There is an underlying understanding in our Faculty that the educational process is a fluid one in which the emotional, the intellectual, the existential, and the aesthetic experience of life, converge. The enactment of an engaging dialogue serves as a medium in that process. However, we are aware that in spite of inspiring educational aims, schools, preoccupied with measurable outcomes, quite often place the cultivation of the artistic and the aesthetic in an inert and rigid space.

It is important to situate our students in the cultural space of the artist in the same way that history educators try to inspire the children to think like historians do. The point here is that artists, as members of social communities, reposition themselves as part of a cultural dialogue with other art forms and expressions and with the social and political environment, which is filtered by their experiences. Cézanne’s art, for example, needs to be understood, to an important extent, as an incarnation of his critique of the Impressionists after his initial involvement with the movement. He opened the doors of artistic expression to the scientific developments of the time and to modernism by proposing an alternative notion of space and by opening an avenue to rethink the representation of what we perceive. It is common-place to say that there are no permanent criteria for artistic production or for defining what is aesthetic which, following Dewey, refers to perception and enjoyment. We do not talk nowadays of masterpieces, but of a successful proposal or of a strong piece which expresses something that we construe. From the late nineteenth century and, in particular, the early twentieth century there was a strong movement away from the absolute; the futuristic approach drastically questioned the certainty surrounding a legitimized piece. The questioning went further along the road paved by the complexities of the past century and the constant struggle for forms of democratization. The spectators’ role changed and uncertainty took a central place in the construction of meaning.

Doubt and anxiety are central to the aesthetic experience. They are represented in our language when we ask ourselves is this art? Is this for real? Is this poetry? Why is the drawing of a moustache on the Mona Lisa a work of art? Why? We are shaken by the paradoxical. In other words, we react to the assertion of the absurd, displacements of meaning, and a preoccupation with what is marginal. Sometimes the aesthetic of the...
minimum, of the not visible, surprises us in exhibitions. In this aesthetic approach, the spectator, the reader, and the audience are all moved to the centre. Sometimes as I have experienced, the interaction is enriched by the three-dimensionality of the experience. Perhaps, the most dramatic change came with poetry. My generation started reading Neruda very early in elementary school. He talked beautifully of our America and our people. Then we knew of Serrat, of Violeta Parra, of Cohen, of Dylan, we knew of the poetry that could be played and sung and even danced to. And yes it is poetry. Poetry became a people’s phenomenon and not just a merely graphic artifact.

The widespread and intense intellectual, artistic, and political changes necessarily lead to a repositioning and to an experimental renewal of Art Education. One may argue that it started to take shape here and there in the 1990s and that our work in the Faculty of Education at Queen’s is an expression of that renewal. However, I will conclude in line with Martin Schiralli’s work (2002) that in the midst of the uncertainty permeating arts education in terms of what is worth studying and what is deemed worthy it is important to resist “the rush to toss out fine art and the aesthetic with the bath water of postmodern critique (p.62).” In other words, I am urging you not to neglect the relevance of the dialogue between the artist, in our case the pupil, with other artists and their times. Our experience of life happens in time and space and our existence itself is profoundly historical in little and big ways. Perhaps, we need to realize that we are not as original as we think we are.

REFERENCE
In the best sense of the phrase, “educating young people” implies a continuous growth, a maturing of an individual, during which we educators are entrusted with two very specific tasks: to prepare the students for the pragmatic world beyond the classroom, and to enrich their lives with experiences that promote their completeness as human beings.

How to accomplish this is itself a matter of continually evolving ideology. It is, in fact, a matter of relevance. We, at Lincoln Center Institute for the Arts in Education (LCI), have chosen the path of imagination, creativity, and innovation to pursue the above-mentioned tasks.

It is now commonly agreed that what is perceived as basic learning—reading and mathematics skills—is no longer enough to prepare young people for today’s economic environment. For all its undeniable importance, it does not on its own equip students for productive positions in the workforce: something more is needed.

The Arts Education Partnership, a coalition of education, business, and government organizations in the U.S., committed to the promotion of arts in learning, reports that “the public is increasingly demanding that schools go beyond the current focus on basic competence in reading and mathematics to teach the skills identified in national reports on the economy.” In other words, look at the marketplace. And the marketplace’s top priority, the same report informs us, is innovation.

