# CONTENTS

# GLOSSARY

AS Level        Advanced Subsidiary Level

CPD     Continuing Professional Development

BA      Bachelor of Arts Degree

BEd     Bachelor of Education Degree

DCMS Department of Culture, Media and Sport

DfEE    Department for Education and the Employment now Department for Education
              and Skills (DfES)

EAL     English as an Additional Language

EAZ     Education Action Zone

FE       Further Education

GCSE  General Certificate of Secondary Education

GNVQ General National Vocational Qualification

GTC     General Teaching Council

HE       Higher Education

HEI      Higher Education Institution

HMI     Her Majesty's Inspector

INSET In-Service Education and Training

IoE       Institute of Education

ITE       Initial Teacher Education

LEA     Local Education Authority

MA       Masters of Arts Degree

NFER   National Foundation for Educational Research

OFSTED        Office for Standards in Education

PGCE   Postgraduate Certificate in Education

QCA     Qualifications and Curriculum Authority

QTS      Qualified Teacher Status

SATs     Standard Attainment Tasks

SEN      Special Educational Needs

SoW      Scheme of Work

TTA      Teacher Training Agency

V&A    Victoria and Albert Museum

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Background

In recent years the value of the educational role of museums and galleries has been convincingly argued by professionals (Anderson 1999, Hooper-Greenhill 1991) and government (DfEE & DCMS 2000).  Each year more than 10 million school children visit museums, galleries and other arts institutions.  The1,000 specialist museum and gallery educators in the United Kingdom can provide provision for schools and other audiences, and can offer some direct teaching services, but neither they nor their curatorial colleagues can provide learning programmes for every school that uses their resources.  The primary responsibility for this must lie with teachers.

Previous research has shown that most teachers lack the distinctive skills they need to make use of museum objects, works of art and sites as resources for pupils' learning.  They also often lack confidence to teach critically and creatively in galleries amongst the general public.  There is a clear and demonstrable need to provide professional development to enable teachers to use museums and galleries effectively.

This report presents the findings from a two year research project *Creative Connections* funded by the DfES (DfEE) as a part of the Museum and Gallery Education Programme. The research project builds upon existing networks: the Victoria and Albert Museum (V&A) and the Institute of Education (IoE) are partners in running the UK's only MA in museum and gallery education.

## Research Brief

The research brief was to discover the key factors that determine teachers' effective use of museums and galleries as a learning resource and to examine the extent to which current provision of museum and gallery continuing professional development (CPD) contributes to this.

## Research Focus and Methodology

Research was conducted between January 2000 - December 2001 in London and South East England to investigate Art and Design teachers' current use of London museums and galleries.  The role of museum and gallery educators and their professional relationship with teachers was examined and pilot CPD initiatives were developed and implemented at the V&A.

The research stages were as follows:

- questionnaire survey of Art and Design teachers in London and South East England regarding their use of museums and galleries
- focus groups of Art and Design teachers
- CPD initiatives piloted and evaluated at the V&A
- questionnaire data gathered from teachers visiting the V&A and contacting the V&A by telephone
- questionnaire survey of London museum and gallery educators
- focus groups of museum and gallery educators

**Main Findings of the Report**

The findings show that there are many complex issues that determine how teachers use museums and galleries. Art and Design teachers, who bring more groups of pupils to visit museums and galleries than any other specialist teachers, do not always feel confident to teach in a museum/gallery or to work with art and artefacts as resources for learning. Those who attend a museum or gallery In Service Education and Training (INSET ) session gain certain skills, knowledge and confidence but not sufficiently so to become independent from the direct teaching services provided by museum and gallery educators.

The findings are presented in two sections. The first relates to the opportunities Art and Design teachers have to develop confidence in using museums and galleries effectively, while the second section focuses on issues that prevent this from being realised.

**Opportunities for gaining confidence in using museums and galleries**
Teachers' undergraduate degree. The findings show that Art and Design teachers' undergraduate art and design courses and how they were taught, directly influence their confidence to use museums and galleries as an educational resource. A lack of familiarity with museum and gallery collections, combined with an undeveloped understanding of interpretative methods and critical analysis at undergraduate level affects teachers' abilities and confidence to teach in a museum or gallery.

Initial Teacher Education. Successfully completing an Art and Design Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) course does not appear to significantly develop an individual's confidence and ability to use museums and galleries effectively.

Newly Qualified Teachers. Within their first five years of employment, few Art and Design teachers in London and the South East of England attend an INSET session offered by a museum or gallery.

Museum and gallery visiting with pupils. Most Art and Design teachers perceive a distinct change in their role when they take school groups to visit museums or galleries. This can be best characterised as moving away from the role of an 'active educator' in the classroom to becoming a more 'passive organiser' in the gallery space. Museum and gallery educators use identical terminology when describing the teachers' role in sessions led by gallery staff.

Museum or gallery INSET sessions. Art and Design teachers value INSET because it allows them to gain skills, knowledge and confidence. The ideas and activities they develop and use frequently make significant impact on their students' learning and colleagues' professional practice.

Museum and gallery educators succeed in their aim to enable teachers to facilitate links between exhibits and their pupils' personal realities. Their other aims for INSET, to develop teachers' interpretation and communication skills in the museum/gallery, are less successfully realised. Art and Design teachers who have attended museum/gallery INSET have less confidence in these areas in comparison to colleagues who have not attended.

CPD accredited course. Evaluation from the pilot accredited CPD course *Critical Interventions* demonstrates that, in comparison to one day INSET sessions, this form of CPD is more effective in enabling **all** participants to gain and sustain new or refined educational strategies and in increasing their commitment to CPD.

**Issues affecting Art and Design teachers' use of museums and galleries as learning resource**

Differences of opinion regarding educational visits to museums and galleries. A lack of common understanding between teachers and museum/gallery educators arises from the different value each profession places on the museum and gallery visit. Museum and gallery educators characterise a successful educational visit to be one where pupils find personal relevance in the exhibits, feel 'at home' in the gallery space and wish to return. Art and Design teachers consider a visit to be successful if it directly influences pupils' practical coursework.

Differences in practice. Art and Design teachers and museum and gallery educators use different pedagogic methods to engage pupils with collections and exhibits. Teachers often attempt to apply a template for classroom practice to the museum and gallery favouring drawing activities in sketchbooks and the use of worksheets. In contrast, museum and gallery educators place an emphasis on interpreting exhibits and prioritise questioning and discussion.

The value placed on INSET by Art and Design teachers. Teachers who have attended a museum or gallery INSET session do not regard this to be as valuable as other educational provision offered by museums / galleries.

**Key Recommendations**

All agencies that contribute to the education and professional development of teachers should collaborate to develop a strategic framework. This framework must ensure that there are regular opportunities for trainee teachers and those with Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) to develop the appropriate skills and knowledge to use museums and galleries effectively throughout their careers.

Through collaboration with teachers, museum and gallery educators need to reconceptualise the purpose of museum and gallery INSET and ensure that the content meets teachers' needs.

# INTRODUCTION

Each year more than 10 million school children visit museums, galleries and other arts institutions. There are fewer than 1,000 specialist museum and gallery educators in the United Kingdom: they can provide leadership within their institutions in strategic development of services and provision for schools and other audiences, and can offer some direct teaching services. But neither they nor their curatorial colleagues can provide learning programmes for every school that uses their resources, the primary responsibility for this must lie with teachers. Research has shown that most teachers lack the distinctive skills they need to make use of museum objects, works of art and sites as resources for children's learning (Selwood, Clive and Irving, *An Enquiry into Young People and Art Galleries* 1995; Hooper-Greenhill, *Improving Museum Learning*, 1996; Anderson, *A Common Wealth,* 1999). They also often lack confidence to teach critically and creatively in galleries amongst the general public. There is a clear and demonstrable need for support, guidance, development and training for classroom teachers in the use of museums and galleries. There is also recognition that museums and museum staff need to contribute more effectively to pupil learning.

So far no effective solution has been found to this challenge. Some museums produce well-researched and tested publications. Others provide in-service courses for teachers that link their collections and resources to the curriculum. Some teachers make a strong commitment to learning how to use museums and galleries as a resource. For example, over the last seven years around 120 individuals have successfully gained an MA in Museums and Galleries Education through the Institute of Education (IoE)/Victoria & Albert Museum (V&A)/British Museum course and returned to their schools, colleges and other institutions as agents of change.

This report presents the findings from a two year research project *Creative Connections* funded by the DfES (DfEE) as part of the Museum and Gallery Education Programme. The research investigated Art and Design teachers' use of museums and galleries as a resource for teaching and learning. It also questioned the extent to which the provision of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) can contribute to and improve effective use of these resources.

**The Research Question**

The research team's brief was to examine how teachers currently use museums and galleries and to investigate the existing and potential role of CPD for increasing effective use. The research strategy drafted as part of the DfES (DfEE) proposal identified the following research question:

> *What key factors determine teachers' effective use of museums and galleries as a learning resource?*

This question directed and focussed the initial stages of the research. Data obtained from these stages (through questionnaire, focus group interviews and pilot INSET/CPD models) identified determining factors but also showed that teachers have a varied range of expertise and experience in using museums and galleries as a learning resource. This necessitated further consideration of the constituent parts of this expertise; how it is acquired, recognised and transferred amongst colleagues.

Findings from questionnaires completed by museum and gallery educators and subsequent focus groups showed that teachers' expertise is often overlooked by museum and gallery educators, whose focus is primarily on how they will provide for or meet what they perceive to be teachers' needs. The research question was therefore extended by the addition of another closely related question that asked:

> *How can teachers' expertise be used and/or developed to increase the effectiveness of museums and galleries as a resource?*

**Research Methods Used**

The wide-ranging nature of the research project necessitated the use of multiple research methods. Qualitative methods and quantitative methods including action research and case studies all form part of the overall methodology.

