is justified but "program" should be preceded by learning related to the responses demanded.

2) Comment on the appropriateness of the program. Is it appropriate to the grade levels? Does it accommodate students of varying abilities and interests?

Yes, approximate to grade level.

3) What is your overall assessment of the unit?

Specific intentions for learning outcomes and what leads up to them specifically could be dealt with. Otherwise it is a very good cultural centre experience process.

4) Please complete the following questions by placing an "X" on the response that best fits your assessment:

The program is:  
satisfactory/unsatisfactory

Objectives

Are they explicit and complete?

Are they clearly stated and easy to follow?

Are they suited to your time and resource restraints?

Are they developed satisfactorily throughout the program?

#### Content

Is there evidence of bias (ethnic, sex roles, stereo-types)?

Are there mistatements or omissions of fact?

-sources should have been acknowledged on the same page.  
Does it match stated objectives?

Is the readability appropriate (vocabulary, sentence structure)?

Is it well organized and easy to follow?

Are a variety of resource materials provided or suggested?

Is the subject treated in sufficient depth?

Is the content new rather than redundant to students?

#### Teacher-learning Strategies in Handbook

Is variety provided for approaches to the program (opener, developmental, closure)?

Are they suited to the objectives?

Are there alternatives for different teaching-learning styles?

Do they encourage creativity:

Do they encourage a variety of student responses?

Do they facilitate enquiry rather than rote learning?

Do evaluation activities suit the objectives?

Do evaluation activities accommodate student differences?

Do students have opportunity for self and group evaluation?

5) Comment on how long it took you to cover the program in class time.

6 hours.

6) Did you require help from someone (eg. consultant, development team member, teacher) to clarify some aspect of the program?

X Yes, help was required.  
No

7) Comment on the involvement of the student in the unit. Do students become actively involved and interested? Do they perceive it as relevant, attractive and meaningful? Does the program build on the student's own experiences? Is it student or content oriented? Is there enough variety? Is student decision-making encouraged and choice accommodated? Does it allow for individualized pacing, or must all students do the same thing at the same time and in the same way?

Students very low key.

8) Comment on any additional aspects which you feel would be helpful to the person revising this program. Suggested areas for comment could include selected aspects from the following: completeness, clarity, scope, realism, internal consistency, bias, accuracy, currency, readability, interest, organization, variety, depth, redundancy, flexibility, creativity, sequence, individualization, open-endedness.

Need for pre-teaching specifics - give unit on learning to approach criticism.

Qestion/answer placement on page.

9) What in your opinion, is the overall strength of this program?

Directed seeing in a gallery setting.

10) What in your opinion, is the overall weakness of this program?

How students perform depends more on previous learning.

11) Do you recommend that this unit be produced for classroom use and distributed throughout the entire province? (check one)

- |     |                      |     |                      |
|-----|----------------------|-----|----------------------|
| (a) | without revisions    | (c) | with major revisions |
| (b) | with minor revisions | (d) | not recommended      |

If you checked (b) or (c), what specific suggestions for improvement do you recommend?

VOLUNTEER EDUCATION OFFICER FOR  
RICHMOND ART GALLERY

DUTIES

Contacts artists for upcoming shows and interviews them, prepares brochures and information for the public, selects, trains and supervises docents, organizes tours for the public, assists in the selection of films, speakers, etc., to enhance exhibitions.

QUALIFICATIONS

Art history degree or equivalent combination of training and experience.

Ability to deal courteously and effectively with the public, artists and to work closely with the Gallery Committee

Ability to visit artists' studios when necessary

Ability to write clearly and concisely and to communicate effectively

HOURS OF WORK

Will vary considerably - approximately 5 hours per week  
- some at Arts Centre and some at home.

Contact P. Hope-Smith - Arts Centre Co-ordinator

## ACTING GALLERY CO-ORDINATOR

## GALLERY QUESTIONNAIRE

This survey is to obtain your view of the materials prepared for the visit to the Richmond Arts Centre as well as your response to the effectiveness of the actual program. As you are piloting this program, please make notations on the following questions as they apply to the objectives, content and teaching-learning strategies. Your comments will be treated confidentially.