These findings make it clear that society needs creative and imaginative people, including inventors, educators, and entrepreneurs, not just in a few privileged jobs, but in the jobs across the economic spectrum. Imagination, creativity, and... continues on page 4
innovation must be seen as essential aspects of the architecture of society, and therefore education of young people.

Can such an abstract thing as the imagination be taught? We are convinced that it can. The word “imagination,” historically, implies something intangible; as Kieran Egan puts it, “we have a sense of vagueness about such concepts.” But ever since Hume and Kant revolutionized psychology and philosophy in the seventeen hundreds, the imagination has evolved into an ability of much greater importance than—as was one of its original definitions—the ability to visualize specific objects or produce entertainment: it is a meaning-making ability, which enables one to think of diverse, unlimited possibilities, such as a world without war. Our intention is to make “imagine” a word as clear and concrete as “write” or “analyze.”

The expansion of LCI’s educational focus to encompass imagination, creativity, and innovation, is a logical conclusion of thirty-plus years of research and evolving practice. Convinced of the value of imagination in our learning and teaching methodology, and of its “teachability”, we have focused our efforts on the implementation of imagination in classrooms.

The nurture of imagination is best achieved by utilizing education through the arts, a method that Lincoln Center Institute pioneered as “aesthetic education.” However, it is important to understand that the Institute eschews the notion that the imagination serves exclusively, or even only primarily, the arts. While engagements with the arts are the essence of aesthetic education—and the most apt exemplar of imagination in action—LCI’s method can be used for the study of any subject in the curriculum.

“Every great advance in science has issued from a new audacity of the imagination.”
John Dewey

Lincoln Center Institute is honoured to be working with Queen’s University Faculty of Education for a second year through the Lincoln Center Institute International Educator Workshop, a professional development opportunity for educators and artists.

The 2008 International Educator Workshop will be held at Queen’s University Faculty of Education July 7–11. For more information go to www.lcinstitute.org or contact Cathryn Williams, Director of Strategic Alliances at cwilliams@lincolncenter.org
Integrating the arts throughout a curriculum and shaping imagination into a skill is an academically rich, rigorous, and multifaceted endeavour, applied by highly-trained teaching artists and educators and involving inquiry-based study and research. Before a performance or museum visit, students examine a specific art form from a number of perspectives, as well as through art-making of their own. They explore choices similar to those of the artist during the creative process, and seek connections between “the artwork’s story” and their own lives. This process results in a number of student outcomes, which the Institute has formulated as the Capacities for Imaginative Learning. The Capacities are: noticing deeply, embodying, questioning, identifying patterns, making connections, exhibiting empathy, creating meaning, taking action, and reflecting/assessing. The Capacities foster imaginative thinking as a habit of mind that is encouraged in the approach to other subjects, such as language arts, math, science, or social studies.

Imagination helps us to not only grasp what we perceive, but to transform it, which is a creative action. Creativity—the act of producing through imaginative skill, according to Merriam-Webster—gave birth to the wheel, Canterbury Cathedral, Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony, the compass, the airplane, and the Constitution.

“Every great advance in science has issued from a new audacity of the imagination,” wrote John Dewey. We have no trouble defining what imagination “has done.” The challenging question today, in the demanding world of factoids, is “how do we make it do the same thing for our modern needs.” Not for the first time in human history, the answers must come from us, the educators. Let us begin by insisting on the centrality of arts to all learning, and let us take the lead in welcoming the pursuit of imagination back to our schools.

Led by an LCI teaching artist, students approach imaginative learning through movement.
Although it was once believed that most animal behavior, “from the food they ate to the places they slept, was based on instinct” Michael Noonan, a marine biologist studying communication sound patterns of Killer Whales at Niagara Falls Marineland recently made a fascinating discovery. “He observed an Orca luring seagulls into its tank by spitting fish onto the water’s surface. The mammal then sank below the water, waited for a gull to grab the bait and when it did, lunged at it with open jaws. Within a couple months, Noonan observed that the whale’s younger brother adopted the gull-catching behavior. Their mother soon followed suit and eventually the behavior spread through Marineland’s entire Killer Whale population.” (Browka, 2005, p.14) For these whales, an unusual creative extension of instinctive feeding behaviors had enlarged their menu possibilities and increased their survival potential.