**Questionnaires**
These were used to collect data and provide an over view of current practice and provision. Four separate questionnaires were devised for the study.

Questionnaire 1 was sent to Art and Design teachers in 181 secondary schools in the Greater London area, to determine their current use of museum and gallery collections and services. The overall response rate was 38% (68/181). A range of 22 open ended and ranked questions were asked to identify:

- the value of museum and gallery INSET and its impact on teaching and learning
- which aspects of their specialist subject and related pedagogy, teachers of Art and Design felt most confident to deliver in the museum or gallery environment
- where they lacked confidence to teach within the context of a museum or gallery environment
- how teachers of Art and Design perceived their role in the museum or gallery
- what teaching and learning methods teachers of Art and Design were using to engage their pupils with exhibits

Responses to Questionnaire 1 informed the planning and course content for both the research project's pilot (CPD) course - *Critical Interventions,* and the pilot, one day INSET -*Whose Interpretations?*

Questionnaire 2 was sent to museum and gallery educators in the 22 London museums and galleries that Questionnaire 1 respondents had visited. It was designed to determine the educators' views on teachers' current use of museum and gallery collections and services. The questionnaire also asked for their perceptions of teachers' current needs to effectively use their institutions as a resource for learning. The overall response rate was high (82%).

Questionnaires 1 and 2 were closely related and contained some identical questions. Together they offered the possibility to compare and contrast different voices not only within professional groups but also across institutions.

Questionnaire 3 consisted of a one-page feedback form handed out to teachers at the end of an INSET session or CPD course. 32 Art and Design and Photography teachers

completed these after attending an INSET session run by the V&A Learning and Visitor Services Department or after attending a pilot INSET or CPD course developed by the research team.

Questionnaire 4 was sent to all the INSET session/CPD course participants, six months after they had visited the V&A to determine whether their initial responses had altered over that period and to examine the longer term impact of the INSET/course on their teaching and their pupils' learning. Out of 32 forms sent out, 75% were returned.

Questionnaire 5 examined teachers' use of museum and gallery educational provision prior to a visit to the V&A. It consisted of eight questions and was sent out to all teachers/lecturers (regardless of subject and age group taught) who booked an educational group visit to the V&A. 355 forms were collected from June 2000-June 2001, from which 250 completed forms were selected for analysis as they fell into the following categories: primary, secondary, further and higher education institutions.

**Focus groups**
From the returns from Questionnaire 1 and 2, (Art and Design teachers and museum and gallery educators) individuals were selected to take part in separate focus groups to examine a selection of responses in greater depth.

**Telephone tracking**
Telephone calls made to the Learning and Visitor Services Department at the V&A were logged according to the purpose of the call. 884 calls were logged covering the period July 2000 to June 2001.

**Action research/Case studies**
Seven Art and Design Teachers from the IoE's PGCE partnership schools took part in a pilot CPD course. As course participants they also elected to become action researchers for the project and to record and evaluate their practice over a period of six months. The research team was able to work closely with these individual teachers and three are presented as individual case studies within the report.

**The pilot Continuing Professional Development course**
This course, in using museums and galleries as a resource for learning, was developed by the research team members from the Art and Design Academic Group at the IoE, and Learning and Visitor Services at the V&A. It was informed by Questionnaire 1 responses, and aimed to address areas where teachers felt they lacked the confidence to teach critically and creatively in the context of the museum or gallery.

**Data analysis**
The data from all questionnaires has been coded and analysed using the Statistics Programme for the Social Sciences (SPSS). All focus groups and interviews have been taped and transcribed with the consent of participants.

**Dissemination**

The research project *Creative Connections* and its findings have been disseminated through academic papers presented to the following audiences:

- delegates at the British Education Research Association (BERA) Conference in Leeds, September 2001
- museum and gallery educators at the Group for Education Conference, London, September 2001
- staff in the Learning and Visitors Services Department at the V&A, April 2001
- academics and doctoral studies students at the IoE, May 2001

An exhibition of students' work from the seven CPD participants' schools was also displayed during June 2001 at the V&A, with a private view for parents, head teachers and governors.  Display panels have also been exhibited in the Art and Design Education Academic Group foyer at the IoE.

## STRUCTURE OF REPORT

Chapter 1 provides a brief overview of some of the policies and practices which relate to learning and teaching in museums and galleries and to the continuing professional development of teachers.

Chapter 2 looks at the various responses which characterise teachers' current use of museums and galleries. Based on a questionnaire survey and focus group interviews with teachers of Art and Design and museum and gallery educators, the chapter offers an overview of visiting patterns and rationales for using museums and galleries as learning resources.

Chapter 3 examines the factors that determine teachers' use of museums and galleries as a learning resource. Based on verbal accounts from teachers of Art and Design alongside questionnaire findings, it investigates perceptions, problems and practices from the perspectives of both teachers and museum and gallery educators.

Chapter 4 examines the effect that teachers' prior learning at undergraduate level has on Art and Design teachers' confidence and ability to effectively use museums and galleries as a learning resource.

Chapter 5 analyses the effectiveness of museum and gallery INSET provision for teachers of Art and Design. It questions whether the needs of these teachers are being met by the current form and content of INSET. It also asks how teachers value and utilise the knowledge and skills that they acquire from such professional development.

Chapter 6 evaluates two pilot models, a one day INSET course, and an accredited CPD course developed by the research team in response to teachers' perceptions of their needs as registered in the Questionnaire1 findings. The CPD model is examined further by presenting three participating teachers as case studies.

Chapter 7 draws together key findings presented by the research and outlines recommendations for future practice.

# CHAPTER 1:  THE WIDER CONTEXT

## Museums and Galleries

As highlighted in the recent report on museum education *A Common Wealth* (Anderson 1999), museums can enrich the learning process in every school, college, university, adult education institution and community centre in the country.

The particular relationship between museums and schools has been a long and complex one.  Throughout the twentieth century both national and local governments have directly funded museum and gallery education staff and services to work alongside teachers and schools.  These services took the form of materials for teachers, gallery teaching and loan collections.  As a part of this provision, teachers' courses were seen to play an important part in disseminating good practice on using collections for curriculum implementation and development (Miers 1928, Board of Education 1932, DES 1973, 1990).  These courses and one day events often had multiple aims and objectives, such as familiarising teachers with museums' or galleries' facilities and collections, or introducing teachers to a methodology for working with objects and works of art.  The focus for such INSET was the individual teacher and her/his classroom practice rather than the school's overall aims and objectives.

The Education Reform Act (1988) significantly changed the relationship between museums and galleries and schools, particularly in the context of INSET provision. A major factor was the impact of Local Management for Schools (LMS) where local education authority funding was given directly to schools.  This resulted in a large number of museum education services being closed down or having to charge the schools for their services.  Museums and galleries also have had to highlight links between the collections and the core subject areas within the national curriculum. Hence many galleries and museums offer support material and taught sessions that incorporate numeracy and literacy, as can be seen in the government's report the *Learning Power of Museums (*DCMS/DfEE 2000).  In terms of primary schools, whole school INSET based at the museum or gallery has proven to be popular, allowing all staff to discuss ways in which collections/exhibitions can be integrated into their class and school development plans.

Research by Harland and Kinder (1995, 1999, 2000) emphasises the need for a quality experience for pupils and young people when taking part in the arts, including visits to museums and galleries.  However, the effectiveness of such visits relies on both the quality of teaching and the currency of the teachers' subject knowledge.  The report, *Arts Education in Secondary schools: Effects and Effectiveness* (2000), identified "the need to recruit and train teachers with specialist expertise in the Arts and to encourage them to remain in the classroom by providing a career and CPD structure that offers regular opportunities for creative renewal"( 2000:571).  The report *All Our Futures* (National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education 1999), makes the recommendation that further training opportunities should be developed for arts educators in the museum, gallery and performing arts sector, giving equal weight to cultural and educational issues.  It also recommends that the DCMS and the DfEE (now DfES) fund a number of pilot projects involving cultural organisations and education providers to investigate practical ways of training artists and teachers to work in partnership.

**Government Policies**

In the past 25 years there has been a gradual but significant change in the role and form of in-service teacher professional development. This change has come from both government and its various agencies (HMIs, OFSTED, and QCA) and the teaching profession in conjunction with higher education and research.

In the 1970s, INSET courses were directed towards the individual teacher who was perceived to operate as an autonomous individual (Goddard 1989). The 80s and 90s brought a change of priorities with national government objectives, such as curriculum changes at the forefront, followed by the needs of the whole school as defined in school development plans (McBride 1989). To impress upon the profession the importance of training, the Government introduced into the academic calendar five additional school training days for school planning and staff development. Funding for INSET provision was, and is still, predominantly placed in these areas. Budgets of over £400 million placed within the DfEE's standard fund (Millet 1995), demonstrate the size of the 'industry' which serves teachers' professional development. Courses are currently designed to support schools in raising standards in the core subject areas of numeracy, science and literacy and in the management of children's learning through target setting and monitoring. However, the report *All Our Futures* (National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education 1999), outlines the consequence of prioritising subjects, namely, that very little of the funding has been set aside for teaching humanities, the arts, and creative thinking.

The current Government has been occupied with professional standards and appears to be aware of tensions. In the DfEE's green paper, *Teachers' Professional Development - the Challenge of Change* (1999), a section is devoted to all aspects of teacher training, from initial teacher education to continuing professional development. It recognises that there are three distinct, and equally important elements of professional development: national training priorities such as literacy, school priorities emerging from school development planning and individual development needs. A year later the same Department issued a consultative document *Professional Development: support for teaching and learning* (2000), that debates issues such as a code of practice for those providing training and development as well as highlighting funding for teacher exchange across schools and with business partnerships.

