

**Cultural Alliance of Greater Washington
ARTS EDUCATION SURVEY:
2004-05 SCHOOLYEAR**

Prepared by:
Alan Yaffe, Ph.D
Consultant
January 2006

In the fall of 2005, the Cultural Alliance of Greater Washington (CAGW) conducted a survey to identify the scope and nature of arts education programs that its member organizations make available to students, teachers, artists, and parents through schools and other educational venues in the greater Washington, DC, metropolitan region. The survey was developed by this consultant in coordination with CAGW's Arts Education Subcommittee and was reviewed by representatives of other member institutions regarding the appropriateness and availability of the information requested and the clarity of questions.

The survey was designed to fulfill two primary purposes: 1) To describe pre-K-grade 12 arts education programs in terms of budgetary resources, arts disciplines addressed, numbers served, and content during the 2004-05 school year; and, 2) To provide benchmark data for periodic surveys of a similar nature in the future, offering an understanding of trends in arts education programming, impact, and resources through the years.

Using the online service "Survey Monkey," the survey was sent to 198 CAGW members (CAGW omitted 37 groups identified as not offering arts education programs). Total response was 74. However, there were eight (8) organizations that responded twice (from two different individuals) and, in each case, one of the responses contained no information. Thus, there were actually 66 respondents (a response rate of 33%). Twenty-one (21) of these organizations indicated that they do not provide arts education programming. The data cited in the remainder of this report represents the responses of 45 institutions [see **Appendix A** for reporting organizations] in the following FY 2005 arts education expense budget categories:

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| ▪ Five (5) | \$0-9,999 | 11% of respondents |
| ▪ Nine (9) | \$10,000-\$99,999 | 20% of respondents |
| ▪ Eight (8) | \$100,000-299,999 | 18% of respondents |
| ▪ Eight (8) | \$300,000-499,999 | 18% of respondents |
| ▪ Six (6) | \$500,000-999,999 | 13% of respondents |
| ▪ Seven (7) | \$1,000,000+ | 16% of respondents |
| ▪ Two (2) did not provide their arts education expense budget category – 4% respondents | | |

The overall response rate of 33% indicates that the data offers a reasonable degree of statistical reliability regarding such issues as program type and content, including the percentage of organizations without arts education programming. However, in terms of numbers of students, teachers, artists, and parents served, the accuracy of information is somewhat problematic.

In an effort to describe the actual numbers of individual participants rather than gross numbers representing both reach and frequency, the survey asked respondents to provide data on **individual students, teachers, artists and parents served** during the period of July 1, 2004-June 30, 2005. In the case of students, this approach appears to have

produced an inflated total figure due to two factors: 1) There is no way to determine to what the degree the total combined figure (429,959) includes students served by more than one organization; and, 2) Some respondents appear to provide a gross number (reach x frequency) rather than discrete individuals participants. An indication of the inflation factor is that the total combined number represents 44% of all kindergarten through high school-aged children in the greater Washington region (DC + 11 Maryland and Virginia counties) as recorded in the 2000 census. It should be noted that the census does not allow us to calculate the number of students enrolled in early childhood settings.

Regarding teachers, artists and parents, it is probable that respondents keep more accurate individual data and that the organizations do not overlap with each other to a large extent in serving these participants. However, since relatively few groups supplied these kinds of data, the total combined numbers may well under represent the scope of services to these arts education stakeholders.

The remainder of the report details all survey data and deals with the issues of accuracy more specifically.

Budgetary and Arts Discipline Data

In addition to providing FY 2005 arts education expense budgets (direct costs and those indirect expenses allocated to arts education), respondents were asked to indicate the percent of costs covered by revenue in the following categories: 1) Contributions and Grants; 2) Admissions/User Fees from School/School District Budgets; 3) Admissions/User Fees Collected by Schools/School Districts from Individual Students and/or Teachers; 4) Individual Admissions, User Fees, Tuition Paid Directly to Organization; 5) Other Sources.

As **Table 1** below shows, organizations across most budget categories depend heavily upon contributions and grants to fund arts education programs. Fifty-four percent (54%) – 19 of the 35 organizations that provided revenue source information – depend on contributions and grants to cover at least 50% of their expenses, and for 15 groups (43%) this source accounts for 75-100% of revenue. In the smallest budget category (\$0-9,999), companies appear to depend less on this kind of revenue. However, it is inappropriate to speculate on the meaning of this specific data as only two of five such groups offered revenue information.

Individual admissions, fees, and tuition paid directly to organizations appear as the next largest source of revenue, with eight (8) of the 35 groups (29%) reporting that this form of earned income covers 50% or more of arts education expenses. Again, there is little variation by budget category regarding dependence on this source.

No organizations in any budget category recorded a level of 50% or higher for any other type of earned revenue – Admissions/Fees from School Budgets and Admissions/Fees Collected by Schools from Individual Students/Teachers. Regarding “other” sources,

three (3) groups reported 50% or higher levels – one derived from membership dues, one from university funding, and the last from a city appropriation.

The data clearly indicates that no matter how large or small the budget, contributions and grants are central sources for funding the arts education activities of CAGW members. School budgets have not yet begun to provide major support, and individual admissions, user fees, and tuition, while an important source of earned income, are less significant than contributed income in the overall mix of revenue streams.

