



Fine Arts Standards Adoption Team

Meeting Notes

Date: Tuesday, Feb. 21, 2017

Time: 9 a.m. to 3 p.m.

Location: Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, Iowa

MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Gretta Berghammer, University of Northern Iowa
- Dan Black, Red Oak Community School District
- Andrea Christians, Pocahontas Area Community School District
- Ellen Craig, Davenport Community School District
- Michelle Droe, Cedar Falls Community School District
- Mike Fisher, Waterloo Community School District
- Leon Kuehner, Iowa Alliance for Arts Education
- Maggie Parks, Marshalltown Community School District
- Anne Pisarik, Washington Community School District
- Kevin Price-Brenner, Dubuque Community School District
- Scott Slechta, Fairfield Community School District
- Nate Sletten, Earlham Community School District
- Ronda Sternhagen, Grundy Center Community School District
- Pat Toben, Sioux City Community School District
- Colleen Tomlinson, Rivermont Collegiate
- Kris VerSteegt, Ankeny Community School District
- Matt Walker, Xavier High School
- Valerie Williams, Co'Motion Dance Theater
- Jill Wilson, Luther College
- Yvette Zarod-Hermann, Art Force Iowa

Team members who were absent: Joel Pedersen from the Cardinal Community School District; and Helen Duranleau-Brennan from the Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency.

Also in attendance were Angela Matsuoka, fine arts consultant for the Iowa Department of Education; Anne Mishkind, a consultant with Midwest Comprehensive Center; Rita Martens, administrative consultant for the Department of Education's Bureau of Standards and Curriculum; Erika Cook, bureau chief for Standards and Literacy; Melissa Walker, writer for the adoption team; and Joanne Tubbs with the Iowa Board of Educational Examiners.

Agenda item: Introductions/Overview

Angela Matsuoka, the department's fine arts consultant, gave a brief introduction and introduced the adoption team's co-chairwomen: Ronda Sternhagen, a teacher of fifth-through 12th-grade visual arts in Grundy Center; and Jill Wilson, a music education teacher and director of the women's chorus at Luther College.

Team members were asked to place a dot on a chart to indicate how familiar they were to the National Core Arts Standards and whether they were clear on the Fine Arts Standards Adoption Team's task. The majority indicated they were between "so-so" and "very much" familiar with NCAS. Members then introduced themselves to the group.

Iowa Department of Education Director Ryan Wise introduced himself and welcomed the group. He said adoption of separate standards for fine arts were more than 10 years in the making. He explained one of his first leadership roles in education was to write standards for U.S. and world history while he was a teacher working in Omaha, Neb. He thanked the team members for their work, which he said was important to elevating the arts to a higher level and to establishing clear and consistent guidelines and approaches for the subjects that fall under the arts.

Ronda led the team in an ice breaker in which everyone did a "blind" drawing of an image she described to them. Team members then shared their drawings with others.

Establishing norms

The team then set norms they believed would help keep their work focused and represent their expectations:

- No sidebars
- All share, all care
- Be respectful of time
- Practice self-care – get a drink, stand up, use the restroom when needed
- Limit personal use of electronics; use technology for learning
- Focus on the task at hand; stay in the game
- Recognize and suspend assumptions
- Identify items that need to be kept confidential at each meeting
- Disagreements stay in the room once consensus is decided so the overall work of the team is not degraded

Determining a quorum

The team decided that small groups would need to come to a consensus before their ideas or suggestions are shared with the larger group. The group decided that a final vote should be received from every committee member if possible, even those who might be absent, and that a recommendation needs to receive three-fourths approval before it goes forward as an official recommendation. The team also decided that even

if an individual(s) disagree, he or she needs to commit to supporting the team's final decision.

Parking lot

There was a "parking lot" posted outside of the room for questions, comments, concerns, etc. that were outside the scope of the items being discussed. The parking lot was divided into four categories: what is going well, what can they improve, what are questions, and what are issues and ideas? The only comment at the end of the day was whether they could tweet from the meet and if there was a designated hashtag.

Agenda item: Beginning with the end in mind

Notes: Team members divided into four groups to discuss these questions:

- 1) Why do you think standards are important/what do they contribute?
- 2) What would characteristics of excellent standards be?