In terms of working in partnership with arts organisations to enhance arts and cultural activities within the curriculum, the DCMS, DfES and the Arts Council are currently working on a large scheme titled *Creative Partnerships*. The scheme is primarily intended for schools in Education Action Zones, encouraging them to work on integrated projects in partnership with a variety of arts organisations including galleries and museums. Issues of training and further professional development of staff have not been discussed as yet. However, as the Museum and Gallery Education Programme funded by the DfEE has identified, for projects to run efficiently and effectively with long term favourable outcomes, CPD of museum and gallery staff is needed. (Cultural Heritage-National Training Organisation 2000)

**Current Research on the Continuing Professional Development of Teachers**

> *"Professional development consists of all natural learning experiences*
> *and those conscious and planned activities which are intended to be of*
> *direct or indirect benefit to the individual, group or school and which*
> *contribute, through these, to the quality of education in the classroom."*
>
> Day (1999:4)

From research and practice, the teaching profession has developed a range of models for CPD. These models may include coaching or mentoring, action research, the use of distance learning materials or an INSET day in or out of school. Research has shown that a successful CPD programme for the individual, which brings about change, requires an integrated approach particularly giving feedback on performance and offering coaching (Joyce and Showers 1988). This approach requires an effective school infrastructure, which supports professional, individual and group learning (Law 1997, Cheng and Cheung 1996, 1997, Hopkins and Harris 2000).

When looking at specific forms of INSET delivery Rhodes and Houghton Hill (2000) found that one day INSET was more suitable for transferring information to attendees than creating a change in professional behaviour and attitudes. For many (e.g. Dadds 1993, Day 1999, Nicholls 1997), it is the importance of a continuing process which will bring about new professional learning. The initial stages of professional development involve personal reflection/self-study and critical intervention by others, be it peers or training providers. This leads the individual to challenge and question their current practices and then to initiate and refine new strategies.

In a report on teachers' non-contact days, Harland (1999) noted that tensions frequently arose in meeting the needs and priorities of the individual teacher, the subject departments and senior management. Also, many teachers were finding that they were having to go to other providers of INSET for specific professional needs, particularly in "developments within their own curriculum area to extend their subject-orientated knowledge and skills." (Harland 1999:7)

**Definitions: Continuing Professional Development and In-service Education and Training for Teachers**

In a recent report *Continuing professional development: LEA and school support for teachers* (NFER 2001), the authors quoted the definition used by MORI in its 1995 survey on CPD on behalf of the Teacher Training Agency (TTA). CPD constitutes 'activities whose main purpose is the development of teachers' professional knowledge, understanding and skills so as to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the classroom'.

The report goes on to show, and to some extent supports, the DfEE's findings (2001a) that teachers identify one off conferences and one off workshops as the two common forms of CPD that they have experienced with these typically delivered outside school. In this report we have taken the term museum and gallery 'INSET session' to reflect the one day or half day sessions which may involve: talks led by museum and gallery staff, curators and artists, discussions around artworks in the gallery, practical activities.

These sessions (INSET) are some of many activities which form the much more complex long term programme of raising teachers' professional understanding and performance.

The research by NFER showed that forms of CPD selected by teachers and delivered by "others", such as museums and galleries, (rather than the LEA, HE, FE and consultants), were in the minority.  It also revealed that academic accredited courses were least likely to be undertaken by teachers.

# CHAPTER 2:  TEACHERS' CURRENT USE OF MUSEUMS AND GALLERIES AS A RESOURCE FOR LEARNING

**Why Art & Design Teachers Organise School Visits to Museums and Galleries**

Art and Design teachers choose to visit museums and galleries to fulfil a number of needs and objectives.  The 68 respondents to Questionnaire 1 made 173 statements describing the purpose of a visit.  These were placed into seven categories, listed below in descending order, with the most frequently mentioned first:

> a resource for a scheme of work (37)
> for direct observation (33)
> to develop and broaden pupils' knowledge and awareness of artists and/or their art forms (32)
> to provide cultural opportunities for all pupils (24)
> change of environment/enjoyment (19)
> to satisfy exam criteria (14)
> for critical/contextual studies (14)

These statements demonstrate a wide range of goals, which could be examined in terms of short, medium and long-term measurable outcomes.  Some of the goals could be assessed as being achieved during, and as a result of, a visit to a museum or a gallery.  For example the activity 'direct observation' is demonstrated through drawings and notes made during a visit and can be seen to inform ideas for artwork and be the basis of some inquiry back in the classroom.  Other categories could be said to have medium term outcomes, such as satisfying criteria for an examination that students may be taking in the same month, year or following year.  While the third category tends to be concerned with the broader aims of an holistic educational agenda, in providing cultural opportunities for pupils, with the belief that once familiar with cultural institutions pupils will use them as sources of learning in the future.  This observation does not preclude the notion that the short term activities do not form part of a gradual accumulation of knowledge and skills which adds to the greater whole of art and design education.

**Which Pupils Visit?**

The results from Questionnaire 1 showed that in the majority of cases the groups that visited museums and galleries were years 10, 11, 12 and 13, that is pupils who are committed to GCSE, AS, A level or GNVQ examinations.  This is significant because if students in years 7-9 are not visiting museums and galleries as a part of their art and design curriculum, and choose not to take Art and Design at GCSE level, their experience of museum and gallery visiting will be limited to possible visits made in primary school.

*Table 1:   The percentage of 68 Art and Design teachers who take specific year groups to museums and galleries*

| Age Group | % of 68 Art & Design teachers that take this age group on museum and gallery visits |
|---|---|
| Yr 7 | 31% |
| Yr 8 | 28% |
| Yr 9 | 25% |
| Yr10 | 82% |
| Yr 11 | 79% |
| Yr 12 | 79% |
| Yr 13 | 72% |
| All year groups taken | 19% |

**How Teachers Select a Museum or Gallery to Visit**

*Table 2:   Order of criteria by which teachers select a museum or gallery to visit*

| Reason for selecting the museum or gallery | Ranking order (with corresponding percentages of teachers' choices) |
|---|---|
| Links with the curriculum e.g. departmental schemes of work, GCSE, AS/A level, GNVQ | 1st (74%) |
| Relevant permanent collection | 2nd (51%) |
| Ease of travel | 3rd (50%) |
| Provision for and attitude towards school groups | 4th (46%) |
| Temporary exhibitions | 5th (38%) |
| Personal contact with museums and galleries through attendance of teachers' evenings | 6th (37%) |
| Prior attendance of INSET/CPD courses/study days | 7th (15%) |

The criteria 'links with the curriculum' is understandably the most important reason for choosing a museum or gallery to visit. The National Curriculum for Art and Design recognises that museums and galleries provide "opportunities for pupils to investigate different kinds of art, craft and design" (DFEE & QCA 1999).

The findings indicate that teachers visit collections that support existing schemes of work and are less likely to use a temporary exhibition to generate a new scheme. They also show that teachers value collections which are accessible for a long period of time. These factors are corroborated by comments made by Art and Design teachers concerning the galleries and museums they actually visit.

The three most visited museums and galleries were Tate Britain (before Tate Modern was opened) (58 respondents), Victoria & Albert Museum (48 respondents) and the National Gallery (44). These all have substantial permanent collections.

A high proportion (over 60%) of these respondents returned to the same galleries on more than one occasion within the two years. This suggests that teachers prefer to make use of collections that they have become familiar with and or that they are repeating schemes of work from year to year.

Factors that are less, but still significant are concerned with physical access for the group as a whole. The importance of location, including issues of transport and efficient use of time, was raised by the focus group.

> " I am prepared to go anywhere but it's depending on transport really, it's dragging the students in the time slot that you've got that does restrict us quite a lot."
>
> (Art and Design teachers' focus group participant)

Equally important are factors to do with feeling welcomed by the museum or gallery, a perception that *school parties are not just accepted but encouraged* (Art and Design teachers' focus group participant). Teachers regard the attitudes of museum and gallery staff towards students as significant. It is interesting to note that three out of the five galleries (indicated by asterisks) that received the largest percentage of positive comments about their staff attitudes were the smaller galleries: Whitechapel Art Gallery 70%*, The Crafts Council 68%*, National Gallery 66%, Tate Britain 62% and the Courtauld Gallery 60%*.

Overall, from the information gathered on teachers' views about the museums and galleries they visit, it is quite clear that different aspects of each museum or gallery's provision is considered carefully, recognising each institution's strengths and weaknesses. From the questionnaire we find that a gallery may get positive comments on the quality of its publications but not on the attitude of its staff to school visits.


**Which Museum and Gallery Services Teachers Value Most**

*Table 3:  Art and Design teachers' ranking of eight typical services provided by museums and galleries in order of value*

| Services provided by museums and galleries | Ranking order by Art and Design Teachers (corresponding %) |
|---|---|
| Educational publications e.g. teachers'/pupils' packs | 1st (75%) |
| Workshops/talks led by museum/gallery staff | 2nd (59%) |
| Helpful advice for planning and booking a visit | 3rd (49%) |
| Teachers' evenings | 4th (44%) |
| Telephone service | 5th (40%) |
| INSET/CPD | 6th (30%) |
| Suggestions for ideas back in school | 7th (19%) |
| Loan collections | 8th (10%) |

The findings in Table 3 show that teachers value publications most highly.

Loan collections are considered the least valued provision reflecting the regional nature of the research, because there are very few such collections available in the London area.  The value teachers place on a service may well imply that is one that they use regularly.


**How Teachers Prepare Themselves for a Visit**

The majority of teachers take time and effort to become informed about their intended group visit.  Time is taken to make phone calls, to attend teachers' evenings and make preliminary visits, money is spent on teachers' packs and other supporting literature, use is made of web sites and reviews in the media.  It should be noted that these activities are often carried out in the teacher's own time, after school and at the weekends, and frequently involve personal expense.