Table 1: Source of Revenue as % of Total Expenses

Note: First line notes the number of organizations providing revenue data as compared with the number of organizations that responded to the survey with arts education information.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Providing Data	2 of 5	8 of 9	7 of 8	8 of 8	5 of 6	5 of 7	0 of 2	35 of 45
Contribs./Grants:								
0-24%	1	0	1	0	0	1	-	3
25-49%	0	0	2	3	2	2	-	9
50-74%	1	1	1	0	1	0	-	4
75-100%	0	5	3	3	2	2	-	15
Admissions/Fees								
From School								
Budgets:								
0-24%	1	2	2	1	0	2	-	8
25-49%	0	1	0	1	0	0	-	2
50-74%	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
75-100%	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
Admissions/Fees								
Collected by								
Schools:								
0-24%	2	0	1	2	0	2	-	7
25-49%	0	0	2	2	0	0	-	4
50-74%	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
75-100%	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
Indiv. Admissions/ Fees/Tuition								
Paid Directly:								
0-24%	0	0	0	0	2	2	-	4
25-49%	1	2	2	1	1	0	-	7
50-74%	0	0	0	1	0	3	-	4
75-100%	1	1	1	1	0	0	-	4
Other:*								
0-24%	0	0	0	1	1	1	-	3
25-49%	0	0	0	1	0	0	-	1
50-74%	0	1	1	0	1	1	-	4
75-100%	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0

* Other: One organization (\$10,000-99,999) reported 69% of arts education revenue derived from sales of arts and member dues; a \$100,000-\$299,000 organization gained 50% of revenue through university funding; county giving accounted for 10% of revenue for a \$300,000-499,000 organization; another organization in that same budget category recorded 28% of revenue as advertising and gala related; a \$500,000-999,999 group received city support accounting for 70% of its arts education revenue; a company in that same budget category derived 15% of revenue from sales of guidebooks and university partnerships; a \$1 million + institution attributed 3% of revenue to miscellaneous sources; and two groups, one in the \$500,000-999,999 category and the other at \$1 million +, did not provide specific sources for 46.5% and 61% of revenue respectively.

Organizations described arts disciplines addressed by their education programs, indicating a diversity of arts offerings across the budget categories. Theatre and music lead the way, followed by dance, multidisciplinary, and visual arts programs. Multidisciplinary approaches tend to appear more often in larger budget organizations

(\$300,000+), perhaps because these companies have a broader range of artistic resources and interests than smaller institutions. Opera and media arts are least frequently addressed. In the case of opera, there are relatively few organizations producing or presenting the art form. Regarding media arts, interest among CAGW members appears nascent in terms of education programming.

Table 2: Arts Disciplines Addressed by Education Programs

Note: Percentages calculated against the number of respondents in each category. Totals may exceed 100% as multiple responses allowed.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Respondents	5	9	8	8	6	7	2	45
Theatre	2 (40%)	3 (33%)	4 (50%)	4 (50%)	6 (100%)	3 (43%)	1 (50%)	23 (51%)
Music	3 (60%)	4 (44%)	4 (50%)	5 (63%)	4 (67%)	4 (57%)	1 (50%)	25 (56%)
Dance	1 (20%)	3 (33%)	2 (25%)	2 (25%)	4 (67%)	4 (57%)	0 (0%)	16 (36%)
Opera	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	3 (50%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	6 (13%)
Visual Arts	1 (20%)	2 (22%)	1 (13%)	4 (50%)	2 (33%)	2 (29%)	1 (50%)	13 (29%)
Media Arts	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (25%)	3 (50%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	7 (16%)
Multidisciplinary	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	4 (50%)	5 (83%)	3 (43%)	0 (0%)	15 (30%)
Other*	1 (20%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (7%)

*Other: The group in the \$0-9,999 category offers “cultural/historical education” programs; the \$10,000-\$99,999 company provides martial arts and circus training; and the \$300,000-499,999 organization addresses creative writing.

Programs for Students

As previously noted, organizations were asked to provide information on the number of individual students, pre-K-grade 12, served during the period of July 1, 2004-June 30, 2005. Three (3) organizations indicated that they did not have student programs. Another group was eliminated as it listed the number of individual students at a level equivalent to 41% of all K through Grade 12 students in the entire metropolitan region. The remaining 41 reported serving a combined total of 424,959 individual students. As discussed earlier, this is most likely an inflated figure. This is not to say that students experiencing arts programs from multiple organizations do not derive added educational value; only that an adjustment is indicated to arrive at a reasonable estimate of individuals served.

Even reducing the total by one half to recognize overlaps in service and the reporting of gross rather than discrete numbers, we can still **estimate** an impressive combined total of **212,480 individual students**,

Table 3 shows the unadjusted number of individual students, as reported by the 41 reporting organizations, by budget category. Not surprisingly, groups with arts education budgets in excess of \$500,000 account for 83% of the total.

Table 3: Individual Student (Pre-K-Grade 12) Participation

Note: First line notes the number of respondents providing individual student participation information as compared with the number of organizations providing arts education program information.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Providing Data	5 of 5	9 of 9	8 of 8	8 of 8	5 of 6	5 of 7	1 of 2	41 of 45
# of Indiv. Students	1,580	24,106	26,550	19,128	153,454	199,016	1,125	424,959

The survey also asked respondents to estimate the average number of hours or days that each individual student participated, offering an indication of the contact hours/days that

their arts education programs impacted students. However, the resulting data is partial in nature as only 29 organizations responded with this information, mostly in terms of average number of hours. Further, the data may not offer an accurate picture as individual organizations undoubtedly used different methods to calculate average figures.

It would prove beneficial to future surveys if CAGW members developed a standard method for recording individual students served and, further, agreed to track average hours or days (one or the other) in a consistent and unified manner. It is this consultant’s belief that the concept of contact hours or days offers an important tool for describing the participation of students and other stakeholders as educators often use these terms in measuring instructional impact.

To bring some consistency to the contact data, we converted “average day” information to hours, using an average of 4 hours of instructional time per day. The 29 groups provided an estimated combined total of **1,066,367 student contact hours** during the July 1, 2004-June 30, 2005 period, for an average of **8.5 contact hours per student**. While these figures may seem inflated, a number of respondents, as detailed in the notes to **Table 4** below, provide arts classes, residencies, and performances of substantial duration and scope.