These are the group responses:

1. Why do you think standards are important/what do they contribute?
 - Create focus, yet allow for individualization
 - Blueprint for learning
 - Drive improvement of curriculum
 - Push authentic meaning/making
 - Drive improvement of teaching
 - Teachers should agree what excellence looks/sounds like
 - Provide a context for evaluation
 - Are a bar by which to measure/establish expectations for student learning
 - Advocate why the arts are important
 - Provide a scaffold for comprehensive sequential instruction
 - Create a scope/sequence
 - An important foundation and a starting place for many ranging from first year teachers to new teachers to the state to veteran teachers
 - A logical progression of student learning and achievement
 - A collaboration of many minds that is more encompassing than just one teacher
 - Integrate learning into lesson (embedded)
 - Give a framework for what is important/outline a structure for student learning/instructional plans
2. What would characteristics of excellent standards be?
 - Measureable, yet allow for customization/individualization
 - Ways that connect students to their communities and support diverse learners
 - Support deeper thinking

- Support teachers in art-making processes, especially contemporary current techniques, as well as the product
- An emphasis on process over product
- Writing is somewhat “timeless”
- Concise and clear
- Cover reading, listening, speaking, performing and composing
- Have value
- Attainable/challenging
- Achievable
- Written in a horizontal/vertical structure that evolves for a population and throughout PK-12
- Finite enough to inform instruction but allow for responsiveness
- Have both depth and breadth
- Easy for students, teachers and community to understand
- Usable by non-fine arts teachers
- Engaging, enlightening and exciting
- Support growing and learning; doesn’t limit creativity
- Include 21st Century skills of communication and collaboration, creativity and critical thinking
- Written with an “I can” mentality
- Rigorous yet attainable and accessible
- Age appropriate
- Varied levels
- Can be implemented
- Helpful to all

Anne Mishkind shared information with the team about a Google document she has created that explains the criteria for writing standards to help aid them in the adoption process. All of the working documents for the team will be located in files on the Fine Arts Standards Adoption Website.

Angela said she and Anne would collect all of the team’s ideas about the standards from their group discussions and create a vision statement for approval at the March meeting.

Agenda item: Structure and development background of NCAS

Angela introduced the team to the history of the National Core Arts Standards, which are the set of standards the team will review and consider for adoption.

The most recent set of NCAS were introduced in 2014. Prior to this, all areas under fine arts had their own set of standards, which had been developed in 1994. Iowa is the last

state to consider adoption of the 2014 standards. The reason for the 2014 update was to bring cohesion across all fine arts disciplines.

NCAS centers around four artistic processes. Within each is an emphasis on artistic literacy and artistic thinking. It's less about the end product and more about the artistic process – the behaviors and thinking that go into making the end product.

The four processes are:

1. Creating
2. Presenting/performing/producing
3. Responding
4. Connecting

The team watched a brief video produced by the National Art Education Association that showed the differences between the 1994 and 2014 standards.

Agenda item: Anchor standards

There are 11 anchor standards within NCAS that are then broken down by discipline and grade-specific performance standards.

The team divided into two teams of 11 to create definitions for the four artistic processes and then categorized the 11 anchor standards into the four processes where they thought they best fit.

Here are their definitions:

1. Creating: to synthesize, ideate, plan, make, generate, imagine, express, conceptualize, invent; something that is unique and original; use what you know to make something new; authentic; individualized and personalized; uses formal and informal methodology.
2. Presenting/performing/producing: to share or show what one has created, complete, communicate, polish, refine, finalize, bring to a close, display; to build confidence and take risks; something that is open to interpretation; refinement; the spirit of intent.
3. Responding: to reflect, analyze, interpret, react, critique, evaluate, internalize, alter, revise, connect and participate; to have empathy; to use self-peer assessment and evaluation; to qualify and validate artistic responses; to advocate for artistic expression.
4. Connecting: to communicate, apply, transfer, internalize, relate, recognize, integrate, share, synthesize, notice, be conscious of diversifying, cross-cultural connecting and discipline, differentiating; to use historical and cultural context; to find meaning; to teach life throughout and identify universals; to be human.

Here are the 11 anchor standards and which artistic process the team believed they fall under. There was

1. Relate artistic ideas and works with societal, cultural and historical context to deepen understanding – Connecting
2. Perceive and analyze artistic works – Responding
3. Apply criteria to evaluate artistic work – Responding
4. Interpret intent and meaning in artistic work – Responding/Connecting
5. Synthesize and relate knowledge and personal experiences to make art – Responding
6. Convey meaning through the presentation of artistic work – Performing/presenting/producing
7. Analyze, interpret and select artistic work for presentation – Performing/presenting/producing
8. Refine and complete artistic work – Performing/presenting/producing
9. Organize and develop artistic ideas and work – Creating
10. Generate and conceptualize artistic ideas and work – Creating
11. Develop and refine artistic work for presentation – Creating

There was one standard in which the two groups differed on where it should go: Interpret intent and meaning in artistic work. In the end, the group came to the consensus that it fit under the responding process.