Program Title: Richmond Arts Centre Program

1) Comment on the significance of the program. Can time allotted to the program be justified? Is the content worthwhile for the students to pursue?

Time easily justified. Program provides background information and gives each student something to look for.

2) Comment on the appropriateness of the program. Is it appropriate to the Gallery space? Does it accomodate students of varying abilities and interests?

Yes - both gallery and schools need to be concerned about set up and damage when a group is in the gallery.

3) What is your overall assessment of student visits to the Gallery?

Written sheets gave the students a reason to view the show carefully, but at times I felt this format was a bit restrictive - certainly wouldn't want to see this each time.

Giving the students an opportunity to interact with artists was an excellent idea.

Smaller groups could be organized for these age groups with gallery co-operation.

4) Please complete the following questions by placing an "X" on the response that best fits your assessment:

The program is:  
satisfactory/unsatisfactory

Objectives

Are they explicit and complete?

Are they clearly stated and easy to follow?

Are they suited to your time and resource restraints?

Are they developed satisfactorily throughout the program?

#### Content

Is there evidence of bias (ethnic, sex roles, stereo-types)?

Are there mistatements or omissions of fact?

Does it match stated objectives?

Is the readability appropriate (vocabulary, sentence structure)?

Is it well organized and easy to follow?

Are a variety of resource materials provided or suggested?

Is the subject treated in sufficient depth?

Is the content new rather than redundant to students?

#### Teacher-learning Strategies in Handbook

Is variety provided for approaches to the program (opener, developmental, closure)?

Are they suited to the objectives?

Are there alternatives for different teaching-learning styles?

Do they encourage creativity:

Do they encourage a variety of student responses?

Do they facilitate enquiry rather than rote learning?

Do evaluation activities suit the objectives?

Do evaluation activities accommodate student differences?

Do students have opportunity for self and group evaluation?

5) Did you require help from someone (eg. consultant, development team member, fellow teacher) to clarify some aspect of the program?

Yes, help was required

No

6) Comment on the involvement of the student in the unit. Do students become actively involved and interested? Do they perceive it as relevant, attractive and meaningful? Does the program build on the student's own experiences? Is it student or content oriented? Is there enough variety? Is student decision-making encouraged and choice accommodated? Does it allow for individualized pacing, or must all students do the same thing at the same time and in the same way?

7) Comment on any additional aspects which you feel would be helpful to the person revising this program. Suggested areas for comment could include selected aspects from the following: completeness, clarity, scope, realism, internal consistency, bias, accuracy, currency, readability, interest, organization, variety, depth, redundancy, flexibility, creativity, sequence, individualization, open-endedness.

8) What in your opinion, is the overall strength of this program?

Made us think about our objectives and perhaps made schools do the same. Might also make students see possible objectives as they pertain to themselves.

Worthwhile carrying on - more work as far as the gallery is concerned.



9) What in your opinion, is the overall weakness of this program?

Concerned that the show would be geared strictly to school audience. There is a danger here.

10) Do you recommend that this unit be produced for Gallery use and distributed throughout the entire province? (check one)

- |     |                        |     |                      |
|-----|------------------------|-----|----------------------|
| (a) | without revisions      | (c) | with major revisions |
| (b) | x with minor revisions | (d) | not recommended      |

If you checked (b) or (c), what specific suggestions for improvement do you recommend?

Once would be OK per class. Would like to see smaller groups, with docents to talk to students.

More fun and group discussion.

## ACTING MUSEUM CURATOR

## MUSEUM QUESTIONNAIRE

This survey is to obtain your view of the materials prepared for the visit to the Richmond Arts Centre as well as your response to the effectiveness of the actual program. As you are piloting this program, please make notations on the following questions as they apply to the objectives, content and teaching-learning strategies. Your comments will be treated confidentially.

Program Title: Richmond Arts Centre Program

1) Comment on the significance of the program. Can time allotted to the program be justified? Is the content worthwhile for the students to pursue?

Time spent in a museum can always be justified and the content, if presented in a proper manner, can open a door to new and exciting fields.

2) Comment on the appropriateness of the program. Is it appropriate to the Museum space? Does it accomodate students of varying abilities and interests?