Table 4: Student Contact Hours

Note: First line notes the number of respondents providing student contact information as compared with the number of organizations providing arts education program information.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Providing Data	4 of 5	6 of 9	5 of 8	8 of 8	2 of 5	3 of 4	1 of 2	31 of 41
Student Contact Hrs.*	89,250	31,778	209,688	226,411	111,000	362,240	36,000	1,066,367
Av. Contact Hours	61.1**	5	8.6	11.8	8.9	5.9	3.2	8.5

*In the \$0-9,999 category, a drama conservatory accounts for 86,400 of the contact hours (1,440 hours/student); in the \$100,000-299,999 category, one organization provides an average 10 hours of instruction to 10,000 individual students, accounting for almost one-half of the contact hours; in the \$300,000-499,999 group, one group provides 120 hours of class/workshop instruction to 1,500 students, accounting for 180,000 of the contact hours; and in the \$1 million+ category, a music conservatory accounts for 277,500 of the contact hours (7.5 per student).

**The organization providing 1,440 contact hours per student distorts the average in the lowest budget category.

Three questions asked for information regarding the distribution of individual students served in terms of types of schools/educational settings, geographic locations, and grade levels. As with contact hours, substantial minorities did not have these kinds of data available, providing only a partial picture that may well not be representative of distribution patterns in the region. To gain accuracy in future surveys, it is suggested that members of CAGW develop standard and unified methods for collecting and reporting in these areas.

Available data from 26 reporting organizations regarding types of schools/educational settings shows, not surprisingly, that public schools are primary markets for organizations in most budget categories. An exception is the \$0-9,999 category where three reporting members serve greater numbers of students through community centers and other community-based organizations.

Table 5: Individual Students Served by School/Educational Setting Type

Note: First line notes the number of respondents providing school/educational setting data as compared with the number of organizations providing student information.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un-known	Total
# Providing Data	3 of 5	7 of 9	5 of 8	7 of 8	3 of 5	1 of 6	0 of 1	26 of 41
Public	350	16,615	15,953	14,834	92,135	21,144	-	161,031
Private/Parochial	10	415	341	2,952	9,282	12,500	-	25,500
Charter	15	3,412	650	736	23,065	1,596	-	29,474
Community Ctrs./ Community Orgs.	1,025	504	90	239	534	0	-	2,392

Twenty-nine (29) groups reported geographic distribution data. These organizations focus arts education services on students in the District of Columbia, Montgomery County and Prince Georges County, in that order. Student participation in Virginia lags behind and is concentrated in Fairfax County. The largest number of Virginia students are served by organizations in the \$500,000-999,999 budget category, even though these four (4) respondents are based in the District of Columbia. **Table 6** details available geographic distribution data.

Table 6: Individual Students Served by Geographic Location

Note: First line notes the number of respondents providing geographic data as compared with the number of organizations providing student information.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un-known	Total
# Providing Data	4 of 5	4 of 9	7 of 8	7 of 8	4 of 5	3 of 5	0 of 1	29 of 41
District of Columbia	351	1,502	5,585	5,955	42,909	9,101	-	65,403
Montgomery Co.	49	10	10,761	4,512	28,693	20,670	-	64,695
Prince Georges Co.	0	76	287	917	26,743	4,364	-	28,023
Fairfax Co.	0	3	100	110	16,520	3,791	-	20,524
Alexandria	1,000	3	0	190	5,213	2,012	-	8,418
Arlington Co.	0	0	100	604	3,718	2,622	-	7,044
Other*	60	127	0	5,828	815	601	-	7,431

*Includes Falls Church, Manassas, Manassas Park, Warrenton, Loudon County, Prince William County, Anne Arundel County, Calvert County, Charles County, St. Mary's County, Howard County, and unspecified Maryland and Virginia locations.

When reviewing grade level distribution in **Table 7** below, it is important to recognize that: 1) 99% of early childhood students were served by two organizations in the largest budget category, both with extensive pre-K programming; 2) 92% of students at the K-3 grade level were reached by three organizations (one \$100,000-299,999 group and two \$1 million+ groups); and, 3) 83% of 9-12 students were accounted for by two organizations in the \$500,000-999,999 category. In other words, a very different distribution pattern might be discerned if a larger number of organizations had responded with this data.

Table 7: Individual Students Served by Grade Level

Note: First line notes the number of respondents providing grade level data as compared with the number of organizations providing student information.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un-known	Total
# Providing Data	4 of 5	4 of 9	5 of 8	6 of 8	2 of 5	2 of 5	0 of 1	23 of 41
Early Childhood	100	28	0	6	0	21,800	-	21,934
K-3	445	42	10,215	1,790	245	22,640	-	35,377
4-5	365	826	3,046	1,765	347	9,000	-	15,349
6-8	320	638	1,363	6,161	7,632	2,050	-	18,164
9-12	170	325	236	6,205	10,712	750	-	18,398
12+	60	0	0	0	0	0	-	60

Given the information available, and setting aside early childhood for the moment, we see that the 23 reporting institutions target grades K-3 most heavily, followed by 9-12, 6-8, and 4-5 respectively. No clear pattern emerges regarding grade level targeting as related to budget size, except that few early childhood students are served by groups below the \$1 million level.

Thirty-six (36) organizations provided information on the types of programs they offer to students, offering a good description of the broad scope of arts education experiences that students in the greater Washington region receive from CAGW members. Programs were segmented by “during regular school hours” and “outside regular school hours.”