While animal populations typically maintain traditional habits, humans have come to dominate the earth as they constantly improve their future with better ideas, more possibilities, and a willingness to experiment and adapt to positive change. Over time, communities that pass on traits that endow their posterity with greater survivorship thrive while those that are locked in the status quo seem to make little progress (Dissanayake, 1995). Groups and individuals who allow creative space for exploration must be willing to give up some of their limited time that might be used more productively to secure resources by using methods that have already proved somewhat successful. The problem with creative endeavors is that they might seem to waste time and resources when they find no new productive strategies. In schools many teachers find themselves struggling with this very dilemma, little time and too many important discipline-specific skills and content to be studied. Notwithstanding the dilemma, it is a necessary struggle as education is meant to take us into a future that we cannot currently grasp. Children starting school this year will be retiring in 2068. At the current rate of change I am convinced that we do not really know what the world will look like in five years time, let alone in 65 years, yet our schools are meant to be educating our youth for that future (Robinson, 2005).

As the traditional and linear concept of “IQ” is being replaced with the idea that intelligence consists of a complex set of human capacities, we have come to understand that intelligence is dynamic. We think in all the important ways we experience life. In his latest book, Harvard psychologist Howard Gardner (2007) argues that in order for us to successfully meet the economic, social, and global challenges in our Third
Millennium we must work through our varied set of intelligences with a balanced understanding of several distinct mindsets including, possibly most importantly, the “creative mind.”

The creative mind is a description of what Dewey (1938) calls flexible purposing, which “pertains to the improvisational side of intelligence as it is employed in the arts.” This intelligence “is the ability to shift direction, even to redefine one’s aims when better options emerge in the course of one’s work” (Eisner, 2002a, p.77).

Despite the fact that the creative mindset might be integrated into any school subject area, it is within the arts that the creative mind might best be explored and practiced successfully. Of all the minds that one might bring to bear on future challenges and possibilities, the creative mind offers students the capacity to move forward in a fast-moving, uncertain environment. The creative mind is the ability to go beyond existing knowledge, understanding, and intellectual boundaries by posing new questions and strategies with novel, productive solutions (Gardner, 2007).

It could be argued that at the top end of every discipline, the work of scholars is very creative. We have numerous examples of creative physicists, mathematicians, historians, etc., exploring new ways of thinking productively about their disciplines. A major challenge in schools is that students typically require the mastery of specific subject-based skills before they

...continues on page 8
can be free to engage ideas creatively within a discipline. These skill-sets are not typically mastered while in elementary or secondary school and as a result, time allocated to each discipline is occupied with the acquisition of the basics in a content-burdened curriculum. By design, outcomes in the arts are not as defined as those in most other school subjects and as a result teachers and students are freed to explore and experiment with the creative mindset.

The arts have fewer defined answers for questions than those posed in other disciplines. If “5x5=25,” options for students to explore are limited and a fear of getting the wrong answer at times becomes a barrier to real creative exploration. Eisner (2002b) argues that when teachers attempt to introduce creative initiatives in their classrooms they are compromised by the fact that the form and content of every discipline cannot be easily separated. Consequently, apparent creativity is often an illusion. “The sum of the numerals 4+4 can be expressed in literally an infinite number of ways: 8, eight, // // // // // // // // // // // // // VIII, 300,000-299,992 and so forth. In all these examples, the arithmetic conclusion, 8, is the same” (Eisner, 2002b, p.6). Most school subjects require pre-definable answers for the questions they pose while the arts offer a negotiable space where true creativity might be nurtured.

The arts are best positioned within schools to offer a creative learning space because their purposes are “out of gear” with the necessary means and ends of living, surviving and arriving at pre-defined answers. In a world where the future is moving ahead at an apparent speed in excess of our ability to capture it, the capacities of a creative mind may be the only way to enable our students to manage and excel in this emerging reality. Through the arts there is real hope for continued success. “The future is not ominous but a promise…it consists of possibilities” (Dewey, 1934, p.18) for the creative mind.