It can accommodate students of varying abilities and interests, but the program cannot be justified if approached by the students from an 'art critique' viewpoint. A museum offers a unique opportunity for an in-depth learning experience!

3) What is your overall assessment of student visits to the Museum?

Student visits generally excellent. Unfortunately, your groups, lacking proper guidance (no docent to explain the exhibits), probably missed much information.

4) Please complete the following questions by placing an "X" on the response that best fits your assessment:

	The program is:
Felt not qualitifified to answer.	satisfactory/unsatisfactory
Objectives	

Are they explicit and complete?

Are they clearly stated and easy to follow?

Are they suited to your time and resource restraints?

Are they developed satisfactorily throughout the program?

#### Content

Is there evidence of bias (ethnic, sex roles, stereo-types)?

Are there mistatements or omissions of fact?

Does it match stated objectives?

Is the readability appropriate (vocabulary, sentence structure)?

Is it well organized and easy to follow?

Are a variety of resource materials provided or suggested?

Is the subject treated in sufficient depth?

Is the content new rather than redundant to students?

#### Teacher-learning Strategies in Handbook

Is variety provided for approaches to the program (opener, developmental, closure)?

Are they suited to the objectives?

Are there alternatives for different teaching-learning styles?

Do they encourage creativity:

Do they encourage a variety of student responses?

Do they facilitate enquiry rather than rote learning?

Do evaluation activities suit the objectives?

Do evaluation activities accommodate student differences?

Do students have opportunity for self and group evaluation?

5) Did you require help from someone (eg. consultant, development team member, teacher) to clarify some aspect of the program?

x Yes, help was required  
No

6) Comment on the involvement of the student in the unit. Do students become actively involved and interested? Do they perceive it as relevant, attractive and meaningful? Does the program build on the student's own experiences? Is it student or content oriented? Is there enough variety? Is student decision-making encouraged and choice accommodated? Does it allow for individualized pacing, or must all students do the same thing at the same time and in the same way?

7) Comment on any additional aspects which you feel would be helpful to the person revising this program. Suggested areas for comment could include selected aspects from the following: completeness, clarity, scope, realism, internal consistency, bias, accuracy, currency, readability, interest, organization, variety, depth, redundancy, flexibility, creativity, sequence, individualization, open-endedness.

Written work, never takes place of personal service. A docent would be required to make this visit a success. There is a need for a normal museum approach.

Art galleries and history museums are not compatable. Found it difficult to see how one could approach a museum from the point of view of "form" as it is mostly concerned with "function".

8) What in your opinion, is the overall strength of this program?

9) What in your opinion, is the overall weakness of this program?

10) Do you recommend that this unit be produced for Museum use and distributed throughout the entire province? (check one)

- |     |                      |     |                      |
|-----|----------------------|-----|----------------------|
| (a) | without revisions    | (c) | with major revisions |
| (b) | with minor revisions | (d) | x not recommended    |

If you checked (b) or (c), what specific suggestions for improvement do you recommend?

Not recommended under present format.

For the future: The museum should be involved in taking materials to the elementary school. There are no specific plans for the secondary schools.

## INTRODUCTION TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

This project has been planned to explore ways that teachers and students may achieve closer liaisons with local cultural centres in their communities. It is intended to enrich their viewing experiences which in turn will lead to a better understanding of the various facets which make up the 8-12 Art Foundation component of the new Art Curriculum.

Without giving your name, only your grade, please answer the questionnaire about your experience at the Richmond Arts Centre. If there is a portion of the sheets that you do not wish to answer you have the right to refuse to participate or withdraw at any time.

The sheets should take you about 20 minutes to complete. When the questionnaire is completed it will be assumed that you have consented to take part in this study.

## YOUR REACTION (after Davis, 1981)

## GRADES 8, 9, 10, 11 AND 12 COMBINED STUDENT RESPONSE

Please tell us how you feel about the things you did during the unit MORE THAN MEETS THE EYE. There are no right or wrong answers. Your reaction will help us to revise the program.