From the range of evidence collected for the research, the three most common ways that teachers prepare themselves for a visit are:

- use of publications ( specifically for teachers or general readership)
- making a preliminary visit (either on their own or organised through a teachers' evening)
- through advice on the telephone

INSET was not considered to be as important an activity as the above in preparing for a visit.  This may be that the three systems of support listed above, to a greater extent, offer teachers flexibility of use and are within the teacher's own control.  Teachers can determine when to phone (in working hours), or use the web (24 hours), make a personal visit to the museum gallery or once obtained, read through the material at their own convenience.


**Publications**

From Questionnaire 5 completed by teachers (250) visiting the V&A, over 50 % replied that preliminary visits and information gathered from phoning Learning & Visitor Services at the V&A were their methods of preparing for a visit.

Yet, if the percentages of teachers using some form of written information e.g. specially designed teachers' packs which include materials for pupils, exhibition catalogues, leaflets, information from web sites and press reviews, was added together the figure would total 81%.  Art and Design teachers commented on the quality of publications (school specific and for the general public) that helped them to prepare for a visit. Publications from the Hayward Gallery, The Royal Academy, Victoria and Albert Museum and Tate Britain received most praise from the 30 London museums and galleries mentioned.

However teachers also experience difficulties, such as availability, cost and inappropriateness of published material:

*"I think that is a genuine problem, you know, being an Art teacher, it actually costs quite a lot of money because you end up paying to go to the exhibition, buying the catalogue…"*

(Art & Design teachers' focus group participant*)*

*"I often put my name down for receiving mailings from places, but my experience previously has been that I tend to receive lots of stuff that's appropriate for a younger age group, because I teach 14-19"*

(CPD course participant)

It should be noted here that there is a significant difference in the way primary school teachers prepare for a visit in comparison to their colleagues in secondary, further and higher education. The data collected at the V&A through Questionnaire 5 and telephone tracking (see Table 4), shows that primary teachers are the most frequent users of the V&A's free publications and telephone service in preparing a visit. Lecturers from higher education institutions appear to be the most independent in preparing for their visits.

*Table 4:   How teachers prepare for visits to the V&A, by a range of types of educational group leaders*

| *How educators prepare for a visit* | *Total number of educational group leaders 250* | *Primary school teachers 34* | *Secondary school teachers 114* | *FE lecturers 69* | *HE lecturers 33* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Preliminary visits | **55%** | 59% | 58% | 45% | 67% |
| Phone call | **52%** | 62% | 51% | 52% | 46% |
| V&A and other publications | **48%** | 65% | 54% | 39% | 27% |
| Coursework | **23%** | 27% | 24% | 19% | 24% |
| Website | **12%** | 9% | 11% | 17% | 3% |
| Media Reviews | **6%** | 0% | 5% | 9% | 9% |
| INSET | **6%** | 3% | 10% | 4% | 0% |
| Previous visits | **5.6%** | .5% | 4% | 9% | 6% |

**Telephone Advice**

As mentioned before, a large proportion of teachers obtain information for preparing a visit by telephone. From Questionnaire 5, which was sent to teachers making a visit to the V&A, over half, 52% (see Table 4)*,* said that they had used information from phoning the museum in advance of their visit. Depending on how familiar the teacher is with the museum or gallery, phone calls may be specifically about booking a visit or, of a general nature, about the collections and services provided. The analysis of 884 phone calls shows that 70% of the calls were to book a visit, while only 23% were calls concerned with general information.

This could indicate that teachers were already informed about the V&A from other means; (perhaps from a previous or preliminary visit and publications) before making the decision to book the visit, or that phone calls are often made during school hours, where there is little opportunity to spend time discussing details. Alternatively in some museums and galleries staff who are dealing with bookings are not in a position to give more advice about planning a visit as it is outside their experience and expertise. As one teacher's comment testifies:

> *"Then again, when you go to a smaller gallery, the education department will spend time to phone a few times, to say who are you bringing, what are they like, this is what the exhibition is about, do you think it will suit? But the larger galleries, they haven't got time to do that, and you haven't got the time to phone up and check who is doing the talk and all this.."*
>
> *(*CPD course participant*)*

**Museum and Gallery Educators' Perspectives**

In Questionnaire 2 museum and gallery educators were asked to rank typical museum and gallery educational services as they perceived them to be valued by teachers.

*Table 5:   The difference between what teachers actually value along side what museum and gallery educators believe teachers to value*

| *Service provided* | *Percentage of 18 London museums and galleries providing these services* | *Ranking order by museum and gallery educators- their perception of what teachers value* | *Ranking order by Art and Design teachers - services they value* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Workshops/talks led by museum/gallery staff | 95% | **1st** | **2nd** |
| Telephone service for booking | 95% | 2nd | 5th |
| Helpful advice for planning a visit | 84% | 3rd | 3rd |
| Educational publications e.g. teachers'/pupils' packs | 84% | **4th** | **1st** |
| Teachers' evenings | 79% | 5th | 4th |
| INSET | 74% | 6th | 6th |
| Suggestions for ideas back in school | 79% | 7th | 7th |
| Loan collections | 10% | 8th | 8th |

There are a number of areas of agreement between the two professional groups regarding loans, INSET and advice for planning. The mismatching of value can be seen most clearly regarding educational publications, teachers'/pupils' packs and phone service for booking. The latter could be explained through the availability of time; teachers have few opportunities to phone and so see it as less important, or could ask the school secretary to contact the museum, whereas the museum is waiting for the call, responding to the demand. It could be said that the mismatch on workshops and educational materials is more significant.

There is recognition by the museum and gallery staff that written materials are often used to prepare for a visit, particularly by those teachers who had long distances to travel and for whom a preliminary visit would be difficult to arrange.

> *"What we are doing is we are actually developing suggested activities for teachers so they actually receive those before they come on the visit. .. Because obviously they won't be able to do that themselves. I think that is where our expertise lies really."*
>
> (Museum and gallery educators' focus group)

> *"I suppose that's part of our role isn't it, to help the teachers with their visit. So if they're not prepared adequately for their visit then really we are partly to blame for that aren't we?"*
>
> (Museum and gallery educators' focus group)

It is understandable that the impression of the face to face contact with groups in the form of workshops/talks is most significant for the museum and gallery educators, but it is a service that most providers can only offer to the minority of visiting groups.

## Preliminary Visits

Museum and gallery educators recognised the importance of making preliminary visits. They felt that teachers often connected this activity with risk analysis and particularly in the case of temporary exhibitions, came to examine the suitability of exhibits for particular key stages. They also identified the need for familiarity with the museum/gallery layout and displays which may have items removed or moved to another location.

## Methods for Managing Pupils' Learning on a Visit to a Museum or Gallery

When teachers of Art and Design take their pupils to museums and galleries they most commonly use sketchbooks or work sheets to engage their pupils with the exhibits. From Questionnaire 1, the 68 respondents gave a total of 113 responses describing the methods that they used. The responses, grouped into four main categories, were as follows:

    work sheets and sketchbooks (46)
    preparatory work (28)
    discussion in groups or with individual pupils (26)
    workshops led by gallery and museum staff (13)

As a method, sketchbooks can be taken to mean asking pupils to make annotated observational drawings from particular works in the galleries; these may be directed by the teacher or selected by the students. Worksheets can be taken to mean a list of tasks and questions for students to solve or answer, often including the task of making observational drawings. The research team expected to find these methods heavily represented.

Such sketchbook activities have become something of an orthodoxy for Art and Design teachers conducting museum and gallery visits. It is relevant to note that these methods

differ greatly from those employed by museum and gallery educationalists. Sketchbooks and worksheets do not form a substantial part of a museum and gallery educator's repertoire.

## The Museum and Gallery Educators' Perspective

Museum and gallery educators as a group of professionals are reluctant to directly identify a unified approach to gallery teaching but indirectly refer almost without exception to similar favoured pedagogic methods.

Most are likely to:

> ask pupils to look in detail at specific works in their collections/exhibitions
> address the whole group of students
> give some information works in their collections/ exhibitions
> employ question and answer techniques
> elicit and value students' responses
> > (Museum and gallery educators' questionnaire and focus groups)

Writing about what teachers of art and gallery educators share, Bridget McKenzie states that they both *"create dialogue around art (encouraging multiple, even contradictory interpretations) "* (McKenzie 2001:23)

Our research indicates that this is very often exactly what they do not share. Where this group of professionals are critical of teachers' approaches (and almost one third (32%) of our questionnaire respondents remarked on: teachers *"lack of involvement,"* and *"lack of knowledge"* or made comments relating to teachers' inability to conduct independent visits), it would strongly indicate that they have learnt to value different teaching/educational methods.

## How Teachers Evaluate a Successful Visit

In Questionnaire 1 Art and Design teachers were asked an open question about how they assess the success of a museum or gallery visit. Their responses fell into the following groups:

- evidence found in the pupils' practical work produced in the classroom (52)
- from pupils' verbal comments (34)
- pupils' greater depth of understanding (subject content) (10)
- the quality of work produced (10)
- pupils independently revisiting the museum or gallery (4)

The above comments can be placed into different categories. The first could be seen as an overt physical and visual resemblance to what was seen in the gallery (repetition/imitation). The second is an attitudinal response, while the third is an integration of knowledge and or critical awareness seen in written work. The fourth comment is more concerned with raising the standards of work produced, be it practical or academic and the fifth by the students' extra curricular behaviour.

**Museum and Gallery Educators' Perspectives**

Museum and gallery educators asked to characterise a successful independent group visit made 32 comments from a total of 18 respondents that were grouped as follows:

- pupils' positive engagement with the works and finding personal relevance (10)
- pupils feel at home, confident to return (8)
- the group was well prepared and organised, using a mix of interpretive approaches (6)
- classroom work is informed by the visit (5)
- new knowledge for both teacher and pupils (3)

Understandably museum and gallery educators focus on the response to the collections, and the return visit is confirmation of the positive impact. Whereas teachers are focused on the result of the visit as made evident by the subsequent activities in the classroom.