The team was then tasked with looking at the NCAS website and analyzing whether members agreed with how NCAS is organized, the definitions placed on the four processes and the placement of the 11 anchor standards. The group used the “fist to five” approach to reach consensus on each of the areas, with all group members either selecting a four or five in favor of consensus.

Agenda item: Task groups breakout

Team members were divided into seven task groups according to their professional and fine arts experience in order to more closely examine strand content within NCAS and note any concerns about the developmental appropriateness of the standards, as well as any questions or concerns they had about the overall structure of NCAS.

Task groups assignments were as follows:

- Visual Art and Media Arts: Ellen Craig, Maggie Parks, Anne Pisarik, Ronda Sternhagen and Colleen Tomlinson
- Theater: Gretta Berghammer and Scott Slechta
- General Music: Pat Toben, Kris VerSteegt and Michelle Droe
- Dance: Yvette Zarod-Hermann and Valerie Williams
- Instrumental Music: Leon Kuehner, Kevin Price-Brenner, Nate Sletten and Dan Black

- Vocal Music: Jill Wilson, Matt Walker, Andrea Christians and Mike Fisher

The two music groups also were tasked with looking at the “Traditional and Emerging Ensembles” and “Music Technology” sections.

After the task groups met, they each gave a report to the team.

The groups’ initial discussion was concern for schools that have one teacher in each of the strand areas and how that person would receive support and how he or she would discuss the standards with another team member.

Individual strand concerns and discussion were as follows:

Dance: In Iowa, there are no dance certifications/endorsements, so many times it falls upon the physical education or elementary music teachers to teach dance. The task group questioned how professional development would be structured.

- Who will be implementing these?
- Reword some of the enduring understandings
- Need a companion document that would provide guidance
- Need a clickable glossary within the document with examples

General music:

- Need a document per grade level, but also keep vertical document
- Inconsistencies within headings

Instrumental music:

- Need a glossary
- Needs to be a few tweaks
- A companion document could explain what it looks like in the classroom
- Professional development needs to be addressed
- Like three levels at high school level

Drama:

- Who will be implementing these?
- Need a glossary
- Blooms – application/comprehension
- High school analysis

Vocal music:

- Keep it clear and concise
- Not all equally weighed
- A5.5 – musical concepts need to be added

- Theory composition – higher education
- What skills should I (the student) be working on? Friendly language/streamline

Visual arts and media arts:

- Media arts vs. visual arts
- Licensure concerns
- Streamline
- Some things could be addressed in a companion document
- Professional development needs to be addressed
- Needs to be more accessible to the single teacher in the kindergarten through 12th-grade district who doesn't know where to start

Wrap-up

Anne said as the group moved forward it would need to consider if adopted, how the standards would be implemented and how they would like to see students succeed in the standards. These suggestions could be incorporated into a guidance document that is presented to Area Education Agencies if the standards are adopted.

Rita Martens, the department's administrative consultant for the Bureau of Standards and Curriculum, said the hope is that the standards are a document that is two-fold: both something districts can use right away and one that provides fodder for future thinking. Some schools might not currently have the programs listed in the standards, but that doesn't mean that Iowa education leaders couldn't approve a charter school with a dance program or a current school could develop a dance program in the future. The standards shouldn't be limited by what is only possible today. They need to represent what are the greatest possibilities for students in the areas of fine arts. The intent is that the standards are voluntary for school districts.

Ronda informed the team that there would be a public input process that will include a survey and will involve members of the community, other educators and parents in the months to come. Details about this will be presented at a future meeting.

Angela walked the group through homework they will have to prepare for the next meeting. The team has been asked to research what other states have done in adoption of the NCAS and their strategies in doing so. Specifically, team members will examine the states of Illinois, Oregon and Utah. Task group teams will meet via a zoom meeting to discuss these states' work, and each group will present its viewpoints at the March meeting.

Angela also summarized the team's work and explained their position is to determine whether the national fine arts standards should be adopted in Iowa. If the team decides to proceed with adoption, they will draft a report of their recommendations that will be presented to the State Board of Education for review and consideration.