During school hours, the following programs were cited most frequently:

- **Performances/Exhibits at Organization or Other Community Sites – 75% of organizations provide this program**
 - Across budget categories, this type of service ranks at the top or near top in terms of organizational offerings
- **Demonstrations/Lectures at School Sites – offered by 64% of the groups**
 - In only one budget category -- \$10,000-99,999 – do less than 50% of respondents offer this program type
- **Artist Residencies (two or more days) in Schools – 56% of organizations note this kind of service**
 - Larger budget organizations (above \$300,000) indicate residency programs most frequently
- **Performances/Exhibits at School Sites – cited by 53% of respondents**
 - No clear pattern by budget size emerges from the data
- **In-Class Instruction at School Sites – offered by 50% of the groups**
 - Organizations with budgets in excess of \$100,000 provide this program most often

Outside of school hours, respondents noted these programs:

- **72% Performances/Exhibits at Organization or Other Community Site**
 - Again, organizations across budget categories rank this program at the top or near top of their offerings
- **67% Classes/Workshops at Organization or Other Community Sites –**
 - Another top ranked activity across budget categories
- **53% Classes/Workshops at School Sites – offered by of the institutions**
 - A more frequent program among groups with arts education budgets above \$300,000
- **50% Demonstrations/Lectures at Organization or Other Community Sites**
 - Again, more frequent among \$300,000+ budget organizations

Table 8 tabulates responses regarding student programs:

Table 8: Number/% of Organizations Offering Student Programs by Type

Notes: First line notes the number of respondents providing program type information as compared with the number of organizations providing student information. Percentages calculated against number of reporting organizations in each category. Totals may exceed 100% as multiple responses allowed.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Providing Data	4 of 5	8 of 9	7 of 8	6 of 8	5 of 5	5 of 5	1 of 1	36 of 41
During School Hrs:								
Perfs./Exhibits at School Sites	2 (50%)	2 (25%)	3 (43%)	5 (83%)	3 (60%)	3 (60%)	1 (100%)	19 (53%)
Demos/Lectures at School Sites	2 (50%)	2 (25%)	5 (71%)	4 (67%)	5 (100%)	4 (80%)	1 (100%)	23 (64%)
In-Class Instruction at School Sites	1 (25%)	2 (25%)	4 (57%)	4 (67%)	3 (60%)	3 (60%)	1 (100%)	18 (50%)
Artist Residencies in Schools	0 (0%)	3 (38%)	4 (57%)	4 (67%)	4 (80%)	4 (80%)	1 (100%)	20 (56%)
Perfs./Exhibits at Org./Other Sites	2 (50%)	7 (88%)	3 (43%)	6 (100%)	4 (80%)	4 (80%)	1 (100%)	27 (75%)
Demos/Lectures at Org./Other Sites	1 (25%)	2 (25%)	0 (0%)	4 (67%)	4 (80%)	4 (80%)	1 (100%)	16 (44%)
Classes/Workshops at Org./Other Sites	1 (25%)	1 (13%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	1 (100%)	6 (17%)
Outside School Hrs:								
Perfs./Exhibits at School Sites	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	2 (28%)	5 (83%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	1 (100%)	12 (33%)
Demos/Lectures at School Sites	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	3 (43%)	4 (67%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	1 (100%)	12 (33%)
Classes/Workshops in Schools	0 (0%)	2 (25%)	3 (43%)	6 (100%)	3 (60%)	4 (80%)	1 (100%)	19 (53%)
Perfs./Exhibits at Org./Other Sites	3 (60%)	3 (38%)	3 (43%)	6 (100%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	1 (100%)	26 (72%)
Demos/Lectures at Org./Other Sites	1 (25%)	3 (38%)	3 (43%)	4 (67%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	1 (100%)	18 (50%)
Classes/Workshops at Org./Other Sites	2 (50%)	4 (50%)	4 (57%)	5 (83%)	5 (100%)	4 (80%)	1 (100%)	24 (67%)

Organizations were also asked if they contracted with any districts or individual schools for the academic year or multi-years to provide student programs. Nineteen (45% of the total groups providing student program information) said “yes” and were further asked to indicate the number of schools and/or school districts with which they had such agreements. Of these 19 respondents, 14 (74%) have arts education budgets in excess of \$300,000. **Table 9** details this data by budget category:

Table 9: Organizations Contracting with School Districts/Schools for Student Programs on an Academic Year or Multi-Year Basis

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Respondents -YES	0	2	2	6	3	5	1	19
Total Indiv. Schools	-	4	3	74	45	7 *	0*	133
Total Districts	-	0	1	2	0	1*	0*	4

*Re Individual School contracts, only one of the five \$1million+ groups provided data and the one “unknown budget” company did not provide data; re District contracts, the same organizations did not provide data.

To describe the nature of student programs more finely, respondents were asked to define the content of services as follows (see **Appendix B** for full definitions):

- **Arts Experiences – Participants have the opportunity to observe performing arts, visual arts, media arts or humanities by artists, including community artists or teachers in the arts**

- **Arts Learning – Participants receive instruction by artists and arts teachers to increase their skill or knowledge of a particular art form**
- **Arts Integration – Participants engage in instruction with objectives in an art form and another content area taught by artists, arts teachers, curriculum specialists and/or classroom teachers to enhance learning in both the art form and other content areas**

As **Table 10** below illustrates, all content areas are addressed substantially. Arts Experiences leads the way, with 98% of organizations citing it as a content area and high percentages across all budget categories. Arts Learning is next, with 90% of groups offering this content. However, organizations with arts education budgets that exceed \$100,000 note this content area more often. Arts Integration lags considerably behind, addressed by 63% of the institutions. Here, groups in the \$300,000+ budget categories appear to deal with integration on a more frequent basis than smaller budget groups.