It is interesting to note that teachers did not explicitly express the quality of visit through its planning and management, though this was considered important by the museum and gallery educators. The two professional groups have different foci for the visit, appropriate to their professions; teachers prioritise the outcome of a visit while museum and gallery educators place greater importance on the visit itself and in encouraging further visits.

**Summary**

This section has looked at the factors involved in planning, managing and evaluating a museum and gallery visit from both the point of view of the Art and Design teacher and to a lesser degree those of museum and gallery educators. There are areas where views are shared and agreed, for example the placing of the ranking of importance of suggestions for post visit classroom activities. Yet there are also areas where there are differences of opinion or misunderstanding; for example the importance of the management of the visit and the value of printed materials. The next chapter looks at underlying issues which may determine such actions and approaches.

# CHAPTER 3: ISSUES UNDERPINNING TEACHERS' USE OF MUSEUMS AND GALLERIES AS A LEARNING RESOURCE

**Change of Context, Change of Role?**

The findings suggest that most Art and Design teachers perceive a distinct change in their role when they take a school group to a museum or gallery. This can best be characterised as moving away from the teaching activities of the classroom (demonstrative, informative, activity based) towards more passive and organisational roles (supervisory, observational, pastoral).

This change is significant and can help us to understand more about teachers' interactions with museums and galleries. By extension it can also help us to identify why certain patterns of practice are employed by teachers in the museum or gallery. How teachers describe themselves is closely linked to how confident they feel and to their familiarity with the spaces and the contents of a museum or gallery. This combination of factors can be seen to determine the teaching methods that are adopted.

Within Questionnaire 1 the open-ended question was posed: "when you visit a museum or gallery with a school group how would you describe your role(s)?" The 68 Art and Design teachers gave 124 descriptions of their role(s) in a museum or gallery and these were divided into five categories. Organisational and/ or facilitator roles were most frequently cited with a total of 70 references. In contrast there were only 36 references to teaching roles:

- facilitator roles - preparation of materials such as work sheets, providing directions (42)
- organisational and support roles (28)
- teaching activities explained – promoting discussion, gallery lecturer (25)
- descriptions of roles to do with maintaining order, discipline (18)
- the term teacher used with no explanation (11)

Reasons for a change of role became clearer when groups of teachers were interviewed. Two discussion groups were held in order to discover what precipitates this change. We asked teachers how they perceive the differences between teaching in the classroom and teaching in a museum or gallery. In both groups there was agreement that the particular change of environment affects their confidence to teach their pupils. They feel confident to teach in their own classrooms but not so confident to teach in a museum or gallery.

The following concerns, voiced by Art and Design teachers, indicate some of the reasons why teachers' confidence may falter in a museum or gallery environment:

**Resources beyond control**
Teachers feel that the resources in the museum or gallery environment are beyond their control and that they might be 'caught out' by lacking understanding and/or knowledge in front of their pupils.

*"Having to think on your feet quickly because there might be a piece of work you haven't read up on or seen …so it's quite different from a classroom situation when you're in control of the resources you're putting on show."*

(CPD course participant)

**Public space**

Teachers also feel self-conscious when talking in a public space.

*"Stood in the gallery, it's the last place you want to look a fool. "*

(Art and Design teachers' focus group participant)

*"It can be quite strange (talking to a group of pupils) in a gallery setting, people think you're talking in a very vain way."*

(Art and Design teachers' focus group participant)

**Teaching**

Teachers found it difficult to see themselves in the teaching role that they would assume in their schools.

*"I think it's difficult to actually teach- teach, in terms of, in your classroom. In your classroom you've blown up a picture (showing a slide or poster reproduction) and you're talking about this painting and saying this is bla you know things about it; and you're not going to do that in a gallery. You can't really do that with the actual painting unless you've just got a few students, because you'll end up with other people coming around and sitting, and you're less confident to do that in a gallery."*

(CPD course participant)

*"I think it (role) changes completely; you're a facilitator, a coach as opposed to a teacher."*

(Art and Design teachers' focus group participant)

It became clear that they did not think of themselves as teachers in the gallery because they perceived that there were barriers preventing them from 'acting out teacherliness'. They still felt responsible for their pupils, but experienced a sense of impotence, which prevented them from being the art and design expert that they were in their classrooms.

*" When you come to a gallery you're not really teaching, you have to do all the teaching before, so that when you do bring your students they can go off on their own and they know what they are looking for. You can't actually say anything, you can't do anything, it's not teaching."*

(CPD course participant)

**Practical considerations**

The Art and Design teachers commented on the very obvious, but important, differences concerning the use of practical activities which normally define their teaching. They alluded to the demands of teaching in the gallery space without being able to engage pupils in practical activities.

> *"Big huge differences are that in the museum you don't have art materials*
> *necessarily, it's a pencil – in the classroom you've got all the materials*
> *but only a slide or one or two images and you focus it differently."*
>                              *(*Art and Design teachers' focus group participant)

For a number of reasons, including public access, security and conservation concerns, practical art activities are not generally possible.  Nor are they necessarily the most appropriate or effective ways to work from collections/exhibits.

**Desire for the familiarity of the classroom**
Some teachers talked about making a museum or gallery more like their classroom. They expressed feelings of confidence and 'comfort' when the gallery most closely resembled a classroom.

> *"I feel most comfortable where they (the pupils) can use the gallery like a*
> *classroom."*
>                              *(*Art and Design teachers' focus group participant)

This meant that the pupils could use a range of materials and engage in practical artwork.

> *"They did allow materials in the gallery on plastic sheets – nobody would*
> *take the slightest notice what you did."*
>                              *(*Art and Design teachers' focus group participant)

Particular galleries were identified because they provided this experience.

> *"That's a really good one (gallery) because they've got an art room at the*
> *back."*
>                              *(*Art and Design teachers' focus group participant)

*Table 6:   The characteristics of the two contexts to illustrate teachers' perceptions of*
*           the challenges presented by museum and gallery teaching*

| *Classroom* | *Gallery* |
| --- | --- |
| Practical activities | Not practical |
| Many art materials | Limited art materials (dry) |
| Teacher controls visual resources | Someone else controls resources (curators) |
| Private domain | Public domain |
| Teacher is the expert | Someone else is the expert (museum and gallery education staff/curators) |
| Familiar | Unfamiliar |
| Few or no original art works | Original works of art |

**Gallery talks and workshops**
Many London museums and galleries offer workshops or gallery talks for school groups led by education staff or artist interpreters.  It was noted that some teachers only felt confident in taking their pupils on visits if museum and gallery staff were able to provide a talk or workshop.  These teachers did not feel at all comfortable or confident working on their own with their school group in the gallery space.  Teachers who use

these facilities often characterise their own experience as becoming *"like one of the group"* or as simply *"supervising behaviour"*.

> *"You're with that class and you're actually a member of that class."*
> (Art and Design teachers' focus group participant)
> "*By using museum or gallery staff I feel confident because I'm not taking responsibility for the session.*"
> (Art and Design teachers' focus group participant)

The teacher with the group can also often experience a feeling of marginalisation.

As one gallery educator's comment testifies:

> "*It is a skill as to how you impart to a teacher that although they will be very important in the session they are there to learn as well, they are there to interact in a different way with their students, so it's how you get that across that sometimes they can feel a bit undermined by it, so it's quite difficult to get that.*"
> (Museum and gallery educators' focus group participant)

There seemed to be a striking contrast between teachers' perceptions of their own abilities and confidence in the museum or gallery context and their perceptions of the abilities of the museum and gallery education staff. Almost without exception museum and gallery education staff were seen as the experts. Because teachers felt that they were "*not experts - like the museum and gallery educators*", they also felt that they were not "*qualified*" to be talking in a public space.

> *(Museum and gallery educators) "They're not like a teacher, more like an expert on the artists .....saying more than I could ever talk about.."*
> *(*CPD course participant*)*

Museum and gallery educators' descriptions of teachers' roles during taught gallery sessions mirror teachers' perceptions of themselves. They also reveal some tensions and conflicting expectations. In a selection of their responses, they stated that:

> "*Teachers are responsible for discipline, medication and toilet trips.*"
> "*They are there to learn from the museum staff.*"
> "*They are often passive unless directed by museum staff.*"
> "*They spend time having coffee.*"
> "*They are 'part of the audience'.*"
> "*..requested to come prepared to be involved and learn alongside their pupils*"
> "*They do not feel responsible and stay 'out of it'*"
> (All quotes are from museum and gallery educators' questionnaire 2001)

Only a small number of the museum and gallery educator respondents made reference to collaboration and/or co-teaching.

**Learning from museum and gallery educators**
Some teachers stated that they have learnt from the examples set by museum and gallery educators and would use similar strategies if they had to work with their pupils independently.

> *"Usually we have a National Gallery speaker or more than one to talk to the boys and on this occasion they couldn't supply one. So having watched how it was done by the professionals, I then had to sort of go and do it myself which was a bit, er, scary, but we did have some good notes about the work. ... it was very much in the ways that gallery staff teach and ask questions and try to engage the students in what's going on."*
> (Art and Design teachers' focus group participant – [with 26 years of teaching experience])

**Understanding pupils' needs**

It has also become evident that some teachers prefer not to make use of these available services because they are critical of the abilities of the education staff to meet the specific needs of their pupils.

> *"We don't tend to use gallery staff because they tend to talk over the children's heads - we have a great many students that have English as a second language."*
> (Art and Design teachers' focus group participant)

Teachers also questioned the abilities of some individuals (employed by museums and galleries) to provide high quality practical workshop experiences.