1) I think this program was...(place a check mark along the line)

Easy to understand	8	26	27	6	2	Hard to understand
Interesting	15	11	21	15	7	Boring
Important to learn	11	14	20	16	8	Not important
Too long	7	7	22	16	17	Too short
Moving too fast	9	18	26	8	7	Moving too slowly
Worthwhile and valuable	10	18	28	7	6	Not very worthwhile or valuable

What else?

2) While doing this program I....(place a check mark along the line)

Often discussed it at home or with friends	8	7	15	13	27	Seldom discussed it at home or with friends
Seldom felt confused	16	14	18	10	6	Often felt confused
Often asked questions	5	11	18	20	13	Seldom asked questions
Learned things I never knew before	17	14	24	5	8	Learned things I already knew before
Broadened my knowledge about art and my local cultural centres	18	18	20	7	6	Did not broaden my knowledge about art and my local cultural centres

What else?

Student Responses:

3) I learned most in this program by.....(Check as many as you wish)

- 18 Taking notes.
- 55 Viewing the art show and the history museum.
- 36 Listening to the teacher.
- 30 Watching the slides.
- 23 Having class discussions.
- 36 Doing the study as a group.
- 28 Doing the written exercises and writing answers to questions.
- 8 Having the teacher ask me questions.
- 22 Working by myself.
- 34 Listening to what other students have to say.
- 19 Asking resource people for their opinions. (artists, docent etc.)
- 4 Working in the library looking up further information.
- 13 Being given the answers to the questions by the teacher.
- 38 Expressing my own opinion.
- 11 Disagreeing with the teacher or other students.
- 24 Finding out answers for myself.
- 25 Asking questions.

What else?



4) I found it hard in this unit to.....(Check as many as you wish)

- 19 Understand the questions.
- 27 Answer the assigned questions.
- 17 Watch the slides.
- 15 Work by myself on the assignments.
- 4 Work with others on the group projects.
- 28 Find information to answer the questions.
- 23 Become interested in the topic.
- 22 Make sense out of the assignment.
- 17 Ask questions.
- 13 Follow the instructions on the handouts.
- 14 Remember what I saw at the Richmond Arts Centre.
- 23 Figure out why we had to do this project.

What else?

5) What I like best about the program was.....

Exposure to art.	27
The history museum.	16
Meeting the artist.	13
Seeing the clowns.	10
Project work, slides, sketching.	7
Artist's works.	7
Realistic art.	2

6) What I liked least about the program was .....

Questions, notes, work.	29
Not enough time.	10
Art, clowns, pictures.	8
The history museum.	7
Slides, lectures, and	

class work.	6
Abstract art.	5
Having picture taken.	4
Poor air - smokers.	4
Questionnaire form.	3
Set-up of museum.	2

7) What I would like to change in this program is .....

More time for viewing.	18
More variety of art and sculpture.	16
Less writing, drawing.	15
Use only history museum.	7
More artists in person.	5
Pick larger museum.	4
Do not have program over lunch time.	3
No history museum.	2
Add music.	2
Art more related to age group.	2
No picture taking.	2
No smoking.	4

quesall

## YOUR REACTION

SCHOOL A

GRADE 8

STUDENT RESPONSE

Please tell us how you feel about the things you did during the unit MORE THAN MEETS THE EYE. There are no right or wrong answers. Your reaction will help us to revise the program.

1) I think this program was...(place a check mark along the line)

Easy to understand	3	8	9	1	1	Hard to understand
Interesting	1	4	5	6	6	Boring
Important to learn	1	4	5	7	5	Not important
Too long	3	1	3	4	11	Too short
Moving too fast	3	3	8	3	5	Moving too slowly
Worthwhile and valuable	1	4	12	1	4	Not very worthwhile or valuable

What else?

2) While doing this program I....(place a check mark along the line)

Often discussed it at home or with friends	1	4	4	3	11	Seldom discussed it at home or with friends
Seldom felt confused	7	2	2	3	3	Often felt confused
Often asked questions	1	2	8	8	2	Seldom asked questions
Learned things I never knew before	5	5	7	1	4	Learned things I already knew before
Broadened my knowledge about art and my local cultural centres	6	5	8	2	1	Did not broaden my knowledge about art and my local cultural centres

What else?