Table 10: Content of Arts Education Programs for Students
Note: Percentage calculated against number of respondents in each category. Totals exceed 100% as multiple responses allowed.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un-known	Total
# Respondents	5	9	8	8	5	5	1	41
Arts Experiences	4 (80%)	9 (100%)	8 (100%)	7 (88%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	1 (100%)	40 (98%)
Arts Learning	3 (60%)	7 (78%)	7 (88%)	8 (100%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	1 (100%)	37 (90%)
Arts Integration	3 (60%)	5 (56%)	3 (38%)	6 (75%)	4 (80%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	26 (63%)

Programs for Teachers

Of the 45 CAGW members with education programming, 19 (42%) provide professional development for pre-K-grade 12 teachers. Following are percentage rates for organizations with professional development programs by budget category:

- **\$0-9,999** **60% (3 of 5)**
- **\$10,000-99,999** **22% (2 of 9)**
- **\$100,000-299,999** **38% (3 of 8)**
- **\$300,000-499,000** **38% (3 of 8)**
- **\$500,000-999,999** **67% (4 of 6)**
- **\$ 1million+** **43% (3 of 7)**
- **Unknown** **50% (1 of 2)**

While these figures appear low, they may represent a reasonable estimate for the larger universe of CAGW members with education programming. However, the limited number of survey respondents does mean that the data should be viewed as partial, especially in terms of the actual number of teachers served and their distribution in the greater Washington region.

During the period of July 1, 2004-June 30, 2005, these 19 groups served a combined total of **8,309 individual teachers** from the greater Washington region. As with students, organizations were asked for individual teacher counts to measure reach as accurately as possible and, the sheer number of individual teachers reached could be considerably greater with a higher survey response rate.

The three groups with budgets of \$1million dollars or more account for 74% of teachers served, as **Table 11** shows.

Table 11: Individual Teacher Participation

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Providing Data	3	2	3	3	4	3	1	19
# of Indiv. Teachers	19	87	1,150	659	923	6,117	8	8,309

Again as with students, the survey asked respondents to estimate the average number of hours or days that each individual participated. Seventeen (17) of the 19 organizations shared this information, mostly in terms of hours. Converting days into hours in the same manner as previously (4 hours of instructional time), we can estimate a combined total of **81,775 teacher contact hours** for an **average of 9.8 hours of professional development per teacher**.

Looking at the data presented in **Table 12** below, we see that the \$1 million+ category accounts for 87% of these contact hour, with an average of 11.7 hours per teacher. The \$500,000-999,999 category averages 22.2 contact hours per teacher and one other group provides (\$0-9,999) provides 11.2 contact hours per teacher.

Table 12: Teacher Contact Hours

Note: First line notes the number of respondents providing teacher contact information as compared with the number of organizations providing teacher information.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Providing Data	3 of 3	2 of 2	2 of 3	3 of 3	4 of 4	3 of 3	0 of 1	17 of 19
Teacher Contact Hrs.	268	586	500	3,177	5,860	71,384	-	81,775
Av. Contact Hours	11.2	6.7	3.3	4.8	22.2	11.7	-	9.8

Although organizations appear to keep slightly better records concerning the distribution of teachers by school type and geographic location than they do for students, the data cannot provide a full and accurate picture in these areas. Thirteen (13) of the nineteen groups (68%) provided school type data; 15 of 19 (79%) supplied geographic information; but only 8 of 19 (42%) had available grade level data for the teachers they served. More tellingly, these information sources account for only a portion of the teachers served in 2004-05 by the 19 reporting groups.

- **53% of total teachers are accounted for in the grade level distribution data**
- **13% in the school distribution data**
- **12.5% in the geographic distribution data**

Using available data on school/educational setting types, reporting organizations most often provide professional development for public school teachers. Teachers from private/parochial schools come in second, followed closely by those served in or through community centers or other community organizations. Two points should be noted: 1) Respondents were instructed to count teachers in one category only, so that “a charter school teacher served through a community center should be counted in the ‘Community Center/Other Community Organization’ category,” inflating numbers in this grouping; 2)

Both the private/parochial schools and community centers trail far behind public schools – their combined total is only 18% of the number of public school teachers served. **Table 13** details school type distribution data.

Table 13: Individual Teachers Served by School/Educational Setting Type

Note: First line notes the number of respondents providing school/educational setting data as compared with the number of organizations providing teacher information.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Providing Data	2 of 3	1 of 2	2 of 3	3 of 3	3 of 4	1 of 3	1 of 1	13 of 19
Public	7	0	125	553	116	95	7	903
Private/Parochial	0	0	10	71	5	0	1	87
Charter	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	15
Community Ctrs./ Community Orgs.	0	22	0	28	30	0	0	80

Reviewing available geographic distribution data, we see in **Table 14** below that professional development programs are heavily concentrated among teachers in the District of Columbia, Montgomery County, and Fairfax County. Only two other locations, Arlington County and Prince Georges County, have more than 25 teachers involved in these programs.

Table 14: Individual Teachers Served by Geographic Location

Note: First line notes the number of respondents providing geographic data as compared with the number of organizations providing teacher information.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Providing Data	2 of 3	2 of 2	2 of 3	3 of 3	4 of 4	1 of 3	1 of 1	15 of 19
District of Columbia	6	35	83	241	99	47	0	511
Montgomery Co.	2	0	0	134	66	0	6	208
Fairfax Co.	0	0	0	138	7	0	2	147
Other*	1	18	77	66	13	0	0	175

*Includes Arlington County, Alexandria, Falls Church, Loudon County, Prince William County, Anne Arundel County, Calvert County, Howard County, Frostburg, and unspecified locations.

Looking at the grade level distribution data in **Table 15** below, we should note that all but ten (10) early childhood teachers are served by a single \$1 million + institution specializing in this area. Organizations above the \$100,000 budget level clearly reach the largest number of teachers, but, with the exception of early childhood, appear to target all grade level teachers more or less equally. Again, a very different pattern might be seen if a greater number of respondents were able to make this data available.