> *"The artists (leading the education session) gave them a fantastic talk but then they went into a room and it was like, here's your materials - now make your own. And the students were just waiting for more information ...like 'how do I start' - It was like, just produce your own animal. And they were absolutely dreadful- they were really, really dreadful even the kids said they were dreadful."*
> (CPD course participant)

**Summary**

Many teachers' perceptions of the challenges presented by museum and gallery teaching stem from fundamental differences in the shift from one institution to the other, which can represent major disruptions to their usual pedagogic practice.

As Eraut acknowledges:

> *"For teachers to change their classroom practice in any radical way* (which is what the museum environment in effect demands*), involves both modifying their classroom persona and embarking on a learning task of enormous magnitude. The experience of disorientation and alienation is profound; and unless teachers are given considerable psychological and practical support over a long period, they will revert to their old familiar practice."* (Eraut 1994:112)

Our research has shown that teachers often attempt to apply a template for classroom practice to the museum and gallery context, not because they have decided that this is the most appropriate approach, but because they have not acquired the experience and confidence to employ alternative approaches.

# CHAPTER 4: HOW TEACHERS' PRIOR LEARNING EXPERIENCES AFFECT THEIR USE OF MUSEUMS AND GALLERIES WITH PUPILS

**The Content of Undergraduate Courses**

Almost without exception, Art and Design teachers in secondary schools have attained a BA degree in a specialist area of art, design or craft practice/theory. The majority has then obtained a postgraduate certificate in education (PGCE).

*Table 7:   The 68 Art and Design Teachers' undergraduate degrees*

| *Area of undergraduate study* | *Number of questionnaire respondents* |
|---|---|
| Fine Art | 29 (42.6%) |
| Design/Craft | 26 (38.3%) |
| Joint (Hons)/ Modular degrees | 7 (10.3%) |
| History of Art | 6 (8.8%) |

The researchers were interested to know if undergraduate experiences, (from grouped subject specialisms) continue to be a contributory factor in determining teachers' approaches to using museums and galleries.

From the biographical accounts of the CPD group participants, it was apparent that some Art, Craft or Design BA courses regard museums and galleries as a major study component whilst others place very little emphasis on their potential as resources for learning. Particular courses privilege making as an autonomous activity, some strive to integrate theory and practice, whilst others concern themselves solely with history or theory.

In the questionnaire for the Art and Design teachers, a series of questions was designed to investigate teachers' perceptions of their confidence when taking a group of pupils to a museum or gallery. Categories were listed relating to areas of knowledge, understanding and practice which affect teaching and learning in the museum or gallery. Teachers were asked to indicate their levels of confidence in relation to the following:

- understanding the social, cultural, historical context of exhibits
- knowledge of individual artists, designers and craftspeople and their art and design contexts
- understanding and application of methods of analysis
- communication skills in the museum or gallery
- management of pupils' learning
- ability to make relevant connections between exhibits and pupils' personal realities
- understanding the role of the curator

It was anticipated that there would be some variation in responses corresponding to the teacher's undergraduate experiences, but we were surprised to find how pronounced this was. It was noticeable that teachers who had studied Fine Art subjects, History of Art

or Theory of Art perceived themselves to be generally more confident to deliver all of the above than their colleagues who had studied Craft or Design subjects.

Teachers who expressed the greatest lack of confidence (particularly in understanding the social, cultural, historical context of exhibits, and communication skills in the museum or gallery) were those who had studied Crafts and Design subjects.

*Table 8:   The relationship between BA specialisms and confidence in museums or galleries*

| BA Specialisms | *% who indicated they lacked confidence associated with communication skills in the museum or gallery* | *% who indicated they lacked confidence associated with understanding the social, historical context of exhibits* | *% who indicated they lacked confidence in using methods of interpretation in the museum of gallery* | *% who indicated they lacked confidence to manage pupils' learning in the museum of gallery* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Craft and Design (26) | 34% | 30% | 27% | 15% |
| Fine Art and History of Art (35) | 11% | 11% | 8% | 5% |

It is important to note that there was a generally high level of confidence to teach in museums and galleries, indicated in the questionnaire responses.  This was not replicated by teacher responses in focus groups.  Several teachers who had ticked to indicate that they were very confident in certain aspects of teaching refuted these comments when asked to talk about their experiences with other teachers.


**Undergraduate Course Experiences: implications for teaching methods**

The methods that teachers employ to engage their pupils with exhibits also indicate an allegiance with their undergraduate courses of study.

Teachers identified the strategies or methods that they would usually employ in the museum or gallery.  Most mentioned two methods (113 answers from 68 respondents). Their responses fell into four categories:

- asking pupils to use sketchbooks and worksheets (46)
- preparatory work – preparing their pupils and setting tasks before they visit the museum or gallery (28)
- giving a talk/discussing with pupils in the museum or gallery (26)
- Workshop or talk led by museum or gallery staff (13)

This pattern can again be seen to reflect the content and structure of different BA courses in Art and Design as set out below.

**History/Theory of Art graduates**

History of Art graduates indicate that they use sketchbooks and worksheets less often (4 of the 46 responses were from History of Art graduates) that their colleagues. They state that they discuss with their pupils in the gallery more frequently than other teachers and describe themselves as facilitators but not as organisers. They also give a high rate of 'role descriptions' concerned with discipline and order.

This can be seen to reflect the pedagogical styles of their undergraduate courses. History and Theory of Art courses place a greater emphasis on examining and discussing the work of others than studio based courses. Traditional lectures (demanding an orderly and attentive audience) both in and outside the gallery or museum are likely to be a common course feature. Visits to museums and galleries will form a major part of undergraduate study but practical art activities such as drawing or visual note taking will not.

**Crafts and Design graduates**

Crafts and Design subject graduates cite the use of sketchbooks and worksheets more frequently than other graduates, 29 of the 46 (63%) responses were from crafts and design subject graduates. Studio based courses differ greatly in how they view the relationship between theory and practice and the use of museums and galleries. Craft and Design courses, as a generalisation, will still place more emphasis on making techniques and handling materials than on examining and discussing the work of others.

It is typical of teachers from crafts backgrounds to feel confident to discussing exhibits where direct making skills could be observed, but lack confidence to approach works of art in which a display of skill and technique has not been the artists' intention.

> *"My background is craft, I can assess and talk about skill, but I don't know if it's a good photograph or a bad one"*
>
> (CPD group participant)

**Fine Art graduates**

Teachers who are Fine Art graduates mention discussion or giving a talk least often, but are most likely to employ the services of museum and gallery education staff to provide a talk or discussion. Fine Art graduates mentioned discipline roles less than other groups and were most likely to describe teaching activities that they undertook in the museum or gallery.

Many Fine Art courses now place more emphasis on the development of students' ideas and personal working practice than on the acquisition of skills and techniques. These courses encourage student awareness of the work of others and stress the importance of museum and gallery visits, however these aspects of the course may be experienced as discrete components, delivered by specialist critical and contextual studies staff/departments.

**Additional postgraduate qualifications**

Of the 68 Questionnaire 1 respondents, 14 had achieved, and one was studying for an MA qualification. Possessing a MA and/or other postgraduate qualification in addition to a PGCE, did not appear to make a substantial impact on teachers' perceptions of their confidence in a museum or gallery. However teachers with a Masters qualification indicated that they were very slightly more confident in their understanding of the social, cultural and historical context of exhibits and in their knowledge of individual

artists and designers.  Though they expressed slightly less confidence in their abilities to manage pupils' learning.

Given that study for a higher degree in Art and Design subjects, or in Art and Design Education, is not necessarily linked with using museums or galleries or with methods of critical analysis, it is perhaps not surprising that these respondents were no more confidant in this particular field of educational practice.  It is interesting to note that although postgraduate qualifications did not seem to affect teachers' levels of confidence they did seem to have an effect on the teachers' perception of their role in the museum or gallery, and on the methods they chose to engage their pupils with exhibits.  This may indicate a greater awareness of their own abilities and short comings.

When asked to describe their role in the gallery or museum teachers with additional postgraduate qualifications registered:

- twice as many descriptions of discrete teaching activities that those without
- a low occurrence of  descriptions of organisational roles
- a low occurrence of descriptions of discipline related roles

When asked to describe the methods they used they mentioned discussion in the gallery substantially more that those without respondents without postgraduate qualifications and registered a lower occurrence of descriptions of sketchbook/worksheet method.

**Initial Teacher Education (ITE)**
Talboys states that teachers are unaware of how museum work can complement their classroom studies because, *"such a concept was not included in their courses of study when they first trained."* (1996:20).  The implication here is that he is referring to ITE and this is an issue that is appropriate to raise in relation to these above findings.

The 68 Questionnaire 1 respondents all possess a teaching qualification.  Their responses, therefore, do not only suggest lack or absence in some specialist undergraduate provision, but also the failure of ITE to address this lack.

**Summary**

The picture that emerges suggests that some Art, Craft and Design graduates come to teaching having:

- acquired a personal rationale for the use of museums and galleries and having become familiar and comfortable in their own use of museums and galleries
- been taught a range of interpretative approaches through which works of art and design can be better understood
- visited museums and galleries with fellow students and tutors as part of their undergraduate studies
- discussed individual works with fellow students and tutors in the galleries

Other Art, Craft and Design graduates come to teaching having had none of these experiences.  We can start to see that undergraduate subject specialisms are highly likely to affect not only an individual's use of museums and galleries but also their understanding of art works and artefacts.

Further research is needed in this area but it appears that a lack of familiarity with museum and gallery collections, combined with an undeveloped understanding of interpretative methods and critical analysis, affects teachers' abilities and confidence to teach in a museum or gallery.  Graduates from courses that place little emphasis on these aspects of teaching and learning are the most likely to lack the confidence to teach critically and creatively about the work of others both in and out of the museum and gallery context.

# CHAPTER 5:  THE CURRENT ROLE OF MUSEUM AND GALLERY INSET

**Who attends museum and gallery INSET?**
Over half (60%) of the Art and Design Teachers who responded to Questionnaire 1, had attended a museum or gallery INSET.  Within this group there are a number of factors that appear to determine teachers' attendance.