Student Responses:

3) I learned most in this program by.....(Check as many as you wish)

- 4 Taking notes.
- 16 Viewing the art show and the history museum.
- 10 Listening to the teacher.
- 8 Watching the slides.
- 7 Having class discussions.
- 15 Doing the study as a group.
- 7 Doing the written exercises and writing answers to questions.
- 4 Having the teacher ask me questions.
- 3 Working by myself.
- 8 Listening to what other students have to say.
- 4 Asking resource people for their opinions. (artists, docent etc.)
- 2 Working in the library looking up further information.
- 3 Being given the answers to the questions by the teacher.
- 8 Expressing my own opinion.
- 3 Disagreeing with the teacher or other students.
- 4 Finding out answers for myself.
- 8 Asking questions.

What else?

4) I found it hard in this unit to.....(Check as many as you wish)

- 6 Understand the questions.
- 8 Answer the assigned questions.
- 4 Watch the slides.
- 8 Work by myself on the assignments.
- 1 Work with others on the group projects.
- 14 Find information to answer the questions.
- 9 Become interested in the topic.
- 5 Make sense out of the assignment.
- 7 Ask questions.
- 4 Follow the instructions on the handouts.
- 6 Remember what I saw at the Richmond Arts Centre.
- 10 Figure out why we had to do this project.

What else?

5) What I like best about the program was.....

- "Meeting the Artist." 2
- "Sketching in the art gallery." 3
- "Visiting the History Museum." 2
- "The hands-on sculpture." 1
- "Seeing the clown sculptures." 4
- "Looking at Nora Harris' work." 3
- "Seeing the paintings." 3
- "Seeing the art gallery." 4
- "Viewing the slides in class." 1

6) What I liked least about the program was .....

- "Answering questions." 2

"Taking notes."	2
"Not enough time."	1
"Artist used too many big words."	1
"Boring."	4
"Too much drawing."	3
"Abstract art."	1
"The art room."	2

7) What I would like to change in this program is .....

"Only use the Museum."	1
"There needs to be more art and sculpture."	5
"Art relating to age group."	2
"More time in the museum."	2
"Spend money on another kind of outing."	1
"More time for art viewing."	5
"Less work."	4
"Not have the program at/over lunch time."	3
"Meet more artists."	1
"Speed up the program."	1

ques8

## YOUR REACTION

SCHOOL B

GRADE 9

STUDENT RESPONSE

Please tell us how you feel about the things you did during the unit MORE THAN MEETS THE EYE. There are no right or wrong answers. Your reaction will help us to revise the program.

1) I think this program was...(place a check mark along the line)

Easy to understand	1	7	6	3	1	Hard to understand
Interesting	5	3	7	2	1	Boring
Important to learn	5	2	5	5	1	Not important
Too long	0	3	5	6	4	Too short
Moving too fast	4	4	6	2	2	Moving too slowly
Worthwhile and valuable	3	6	5	2	2	Not very worthwhile or valuable

What else?

2) While doing this program I....(place a check mark along the line)

Often discussed it at home or with friends	4	0	2	6	6	Seldom discussed it at home or with friends
Seldom felt confused	3	5	6	2	2	Often felt confused
Often asked questions	3	3	3	5	4	Seldom asked questions
Learned things I never knew before	3	3	7	2	2	Learned things I already knew before
Broadened my knowledge about art and my local cultural centres	5	6	4	2	1	Did not broaden my knowledge about art and my local cultural centres

What else?

Student Responses:

3) I learned most in this program by.....(Check as many as you wish)

- 8 Taking notes.
- 14 Viewing the art show and the history museum.
- 10 Listening to the teacher.
- 9 Watching the slides.
- 4 Having class discussions.
- 11 Doing the study as a group.
- 8 Doing the written exercises and writing answers to questions.
- 2 Having the teacher ask me questions.
- 6 Working by myself.
- 11 Listening to what other students have to say.
- 5 Asking resource people for their opinions. (artists, docent etc.)
- 1 Working in the library looking up further information.
- 6 Being given the answers to the questions by the teacher.
- 12 Expressing my own opinion.
- 4 Disagreeing with the teacher or other students.
- 10 Finding out answers for myself.
- 9 Asking questions.

What else?

"Got the information from the teachers."