Table 15: Individual Teachers Served by Grade Levels Taught

Note: First line notes the number of respondents providing grade level data as compared with the number of organizations providing teacher information.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Providing Data	2 of 3	0 of 2	1 of 3	1 of 3	1 of 4	2 of 3	1 of 1	8 of 19
Early Childhood	0	0	0	0	0	3,910	0	3,910
K-3	3	0	0	32	16	162	3	216
4-5	0	0	40	14	9	20	3	86
6-8	2	0	10	5	31	8	0	56
9-12	2	0	0	0	83	17	1	103

Eighteen (18) of the 19 reporting organizations described the type of professional development programs they offer to teachers. Results across budget categories show a

preference for workshops/institutes for “any interested teachers” and in-service workshops/institutes for teachers involved in special projects or programs. Only large budget institutions have contracted for professional development programs with individual schools, school districts, or other educational jurisdictions. Asked to provide the number of these contractual relations, organizations specified nine (9) schools and two (2) school districts.

A mini-trend appears in relation to professional development for pre-service teachers. Six (6) groups, from all budget categories except one, train pre-service teachers in coordination with higher education institutions. Among area colleges and universities mentioned are Georgetown, Washington and Lee, Bowie State, the University of the District of Columbia, Morgan State, George Washington University, Catholic University, and American University.

Table 16: Number/% of Organizations Offering Professional Development Programs by Type

Notes: First line notes the number of respondents providing program type information as compared with the number of organizations providing teacher information. Percentages calculated against number of reporting organizations in each category. Totals may exceed 100% as multiple responses allowed.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Providing Data	3 of 3	2 of 2	3 of 3	3 of 3	4 of 4	3 of 3	0 of 1	18 of 19
PD for Any								
Interested Teachers	1 (33%)	1 (50%)	3 (100%)	2 (67%)	4 (100%)	3 (100%)	-	14 (78%)
In-Sv. PD for Teachers in Specific Projects	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	2 (67%)	4 (100%)	3 (100%)	-	14 (78%)
In-Sv PD Contracted by Schools/Districts/ Other Educational Jurisdictions.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	3 (100%)	-	6 (33%)
Pre-Sv. PD in Coordination with Higher Education Institutions	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	1 (25%)	2 (67%)	-	6 (33%)
Other*	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	-	2 (11%)

* Other includes an open house for teachers and a special scholarship program for high school teachers.

The survey asked respondents to define the content of their professional development programs in terms of Arts Experiences, Arts Learning, and Arts Integration. Results show Arts Learning as most often addressed across budget categories – 95% of the reporting organizations marked this area. Next is Arts Experiences, noted by 79% of the groups, followed closely by Arts Integration at a 74% incidence rate. Larger budget institutions (above \$100,000) display a greater tendency than smaller groups to deal with arts integration. The emphasis in professional development is somewhat different than what we saw in student programs. Here, organizations pay more attention to integration and arts learning – both prevalent issues in preparing teachers to use the arts in their classrooms.

Table 17: Content of Professional Development Programs for Teachers

Note: Percentage calculated against number of respondents in each category. Totals may exceed 100% as multiple responses allowed.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Respondents	3	2	3	3	4	3	1	19
Arts Experiences	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	2 (67%)	4 (100%)	3 (100%)	1 (100%)	15 (79%)
Arts Learning	3 (100%)	2 (100%)	3 (100%)	2 (67%)	4 (100%)	3 (100%)	1 (100%)	18 (95%)

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
Arts Integration	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	4 (100%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	14 (74%)

Programs for Artists

Twenty-two (22) of 45 arts organizations with education programs (49%) offer training programs designed to prepare artists for work in schools and other educational settings. As seen in **Table 18**, as budgets increase, organizations are generally more likely to provide artist training as well as reaching greater numbers of artists. In all, the 22 groups served **511 individual artists** during the period of July 1, 2004-June 30, 2005.

Table 18: Individual Artist Participation

Note: First line notes number of organizations providing artist program information compared with number of institutions with education programs.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Providing Data	2 of 5	3 of 9	4 of 8	5 of 8	5 of 6	3 of 7	0 of 2	22 of 45
# of Indiv. Artists	35	60	126	90	108	92	-	511

More than 80% of these organizations (18 of 22) were able to provide data on the average number of artist training hours or days. As “average hour” calculations dominated, we again converted days to hours. However, we used a higher hour figure (5 hours per day) as, in our observation, artist training days tend to last longer than teacher professional development days. We estimate that the 18 organizations offered a combined total of **9,052 artist contact hours** during the period for an **average of 18.7 hours of training per artist**. Groups in the \$100,000-299,999 record the highest average hours of artist training (**35 hours per artist**), followed by \$500,000-999,999 institutions at **19.9 hours per artist**.

Table 19: Artist Contact Hours

Note: First line notes the number of respondents providing artist contact information as compared with the number of organizations providing artist training information.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Providing Data	2 of 2	3 of 3	2 of 4	5 of 5	4 of 5	2 of 3	0 of 0	18 of 22
Artist Contact Hrs.	300	780	4,144	844	1,750	1,224	-	9,052
Av. Contact Hours	8.6	14.2	35	9.4	19.9	13.3	-	18.7

Organizations most frequently focus on training their own artists, although as budgets rise, there is a greater tendency to offer services to any interested artists. **Table 20** details this data.

Table 20: Types of Artists Served

Note: First line notes the number of respondents providing types of artist information as compared with the number of organizations providing artist training information. Percentages calculated against number of respondents in each category. Totals may exceed 100% as multiple responses allowed.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Providing Data	2 of 2	3 of 3	3 of 4	5 of 5	5 of 5	3 of 3	0 of 0	21 of 22
Organ. Artists	2 (100%)	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	3 (100%)	-	21 (100%)
Any Interested Artists	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	4 (80%)	2 (40%)	1 (33%)	-	8 (38%)

Further, when training organizational artists, the groups tend to serve continuing more often than new artists:

- **15 organizations (79%) train new artists**
- **All 21 train continuing artists**

Asked for information regarding their artist trainers, 19 groups indicate they use internal personnel while 11 employ personnel from outside the organization.