*Table 9:   Factors that determine Art and Design teachers' attendance of museum and gallery INSET sessions*

| *Factors that determine attendance* | *Variable* | *% of teachers in each variable group who attended a museum or gallery INSET* |
|---|---|---|
| Number of years teaching | 1-5 years | 29% |
| | 6-11 years | 61% |
| | 12-21 years | 67% |
| | 22 years and over | 71% |
| Number of School visits to a museum or gallery in a 2 year period | 0-7 visits over 2 years | 36% |
| | 8-18 visits over 2 years | 82% |
| Postgraduate qualification in addition to PGCE | e.g. MA | 57% |
| | BA only | 35% |
| Type of school | State | 54% |
| | Independent/Grant maintained | 78% |
| Post held within school/department | Head of Department | 70% |
| | Special responsibilities | 50% |
| | No additional responsibilities | 33% |

The first five years of teaching is a crucial period for teachers' continuing professional development.  Yet only 29% of Art and Design teachers had attended a museum and gallery INSET within this period.  The teachers with the least responsibilities in the school/department, again very likely to be teachers in their first five years of teaching, are underrepresented as attendees of INSET sessions.

Clearly there are many demands on teachers' time in their first few years of employment and the findings do not offer an explanation as to whose decisions (school's, teacher's or negotiated) determined the type of professional development that individual teachers received, or why they did not attend museum and gallery INSET sessions.  However, the findings do indicate that professional development in using museums and galleries as a learning resource is a low priority for Art and Design teachers in the initial years of employment.

It is highly likely that museums and gallery education departments are unaware of this trend and are therefore not targeting INSET sessions to meet the needs or highlight the benefits of attendance for this group of teachers.  There is a need for museums and galleries to target NQTs, or tailor INSET sessions to meet the needs of less experienced teachers.

It appears that the most experienced teachers, those who are heads of department and those who are the most qualified, represent the majority of attendees.  We would acknowledge that this could be an effective way to disseminate the content of the INSET session.  However, this does rely heavily on the assumption that more experienced staff, such as the head of department, will effectively be able to develop skills, knowledge and confidence in younger and more inexperienced colleagues.

Attendance of INSET also appears to be affected by the type of the school in which teachers are employed.  Teachers working in independent and grant-maintained schools are considerably more likely to have benefited from museum and gallery INSET provision than their colleagues in the state sector. This echoes the pattern for visiting where again the independent sector visits are proportionally higher.  This seems to indicate an imbalance in amount of contact certain types of schools (and therefore teachers and pupils in these schools) have with museums and galleries.  Currently pupils from independent and grant -maintained schools appear to be privileged as the most frequent visitors and their teachers as the most frequent attendees of INSET provision (Questionnaire1).

It is also interesting to note (from Questionnaire 2 and museum and gallery educators' focus groups), that a number of museums and galleries have had to cancel INSET days due low take up rates.  The London museum and gallery educators attributed this to the increasing pressures on teachers' time; examinations, SATs, OFSTED inspections and whole school INSET sessions were all cited as reasons for low take up rates.

**Teachers' Understanding of the Content of Museum and Gallery INSET Sessions**

*Table 10: Art and Design teachers' descriptions of the museum/gallery INSET sessions that they have attended.*

| *Content of INSET sessions attended* | *Responses from the 60% of Art and Design teachers who had attended museum and gallery INSET* |
|---|---|
| Gaining knowledge and understanding of a particular collection or exhibition | 46% |
| How to use specific gallery resources and facilities e.g (National Art Library or Print room at the V&A) | 18% |
| Practical workshops | 15% |
| Direct curriculum or syllabus links | 13% |
| Cannot remember the content | 7% |

Art and Design teachers most frequently describe museum and gallery INSET to be about a particular collection or a temporary exhibition at the museum/gallery.

From the perspective of museum and gallery educators it would appear logical to offer INSET sessions with this focus. After all this is what such institutions offer; collections and exhibitions of art, craft and design. In London these are many and various offering a superb selection of resources for pupils to learn from. The research findings provide an overview which indicates that different museums and galleries deliver similar format, one-day INSET sessions. These INSET sessions differ greatly in terms of variety of exhibitions and collections that form their focus, but are consistently similar in that teachers' perceive their primary aims to be giving information about exhibitions or collections.

**What Teachers Value**

When Art and Design teachers were asked to rank services provided by museums and galleries in Questionnaire 1, INSET was not considered to be as valuable as other services (see Table 3 p.16). However, many teachers were able to clearly describe the benefits of attending an INSET. Teachers' comments were placed into four groupings, seen below:

Specified curriculum key stage or examination criteria links and art and design techniques (16)

For example "(INSET provided a)*"good History of Art lesson on fresco tempera and increased* (my*) understanding of techniques"*.

A photography INSET at the National Portrait Gallery enabled *"greater use of photographic practice in GCSE and A level lessons."*

Subject knowledge and critical/cultural analysis (16)

INSET was helpful in *" developing ways of looking and using visual information, to explore concepts and themes relevant to GCSE and A level assignments"* and *" to make pupils aware of broader issues of critical studies."*

Personal professional development e.g. enrichment/ confidence (12)

*"(I) felt more confident when conducting the visit "*. (I found it) *" An enriching process"*. It *"recharged the batteries"*

General management of visit (10)

It showed me *" how to use resources available"*
In relation to the Tate (Britain) and the Hayward *" (I) became aware of gallery procedures and collections"*

These statements are concerned with both professional and personal needs.

*"I like INSET days because that is educational something that stays with you and also means that if you've learned about collections you can go back and organise a group without having to organise education."*
<div align="right">(Art and Design teachers' focus group)</div>

The phrase "*something that stays with you*" may indicate why INSET is less likely to be recognised as having a significant influence on a school visit. The knowledge gained from INSET may become absorbed over time into the general experience that forms professional competency. The teacher's comment shown above emphasises an awareness of a transferral of knowledge that has been made and acted upon.

Practice that has become second nature along with knowledge and skills that are developed and assimilated over a period of time are difficult to trace or attribute to an initial source such as an INSET session.

## How INSET Affects Teachers' Confidence

To establish the impact that museum and gallery INSET has on teachers' perceptions of their confidence, the responses of INSET attendees were compared with non attendees. Areas of knowledge and skills used in the museum and gallery were identified and teachers were asked to indicate where they felt most or least confident.

*Table 11: The ranking of confidence between the two groups of Art and Design teachers: those who had attended a museum or gallery INSET session and those who had not*

| Areas of expertise in which teachers were asked to evaluate their levels of confidence | Teachers who had attended a museum/ gallery INSET | Teachers who **had not** attended INSET |
|---|---|---|
| Knowledge of individual artists | 3 | 1 = most confident |
| Understanding social, cultural historical context of exhibits | 4 | 2 |
| Management of pupils' learning | 2 | 2 |
| Understanding and application of methods of interpretation | 5 | 3 |
| Ability to make relevant connections between exhibits and pupils' personal realities | 1 = most confident | 4 |
| Communications skills in museum or gallery | 6 | 5 |
| Understanding the role of curator | 7 = least confident | 6 = least confident |

Both groups of Art and Design teachers (INSET attendees and those who had not attended) lacked confidence in their knowledge and understanding of the role of the curator and similarly both groups lacked the confidence to talk to their groups in the gallery spaces. Current INSET provision does not appear to be addressing this lack of confidence.

Teachers who **had not** attended museum and gallery INSET sessions perceive themselves to be confident in their knowledge of artists, designers, and craftspeople. They felt secure in their understanding of social, cultural and historical contexts. They were also confident about their ability to understand and apply different methods of interpretation.

Those teachers who **had attended** INSET sessions appeared less sure of their own knowledge and skills in these areas. This may well indicate that following a museum and gallery INSET session teachers appreciate how much more there is to learn and how little they know. Attending museum and gallery INSET sessions appears to take teachers from a state of confidence to one of questioning and doubt.

The ability to make connections between exhibits and pupils' personal realities was an aspect of museum and gallery teaching and learning where current INSET appears to be making a difference. INSET attendees expressed greater confidence to do this than their colleagues who had not attended. Their perception of their confidence to manage pupils' learning was also enhanced through INSET attendance.

**Museum and Gallery Educators' Perspective**

When we correlate teachers' perceptions of museum and gallery INSET sessions with museum and gallery educators' intentions for INSET a more complex picture emerges.

*Table 12: Museum and gallery educators' priorities for INSET, shown alongside teachers' perceptions of their levels of confidence after attending a museum/gallery INSET session*

| *Areas of knowledge and skills delivered in INSET* | *Priorities for INSET by M&G educators* | *Areas of confidence by Art &Design teachers who had attended an INSET* | *Teachers who **had not** attended INSET* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ability to make relevant connections between exhibits and pupils' personal realities | 1st | 1 = most confident | 4 |
| Understanding and application of methods for interpretation | 2nd* | 4* | 3 |
| Communications skills in museum or gallery | 3rd | 5 | 5 |
| Knowledge of individual artists | 3rd | 2 | 1 = most confident |
| Understanding social, cultural historical context of exhibits | 3rd | 3 | 2 |
| Understanding the role of curator | 4th | 6 = least confident | 6 = least confident |

Museum and gallery educators rank the ability to make relevant connections between exhibits and the personal realities of learners as their priority from the list given above. This seems to have been clearly understood by teachers who have attended museum and gallery INSET sessions as they are far more confident in their abilities to make these connections that their colleagues who have not attended.

However there do appear to be anomalies, for example, museum and gallery educators ranked the development of teachers' use of interpretative/analytical methods the second priority for INSET. Yet teachers who had attended INSET sessions did not reflect a

comparable level of confidence, here is a gap between what is thought to be delivered in INSET sessions and what is understood to be received.