2



4) I found it hard in this unit to.....(Check as many as you wish)

- 6 Understand the questions.
- 9 Answer the assigned questions.
- 4 Watch the slides.
- 5 Work by myself on the assignments.
- 0 Work with others on the group projects.
- 10 Find information to answer the questions.
- 6 Become interested in the topic.
- 7 Make sense out of the assignment.
- 5 Ask questions.
- 4 Follow the instructions on the handouts.
- 4 Remember what I saw at the Richmond Arts Centre.
- 8 Figure out why we had to do this project.

What else?

"Understanding and listening to the speaker."	2
"There was not enough time to complete the work."	2
"Finding the meaning in the works."	3
"Doing the sketches quickly."	1

5) What I like best about the program was.....

"The history museum."	5
"Hearing the artist".	2
"Seeing realistic art."	1
"Well organized."	1
"Seeing the clown sculptures."	3
"Hearing different opinions."	1
"Missing school."	1

6) What I liked least about the program was .....

"Answering questions."	11
------------------------	----

"Taking notes."	2
"Not enough time."	3
"Artist used too many big words."	1
"The history museum."	3
"Abstract art."	1
"There was not time to talk."	1

7) What I would like to change in this program is .....

"Less paintings."	1
"There needs to be more art and sculpture."	4
"Needs to be more visually exciting."	1
"More time in the art gallery."	3
"More information re: Steveston."	1
"No written questions."	2
"Would like to meet more artists."	2
"Add music."	2
"More time."	2

ques9

## YOUR REACTION

SCHOOL C

GRADE 10

STUDENT RESPONSE

Please tell us how you feel about the things you did during the unit MORE THAN MEETS THE EYE. There are no right or wrong answers. Your reaction will help us to revise the program.

1) I think this program was...(place a check mark along the line)

Easy to understand	2	8	2	0	0	Hard to understand
Interesting	7	2	2	1	0	Boring
Important to learn	4	4	4	0	0	Not important
Too long	1	1	7	2	1	Too short
Moving too fast	1	5	5	0	0	Moving too slowly
Worthwhile and valuable	5	5	2	0	0	Not very worthwhile or valuable

What else?

2) While doing this program I....(place a check mark along the line)

Often discussed it at home or with friends	3	2	3	3	1	Seldom discussed it at home or with friends
Seldom felt confused	4	3	5	0	0	Often felt confused
Often asked questions	1	3	4	2	1	Seldom asked questions
Learned things I never knew before	7	3	1	0	1	Learned things I already knew before
Broadened my knowledge about art and my local cultural centres	6	3	2	1	0	Did not broaden my knowledge about art and my local cultural centres

What else?

Student Responses:

3) I learned most in this program by.....(Check as many as you wish)

- 1 Taking notes.
- 11 Viewing the art show and the history museum.
- 7 Listening to the teacher.
- 4 Watching the slides.
- 7 Having class discussions.
- 7 Doing the study as a group.
- 8 Doing the written exercises and writing answers to questions.
- 1 Having the teacher ask me questions.
- 5 Working by myself.
- 9 Listening to what other students have to say.
- 7 Asking resource people for their opinions. (artists, docent etc.)
- 1 Working in the library looking up further information.
- 1 Being given the answers to the questions by the teacher.
- 10 Expressing my own opinion.
- 2 Disagreeing with the teacher or other students.
- 5 Finding out answers for myself.
- 6 Asking questions.

What else?

"Listening to the artist."	3
"Thinking about the art."	1
"Talking to art students."	1

"Looking up the vocabulary." 1

4) I found it hard in this unit to.....(Check as many as you wish)

- 2 Understand the questions.
- 6 Answer the assigned questions.
- 3 Watch the slides.
- 0 Work by myself on the assignments.
- 0 Work with others on the group projects.
- 1 Find information to answer the questions.
- 0 Become interested in the topic.
- 4 Make sense out of the assignment.
- 2 Ask questions.
- 1 Follow the instructions on the handouts.
- 0 Remember what I saw at the Richmond Arts Centre.
- 0 Figure out why we had to do this project.

What else?

"Getting the work done in a short time."	1
"To give a thorough opinion."	1

5) What I like best about the program was.....