REFERENCES
A quick glance at a newspaper or magazine aimed at the Gen X and baby boomer populations confirms that vacationers are looking for experiences that involve learning, adventure sports, or crafts. According to the American Travel Industry Association (n.d.), 30.2 million adults reported having taken an educational trip to learn a skill, sport or hobby over the past three years. Why are they seeking these experiences?

In the nineteenth century, Thoreau (1854/1886) observed that most people lead lives of quiet desperation. The same could be said in these early years of the twenty-first century—a time marked by frenzy and weariness and a vague feeling, as MIT physics professor Alan Lightman has put it, of not keeping up. Lightman comments on the ever-increasing speed of technology and the fact that “public space—the space of people and clocks and commerce and deadlines and cellular phones and e-mail—is occupying more and more of our physical and psychic terrain” (p. 292). This weariness is also a function of being out of touch with the kinds of manual activities that connect us with our fundamental needs for shelter and sustenance, companionship, and beauty—the lost arts.

Many of us in the developed countries have not only lost the skills associated with manual activities; we have also lost admiration and respect for work done with the hands. Many so-called educated people proudly proclaim that they never cook or clean. We no longer know how to spin and weave, sew clothes, grow crops, preserve food, build shelters, or decorate our homes with artifacts crafted by hand.

The Domestic Arts and Schooling

The loss of the skills directly associated with the provision for human life is also reflected in contemporary North American schooling. Long gone are the days of mandatory Home Economics and Industrial Arts. Like the fine and performing arts, the domestic arts have suffered in the efforts to channel energy and funding into mathematics, language, and the sciences. And if the domestic arts have survived, then they have fundamentally changed in nature.

University-level home economics courses have either disappeared completely or reappeared under new names such as “human ecology” or “family and consumer sciences” (Dube, 2007; Schneider, 2000; Rohan, 2006; Trickey, 2001). Courses are taught by professors with backgrounds in chemistry, public health, nutrition, facility planning, and psychology—and perhaps, home economics (Schneider, 2000). The emphasis has moved away from how to make a lump-free white sauce to issues like designing better desk chairs, studying connections between cancer and food, and finding ways of repairing human joints with biodegradable fibres (Schneider, 2000). While the importance of these latter topics is not up for debate, surely there is still a place for learning to cook and learning to build.

The ordinary arts we practice every day at home are of more importance to the soul than their simplicity might suggest.

Sir Thomas More (1478–1535)
Handwork as an integral part of an educational program is rare. One notable exception is found in Waldorf schools, where the handwork curriculum—for both males and females—includes knitting, crocheting, hand sewing, carpentry, embroidery, woodworking, pottery, felting, paper crafts, and machine sewing. In describing the place of handwork in the Waldorf schooling, Iannaccone (2007) observes that:

advances in microelectronics, information processing, and communications are bringing a new era, not just in technology but in all the areas of life … The personal computer has radically changed how we think about and use information, how we act, and how we interact. But even relatively simple products such as the telephone answering machine, the VCR, and the microwave oven have altered our sense of time, our expectations, and our daily lives.

While she notes that there are obvious benefits to these advances in technology, she cautions that there will be unforeseeable consequences as well. She draws a parallel between the present technological advances and those of century just passed, noting that a number of thinkers of the early twentieth century—including Rudolf Steiner, the founder of Waldorf schooling, as well as John Ruskin and William Morris, leaders of the Arts and Crafts movement—were concerned about how such inventions as the typewriter, the automobile, and the electric light would affect human interactions. She notes that these thinkers feared that the mass production of machine-made goods would lead to depersonalization, apathy, consumerism, and other social ills.

As it turns out, Steiner’s involvement in the debate about the effect of machines and machine production, coupled with his aesthetic based on natural and organic forms, directly influenced the development of the Waldorf curriculum. According to Steiner’s aesthetic, each artistic creation should capture the vitality, beauty, and uniqueness that living organisms manifest. The hand-carved wooden bowls and knitted hats that are commonly found in Waldorf classrooms encapsulate this sensibility.