- **Most frequently used internal personnel are education staff, teaching artists, and master teaching artists**
 - **(79%) 15 of the 19 groups using their own teaching artists and master teaching artists have \$300,000+ budgets**
 - **Interestingly, however, at least one organization in every budget category has an arts education specialist on staff**
 - **Only one \$1 million+ organization has a curriculum specialist in another discipline on staff (part-time at least)**
- **Organizations most often employ two types of outside personnel – master teaching artists and arts education curriculum specialists**
 - **All 5 groups that use outside master teaching artists are in the two highest budget categories**
 - **At least one institution in each of the following budget categories employs an external arts education curriculum specialist: \$10,000-99,999; \$100,000-299,999; \$300,000-\$499,000; \$500,000-999,999; and \$1 million+**
 - **One \$1 million+ group employs an outside curriculum specialist in another discipline**

As with student and teacher programs, the survey asked respondents to characterize the content of their artist training as Arts Experiences, Arts Learning, and Arts Integration. Most organizations address arts learning and arts integration, but only half deal with arts experiences. This is not surprising in light of the fact that training of artists generally does not focus upon exposure to art forms. It is notable that organizations above the \$500,000 budget level address arts integration at higher rates than smaller budget groups.

Table 21: Content of Artist Training

Note: Percentage calculated against number of respondents in each category. Totals may exceed 100% as multiple responses allowed.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Respondents	2	3	4	5	5	3	0	22
Arts Experiences	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	1 (25%)	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	2 (67%)	-	11 (50%)
Arts Learning	1 (50%)	2 (67%)	3 (75%)	4 (80%)	5 (100%)	3 (100%)	-	18 (82%)
Arts Integration	1 (50%)	2 (67%)	2 (50%)	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	2 (67%)	-	17 (77%)

Parental Involvement Programs

Somewhat surprisingly, 14 organizations (31% of total institutions offering arts education programming) provide programs to foster parental involvement. This phenomenon appears in every budget category, although five (5) of the organizations are in the \$300,000-499,999 group. In total, **32,474 individual parents** participate. Two (2) \$1

million+ groups account for 93% of this total. No attempt was made to obtain data on parent contact hours or days.

It should be noted that most of the respondents serving parents are organizations that offer classes and performance opportunities for students over substantial time durations each year, such as children’s choruses and community arts schools or conservatories. This explains the kinds of involvement parents tend to have, as detailed after the presentation of participation in **Table 22**.

Table 22: Individual Parent Participation

Note: First line notes number of organizations providing parental involvement information compared with number of institutions with education programs.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Providing Data	1 of 5	2 of 9	1 of 8	5 of 8	2 of 6	2 of 7	1 of 2	14 of 45
# of Indiv. Parents	700	35	10	1,610	64	30,045	10	32,474

Asked to self-describe parent involvement programs, groups offered this information:

- **Chaperones on field trips, family participation in art classes, volunteer coordination of activities**
- **Attendance at rehearsals and performances, backstage help**
- **Chaperones**
- **Chaperones, concert volunteers**
- **Volunteers at rehearsals and concerts**
- **Attend demonstrations/lectures, performances and exhibits**
- **Coordinate annual gala**
- **Attend performances**
- **Audiences**
- **Attend adult music classes**
- **Attend classes with children**
- **Parent/child workshops, assist with artist residencies in schools**

Content leans heavily towards Arts Experiences, followed at a distance by Arts Learning and Arts Integration.

Table 23: Content of Parent Involvement Programs

Note: Percentage calculated against number of respondents in each category. Totals may exceed 100% as multiple responses allowed.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un- known	Total
# Respondents	1	2	1	5	2	2	1	14
Arts Experiences	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	10 (71%)
Arts Learning	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	0	6 (43%)
Arts Integration	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0	4 (29%)

Partnerships

Organizations were asked if they partnered with any other CAGW members in providing arts education programs. Twenty-seven (27) responded “yes” – 60% of 45 organizations – indicating a fairly high incidence of partnering across budget categories as follows.

- (40%) 2 of 5 \$0-9,999 groups
- (67%) 6 of 9 \$10,000-99,999 groups
- (63%) 5 of 8 \$100,000-299,999 groups
- (38%) 3 of 8 \$300,000-499,999 groups
- (100%) 6 of 6 \$500,000-999,999 groups
- (71%) 5 of 7 \$1 million+ groups

In all, these organizations coordinate programming with 133 partners. The 27 groups have the following types of partnership programs.

Table 24: Types of Partnership Programs

Note: Percentage calculated against number of respondents in each category. Totals may exceed 100% as multiple responses allowed.

	\$0 - 9,999	\$10,000 - 99,999	\$100,000- 299,999	\$300,000 499,999	\$500,000 999,999	\$1 million+	Un-known	Total
# Respondents	2	6	5	3	6	5	0	27
Student Programs	2 (100%)	2 (33%)	5 (100%)	3 (100%)	6 (100%)	3 (60%)	-	21 (78%)
Professional Devel.	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	1 (33%)	4 (67%)	1 (20%)	-	8 (30%)
Artist Training	1 (50%)	2 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	4 (67%)	2 (40%)	-	11 (41%)
Parent Involvement	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	-	3 (11%)

Conclusions and Recommendations

Despite the issues of accuracy discussed in this report, the survey produced a decent baseline of data for describing the nature, scope and impact of arts education programming by CAGW members. The respondents that provide educational programs:

- **Serve an estimated 212,480 individual students in the greater Washington region**
 - Provide an average of 8.5 hours of contact per student
 - Offer a broad range of educational programming to students
 - Focusing on performances/exhibits at their own venues demonstrations/lectures both at school sites and their own venues, artist residencies, performances/exhibits at school sites and their own venues, in-class instruction, and classes/workshops in their own venues
 - Provide a variety of content to students – arts experiences, arts learning, and arts integration
- **Serve an estimated 8,309 individual teachers with professional development programs**
 - With an average 9.8 contact hours per teacher
 - With a predominance of in-service professional development for teachers involved in specific programs or projects
 - Six groups have services for pre-service teachers in coordination with higher education institutions – something of a mini-trend
 - Training content leans toward arts learning, but arts experiences and arts integration receive substantial attention
- **Provide artists with training to prepare them for work in schools and other educational settings**

- **22 groups have such programs, primarily targeting their own teaching artists**
- **The average number of contact hours per artists is 18.7**
- **Training emphasizes arts learning and arts integration**
- **Sponsor a sizable number of parent involvement programs**
 - **14 organizations, mostly those offering classes and performance opportunities for children, serve an estimated total of 32,474 parents**
 - **Concentration is on arts experience content**
- **Partner with other CAGW members – 27 groups coordinate programs with a combined total of 133 other institutions**
 - **Most partnerships address student programs**

To increase the accuracy of data in future surveys, we suggest that CAGW and its membership:

- **Encourage a higher overall response rate so that figures do not under represent or over represent numbers served**
- **Jointly develop a unified system for tracking individuals served, especially students, and the average number of contact hours or days (one or the other)**
 - **If days are used, agree upon what constitutes a “day” in terms of number of hours**
 - **Additionally, adopt a unified system for tracking school type, geographic, and grade level distribution for students and teachers**
 - **Possibly develop and employ a simple database format to facilitate record keeping in all of these areas**
- **To understand the percentage of individual served against student and teacher universes in the Washington metropolitan region, obtain enrollment and employment data from public school jurisdictions, private and parochial schools (diocese in the latter case), charter schools, and early childhood programs**

APPENDIX A

Responding Organizations with Arts Education Programs

Adventure Theater
Alexandria Commission for the Arts
American Youth Philharmonic Orchestras
Arena Stage
Arts and Humanities Council of Montgomery County
Bowen McCauley Dance
Cathedral Choral Society
Children's Chorus of Washington
Class Acts Arts, Inc.
Clarice Smith Performing Arts Center
Congressional Chorus
Coral Cantigas
Dance Institute of Washington
Dance Place
DC Commission on the Arts and Humanities
Folger Shakespeare Library
Ford's Theatre
Imagination Stage
KanKouran West African Dance Company
Levine School of Music
Life Pieces to Masterpieces
Master Chorale of Washington
Montpelier Arts Center
National Conservatory of Dramatic Arts
National Foundation for National Archives
National Philharmonic
Olney Theatre Center for the Arts
Opera Theatre of Northern Virginia
Shakespeare Theatre Company
Step Afrika!
The Arts League
The Choral Arts Society of Washington
The Helen Hayes Awards
The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts
The Patricia M. Sitar Center for the Arts
The Phillips Collection
The Textile Museum
Washington Improvisational Theater
Washington National Opera
Washington Performing Arts Society
Washington Printmakers Gallery
Washington Youth Choir
Wolf Trap Foundation for the Performing Arts
Woolly Mammoth Theatre Company
World Arts Focus

APPENDIX B

Definitions of Arts Education Delivery Models

Arts Experiences:

Participating students and/or teachers have an opportunity to observe performing arts, visual arts, media arts or humanities by artists, including community artists or teachers in the arts.

Examples:

- After school/extracurricular/in the community: Students and/or teachers – or students and their parents – attend a performance or visit a museum/gallery.
- In school: A performance/exhibit provided at a school by an artist that serves as an introduction to or reinforcement of a particular art form.

Arts Learning:

Students, teachers and/or artists receive instruction by artists and arts teachers to increase their skill in or knowledge of an art form.

Examples:

- In school: Student is enrolled in music, theatre, visual arts, dance, media arts, and/or humanities class(es) as part of their curriculum.
- After school/extracurricular/in the community: Student, teachers and/or artists participate in individual lessons or group instruction taught by artists or arts teachers in the performing arts, visual arts, media arts and/or humanities.

Arts Integration:

Students, teachers and/or artists participate in instruction with objectives in an art form and another content area taught by artists, arts teachers, curriculum specialists and/or classroom teachers to enhance learning in both the art form and the other content area.

Example:

- In school: A teaching artist or teacher develops a five lesson unit of study integrating English/Language Arts and Dance. During the unit, students will learn about the elements of Dance (body, energy, space and time), and explore English/Language Arts concepts (nouns, verbs, adjectives) and create a dance using the elements to express the English/Language Arts concepts. The student-created dance (performance assessment task) combined with an oral reflection will demonstrate understandings in both areas.
- After school/extracurricular/in the community: Teaching artists conduct a half-day workshop for classroom teachers on the development of a five lesson unity of study integrating English/Language Arts and Dance.

Cultural Alliance of Greater Washington Arts Education Committee Members

Co-chairs: Cultural Board Member, Terre Jones, President & CEO
Wolf Trap Foundation for the Performing Arts

Dawn McAndrews, President, DC Arts and Humanities Collaborative
Director of Education, Shakespeare Theatre Company

Staff Liaison

Jennifer Cover Payne, Executive Director
Cultural Alliance of Greater Washington

Committee Members:

Darrell Ayers, Vice President Education—Kennedy Center; Rex Bickmore, Executive Director—Musical Theatre Center; Rhonda Buckley, Executive Director—Sitar Center; Mimi Flaherty, Senior Director Education—Wolf Trap Foundation for the Performing Arts, David Markey—Director of Education, Imagination Stage; Varissa McMickens—Wolf Trap Foundation for the Performing Arts, Linda Miller—George Mason University; Ron Stowe, President, Institute for Education in the Arts