"Exposure to art ."	7
"Exposure to the feelings of art."	1
"Hearing the artist."	8
"Seeing the history of Richmond."	1
"The history museum."	1

6) What I liked least about the program was .....

"Answering questions."	3
"Taking notes."	1
"Not enough time."	4
"Drags in class."	1

"The slides."	1
"Walking home."	1
"Drawing saw blades in museum."	1

7) What I would like to change in this program is .....

"Bigger whole program."	1
"No taking of notes."	1
"Shorter questionnaire so more time time to look at art works."	3
"More museum exhibits."	1
"More information re: Steveston."	1
"No history museum."	1
"More time."	5

ques10

## YOUR REACTION

SCHOOL D

GRADE 11/12

STUDENT RESPONSE

Please tell us how you feel about the things you did during the unit MORE THAN MEETS THE EYE. There are no right or wrong answers. Your reaction will help us to revise the program.

1) I think this program was...(place a check mark along the line)

Easy to understand	2	3	10	2	0	Hard to understand
Interesting	2	2	7	6	0	Boring
Important to learn	1	4	6	4	2	Not important
Too long	3	2	7	4	1	Too short
Moving too fast	1	6	7	3	0	Moving too slowly
Worthwhile and valuable	1	3	9	4	0	Not very worthwhile or valuable

What else?

2) While doing this program I....(place a check mark along the line)

Often discussed it at home or with friends	0	1	6	1	9	Seldom discussed it at home or with friends
Seldom felt confused	2	4	5	5	1	Often felt confused
Often asked questions	0	3	3	5	6	Seldom asked questions
Learned things I never knew before	2	3	9	2	1	Learned things I already knew before
Broadened my knowledge about art and my local cultural centres	1	4	6	2	4	Did not broaden my knowledge about art and my local cultural centres

What else?

Student Responses:

3) I learned most in this program by.....(Check as many as you wish)

5 Taking notes.

14 Viewing the art show and the history museum.

9 Listening to the teacher.

9 Watching the slides.

5 Having class discussions.

3 Doing the study as a group.

5 Doing the written exercises and writing answers to questions.

1 Having the teacher ask me questions.

8 Working by myself.

6 Listening to what other students have to say.

3 Asking resource people for their opinions. (artists, docent etc.)

0 Working in the library looking up further information.

3 Being given the answers to the questions by the teacher.

8 Expressing my own opinion.

2 Disagreeing with the teacher or other students.

5 Finding out answers for myself.

2 Asking questions.

What else?



4) I found it hard in this unit to.....(Check as many as you wish)

- 5 Understand the questions.
- 4 Answer the assigned questions.
- 6 Watch the slides.
- 2 Work by myself on the assignments.
- 3 Work with others on the group projects.
- 3 Find information to answer the questions.
- 8 Become interested in the topic.
- 6 Make sense out of the assignment.
- 3 Ask questions.
- 4 Follow the instructions on the handouts.
- 4 Remember what I saw at the Richmond Arts Centre.
- 5 Figure out why we had to do this project.

What else?

"Understanding the symbols."	1
"Poor instructions."	1
"Hard to use this questionnaire."	2

5) What I like best about the program was.....

"The history museum."	5
"Meeting the artist."	2
"Seeing realistic art."	2
"Seeing the clown sculpture."	3
"Viewing the art gallery."	4
"Dissecting" paintings for meaning."	1
"Adeline West's work."	1

6) What I liked least about the program was .....

"Abstract art."	3
"The bus trip."	1
"Not enough time."	1
"Boring."	1

"Having pictures taken."	4
"Simple art, priced high."	1
"Answering questions."	3
"Want more history."	1
"Poor air." (smokers)	4
"Negative mood of students."	2
"Questions hard to follow."	3
"Set-up of museum."	2

7) What I would like to change in this program is .....

"More art and sculpture."	2
"More time for art viewing."	3
"Less work."	4
"Meet more artists."	1
"Hear artist, then see works."	1
"Pick better laid out museum"	4
"No smoking."	1
"No picture taking."	1
"More oils, realistic style."	2
"Larger museum."	1

ques11/12

## APPENDIX II

### Samples of Correspondence