Arts and Crafts all over again?
Perhaps what we are calling for here is another Arts and Crafts movement—paralleling that of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when the movement served as a rebellion against what some perceived as the ills of the Industrial Revolution including the exploitation of workers, the destruction of the countryside, and the production of poorly made goods. The movement’s leaders believed in the supremacy of individual expression, which could best be realized through the domestic vernacular [italics added] (Kaplan, 1999, p. 476). The objective was the unity of manual labor and spiritual enlightenment, of work and leisure, of farming and making beautiful crafts from the bounty of the land using time-honored methods.

The Arts and Crafts movement fell for various complex economic and social reasons. But it may well be time to look at what an Arts and Crafts movement in the twenty-first century would be like, perhaps less as a rebellion against the ills of the Knowledge Revolution, but more an embracing of the things that make human life worth living—connection with our bodies, connection with other living creatures, connections with the planet.
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Re-Awakening to the Arts in Education

LARRY O’FARRELL, Queen’s University

The world is awakening to the potential of the arts in education. The Roadmap for Arts Education (UNESCO, 2006) produced by a World Conference in 2006 itemizes many of the reasons given internationally for this phenomenon. It cited research indicating that, introducing learners to artistic processes, while incorporating elements of their own culture into education, cultivates in each individual a sense of creativity and initiative, a fertile imagination, emotional intelligence and a moral “compass”, a capacity for critical reflection, a sense of autonomy, and freedom of thought and action. Education in and through the arts also stimulates cognitive development and can make how and what learners learn more relevant to the needs of the modern societies in which they live. (4)

This sentiment has been echoed by educational authorities in Canada as well as abroad. (Di Cocco, 2006)

It would be more accurate to call this a re-awakening because, at various points in the history of education, the arts have figured prominently in school curricula. Most recently, the arts were integral to the innovative pedagogy that characterized the Progressive Education movement of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Dewey (1934) proposed that the aesthetic act should be a condition of all forms of knowledge. His aim was to reunite art and everyday experience. More than century earlier, Pestalozzi (1801, trans.1894) laid the groundwork for a child-centred, experience-based pedagogy, proposing that children should learn through observation and concrete activities.

As children in the Ontario school system of the 1950s, my classmates and I benefited from the lingering influence of these ideas. Our school experience was enlivened by regular participation in the arts. I recall, particularly, choral music, visual art and occasional performances involving theatre and dance. According to the tenets of Progressive Education, we were being educated as whole persons. Although this philosophy was not applied consistently, it encouraged generalist teachers to include the arts in their schedule and provided a rationale for school boards to employ specialist arts teachers. My teachers did not appear concerned that our cognitive development would be obstructed by time spent on artistic projects. On the contrary, it was understood that our overall development would be enhanced.

In the decades that followed, adherence to this holistic pedagogy declined in the face of the ascendancy of behaviourism in the planning of curricula, the designing of teaching methods and the assessment of student achievement. Behaviourism aimed to modify student behaviour by delivering pre-determined instructional content in discrete units that could be measured on standardized tests. This model offered little scope for the dynamic, non-linear, multi-dimensional, educational capacity of the arts. The so-called “back to the basics” movement gradually marginalized the arts within school curricula.
Arts programs were reduced or eliminated and specialized teachers of the arts were often re-deployed as generalist teachers.

Today, in the wake of the conspicuous failure of behaviourism to raise or even maintain the quality of education (Gibbone, 1994), school leaders are looking for alternative approaches. They have begun to acknowledge, as Pestalozzi, Dewey and their fellow travellers understood so well, that motivation to learn originates from personal experience and, moreover, that learning flourishes in an integrated process. Once again, the arts with their capacity to integrate a student’s engagement in physical, emotional, cognitive, imaginative and aesthetic experience have attracted the attention of educational authorities.

This is not to suggest that Progressive Education has been revived. Although discredited, behaviourism retains a tenacious hold on educational practice. School curricula continue to be written in inventories of behaviourist learning objectives and standardized testing is entrenched. At the same time, Rousseau’s romantic vision of the natural development of the child that nourished Progressive Education (Rousseau 1762, trans. 1979) has been succeeded by an alternative understanding of human cognition. The focus has shifted to the construction of knowledge by students living in a diverse, relativistic world. Not only has the methodology of behaviourism been challenged but also its underlying positivistic belief in the universality of knowledge (Wonacott, 2001). Consequently, expectations of the contribution that the arts can make have undergone a corresponding transformation.

Nevertheless, a common purpose links Progressive Education with arts education in a post-modern world. Not only does each focus on the experience of the child within an integrated learning process but they also share a commitment to social change. Pestalozzi struggled to “stop the springs of misery in which [he] saw the people around [him] sunk.” (Pestalozzi, 1801, trans. 1894, 11) This aspiration resonates with a recent UNESCO appeal: “At a time when family and social structures are changing, with often adverse effects on children and adolescents, the school of the twenty-first century must be able to anticipate the new needs by according a special place to the teaching of artistic values and subjects. . .” (UNESCO 1999, 40)
Performing Arts Centre, Queen’s University

Located on the Kingston waterfront close to the central campus, Queen’s University will create a pre-eminent performing arts centre to provide a multi-disciplinary site for education, creativity and training.

The new Performing Arts Centre, made possible by a generous contribution of $14 million from benefactor Alfred Bader, will be the only one of its kind between Toronto and Montreal. The Centre will meet the needs of the Queen’s community and provide a medium-sized performing arts theatre for local and visiting arts enthusiasts.

The vision calls for a complex with a 500-seat concert hall, a 150-seat studio theatre, a small gallery, classrooms and rehearsal space. Designers Snohetta and EMA Architects have an impressive record of imaginative projects with regard for heritage buildings.

The project will encourage a fully-integrated arts program at Queen’s with all four creative arts departments (Music, Drama, Film and Art) sharing space. The new facility will also welcome student clubs. University collaboration with the City of Kingston will maximize the use of the new facility. The new facility will be accessible to community groups who wish to hold concerts, present theatre or have their works exhibited on the lobby gallery walls.

Through university and community programming, the new arts complex will attract local and international artists as well as arts consumers and cultural tourism. This project will significantly enrich the teaching and learning environment of our university and create a new venue to celebrate and enjoy culture and the arts, adding to the quality of life in our community.

An arts village model is envisioned, with morning artisan arrivals, continuing with the midday bustle of student culture and running into an evening of public performance and exhibition.
Since 2003, “The Studio” at Duncan McArthur Hall has provided space and opportunities for the arts for members of the Faculty and the public. Arts faculty members conceptualized and realized this studio in their desire to make the arts more accessible.

Located on the ground floor of “B” wing in Duncan McArthur Hall, The Studio is a flexible arts space designed to accommodate a number of artists and art forms. Presently, the activities of The Studio are focused on four main areas: Art on the Walls, Notes at Noon, Artists-in-Residence and hosting the Lincoln Center Institute International Educator Workshop.

Art on the Walls exhibits several shows a year with an emphasis on variety. Notes at Noon is an informal concert series held Wednesdays at noon during the B.Ed. on-campus weeks. Artists-in-residence typically “reside” at the Faculty for two to three weeks, offering a selection of free workshops and open studio times where individuals can drop by and chat or make art with the artist. A partnership with Lincoln Center Institute in New York City was initiated in 2007 with a one-week intensive workshop to experience the modalities of music and visual arts.

Almost thirty years ago Queen’s Faculty of Education pioneered the Artist in Community Education program to help prepare artist-educators for school and alternative career paths in arts organizations. We are proud that our Faculty now has space to offer arts beyond the classroom, and initiate more opportunities to enrich learning through the arts.
Angela Costello (Solar)  
Printmaker, Arts Educator

Angela is a practicing artist and arts educator who has been working in the arts and education fields for about twenty years. A graduate of the Queen’s University Bachelor of Fine Arts Program, Angela studied printmaking and continues to work in this medium, specializing in water-based, UV-cured silkscreen printmaking. Angela’s silkscreen prints incorporate images inspired by nature, domestic felines, human forms and objects fashioned by humans. The multiple layers of the printing process allow rich colours and textures to emerge which invite the viewer to move in for a closer look.

Angela also has a Bachelor of Education from Queen’s Faculty of Education and is a graduate of the Artist-in-Community Education Program. She began her career teaching Visual Art and English at the Secondary School level. Currently, she teaches Visual Art Curriculum in the Primary-Junior Program at the Faculty of Education, Queen’s University. In addition, Angela teaches a course in Arts Based Education in the Elementary School and the Theory and Professional Practice course.