Again, with communication skills in the gallery or museum, the confidence of teachers who have attended INSET sessions remained low and did not acknowledge that museum or gallery INSET sessions had increased their confidence and ability.

There are persistent generic difficulties experienced by Art and Design teachers that affect their confidence and ability to use museums and galleries with their students. These difficulties are not currently prioritised by museum and gallery INSET sessions. Perhaps it is precisely the generic nature of professional development concerns such as confidence to teach in the gallery environment and methods for interpreting art and artefacts that prevent them from becoming the explicit purpose of museum and gallery INSET.  Museums and galleries, as mentioned earlier, tend to focus INSET sessions on specific collections or exhibitions obscuring issues such as those above, which the museum and gallery educators believe are evident to all.

**The Role of INSET in Encouraging A Return to Museums/Galleries**

Existing V&A Data on INSET sessions and the visiting patterns of school groups over a period of time (seven years) provided the opportunity to look closely at return group visits following a teacher attending a V&A INSET session.  A random selection of INSET days over three years was examined to see if there was any relationship between teachers attending an INSET session and their previous or subsequent visiting patterns.

The data does not allow us to see if teachers who attended the V&A INSET sessions then went on to visit other museums and galleries, thereby transferring their skills and knowledge to other collections and contexts.

*Table 13: The relationship between teachers attending one INSET session at the V&A and the prior and/or subsequent visiting patterns*

| Action taken | 1998-9 | 1999-2000 | 2000 -2001 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of people attending three INSETs | 39 attendees | 36 | 30 |
| Teachers attending other V&A INSETs | 9 (23%) | 8 (22%) | 3 (10%) |
| Nos. of school visiting the V&A for the first time after the INSET | 2 (5%) | 4 (11%) | 1 (3%) |
| Nos. schools visiting prior to INSET | 14 (35%) | 9 (25%) | 8 (27%) |

It would appear that attendance of an INSET session is more likely to result from a prior school visit rather than encourage a subsequent visit.  Once a school has visited the museum, staff become aware of the INSET activities available by obtaining relevant information while on the visit. Attending an INSET session did not directly increase return visits to the museum.

**Teachers' Evenings**

Teachers' evenings vary in purpose and delivery from gallery to gallery and museum to museum. Usually they are linked to temporary exhibitions, offering teachers a free private viewing. The evening may well include a lecture, a discussion group, teaching materials prepared to accompany the exhibition and, not to be neglected, refreshments.

When asked to rank the educational services provided by museums and galleries the Art and Design teachers in Questionnaire 1 ranked teachers' evenings fourth out of eight services, whereas INSET was placed 6th. Comments from Art and Design teachers suggest the functions that these evenings serve:

> *"I never go to look at the work really, you go to get an overview."*
> (Art and Design teachers' focus group participant)

> *"They 're really good to get resources and that's probably about it. I don't think you can engage in the work, certainly (not) on a Friday night. Perhaps really if I put my hand on my heart and think right do I go there and learn anything? And I probably really don't I learn a lot more in other situations when I go on my own really."*
> (Art and Design teachers' focus group participant)

> *"The best ones are the ones where you get into a gallery where it normally costs you to go and have a preview and then you decide that was great. Then you come back, and I will pay my £8, £7, or whatever it is to go in there, no problem, but it's really nice to have that kind of free taster..."*
> (Art and Design teachers' focus group participant)

The opportunity to become familiar with temporary exhibitions is important even if it is at a cursory glance or in fact carrying out the 'risk analysis' discussed earlier on page 20. What may be more significant about these evenings is their role in establishing and maintaining professional relationships between teachers, museum and gallery staff and other teachers.

In focus group meetings and in one-day INSET sessions teachers have articulated a case for discussion groups with colleagues, museum and gallery staff and artists.

> *"When I was working in Barking and Dagenham, it was superb. We had a consortia there and it was superb, meeting people (to) discuss and get a whole new kind of perspective is very rejuvenating, exciting."*
> (Art and Design Teachers' focus group participant)

> *"The INSET was very valuable to me apart from activities and workshops provided, it was invaluable to talk to other teachers of photography."*
> (Photography at the V&A INSET participant)

**Museum and Gallery Educators' Perspective**

The views held by museum and gallery educators match those of the Art and Design teachers. There seemed to be an interest in improving teachers' evenings and awareness

that they did not always meet teachers' needs. One museum and gallery educator suggested that the evenings might be:

> *" A kind of focus group, a kind of personal contact thing rather than the bland big unfocused teachers' evenings that we do at present*."
>
> (Museum and gallery educators' focus group)

Another commented on the unsuccessful attempts that the gallery had made to try to improve the potential of the evenings:

> *"Our education open evenings are very untargeted.  You just put your name on the list and you get invited to those.  We have tried to sort of make arrangements with artists to act as guides, for further visits from teachers who have come to those evenings.  They have been universally unsuccessful in different ways.  Sometimes quite exploitative to the artist, using up their time and then cancelling, that kind of thing.  We've dropped doing that completely."*
>
> (Museum and gallery educators' focus group)

**Summary**

An examination of the role and impact of museum and gallery based INSET activities reveals a complex and sometimes contradictory set of findings.  The key points to emerge are as follows:

- Teachers consider INSET sessions to be less significant than other services offered by museums and galleries such as publications and preliminary visits.

- INSET sessions, delivered by museum and gallery educators are successful in achieving some of their intended aims and objectives.  Teachers who had attended a museum or gallery INSET felt most confident in making connections between art and artefacts and the pupils' personal realities as prioritised by the museum and gallery educators.

- However, INSET appears to be unsuccessful in developing the skills required for critical analysis and communication for use in the museum and gallery. Teachers feel least confident in these areas although they were considered by museum and gallery educators to be very important for achieving a successful visit.

- Attending INSET may move the individual from a state of confidence to a new state of insecurity, for example s/he may recognise the complexity of information surrounding the art work or collection and as a result realise the limitations of their own knowledge.

# CHAPTER 6:  LONG-TERM IMPACT OF INSET/CPD

This chapter considers the findings from three monitored INSET/CPD courses that took place at the V&A in the year 2000.  The aim of this part of the research was to assess the effectiveness of the courses through evaluating the long-term impact (6 month follow up) of two pilot models and one existing INSET course.

The two pilot models were:

   • a 30 hour accredited CPD course *Critical Interventions*
   • a standard one day (5 hour) INSET *Whose Interpretations?*

The content of the pilot models was developed to address Art & Design teachers' perceptions of their needs, as registered in Questionnaire 1.

An existing INSET *Photography at the V&A* was planned before the research project commenced, this was tracked alongside the pilot models to allow for comparisons to be made.


**Breakdown of the Three INSET/CPD Courses**

**Photography at the V&A:** was a one day INSET session held in June 2000.
12 participants were introduced to facilities and resources for the study of photography at the V&A.  Recruitment for the course was through the V&A's termly Teachers' Courses leaflet sent out to all schools in London and the South East.  The course delivery was through slide talks, and a guided tour of galleries and resource areas.

The course aims were:

   • to build on the success of the Canon Post 16 Photography Project (1999);
   • to inspire teachers to carry out their own research using the V&A facilities (Print Room, Canon Photography Gallery and National Art Library);
   • to encourage teachers to bring their students to use these facilities.

The course sessions were:

   • slide presentation by Colin Chapman, a secondary school Art and Design teacher showing art work produced by pupils who participated in the V&A's Canon Post 16 Photography Project (1999);
   • slide talk by Martin Barnes, assistant curator of Photography, Prints and Drawings Collections about the forthcoming photography exhibition that he was preparing;
   • guided tour by Martin Barnes in the Canon Gallery about his curated photography exhibition *Breathless*;
   • talk by Robin Crawford, librarian in the National Art Library housed in the V&A.  Advice was given on how teachers and students can access these resources;
   • talk by Charlotte Cotton, assistant curator of Photography, Prints and Drawings Collections in the Print Room on how teachers and students can access the study boxes, each of which hold over 20 photographic images that can be viewed close at hand.

**Critical Interventions:**  A pilot CPD course accredited by the Institute of Education as an Advanced Diploma in Professional Studies which carries 20 credits towards a Masters Degree.  Seven teachers enrolled on the course that ran between June 2000 and March 2001.  Recruitment was through partnership schools that work with the Art and Design Education Academic Group's PGCE course.  The taught part of the course was delivered in three days and four evenings over a period of nine months; a total of 30 hours.  Between taught sessions, course participants undertook an action research assignment with a group of pupils that involved a visit to the V&A.  The course offered experiential learning combined with lecture/seminar sessions led by experienced practitioners in art and design education and museum and gallery education.  Sessions were led by staff from the Institute of Education, the V&A and other specialists in museum and gallery education, e.g. curators, art/design historians/theorists, practicing artists/designers.

The course aims were:

- to enable teachers of Art and Design to gain the skills, understanding and confidence they need to successfully use museums and galleries as resources for learning;
- to explore a range of contemporary interpretative approaches through which works of art and design can be understood and used to inform and enrich classroom practice;
- to provide a critical understanding of curatorial decisions which affect permanent collections and temporary exhibitions;
- to develop, through an exploration of both theory and practice, strategies for museum and gallery teaching that can be implemented as a curriculum development project.

The course included the following sessions:

- *Working with Objects* – A workshop session exploring subjective and objective responses to personal artefacts, and considering issues of contextualisation and labelling;
- *Artist Interventions* – Slide talk by James Putnam about contemporary art work that is created specifically to be positioned alongside established collections, entering into a critical dialogue with the ideological assumptions of the museum;
- *Critical Interpretations*  - Discussion session led by Claire Lofting (Central St. Martins College of Art and Design) and Dr Simon O'Field (Middlesex University) in the Canon Gallery, exploring a range of interpretative methods and approaches with reference to secondary school art and design pupils;
- *The Curator's Voice* - Talk by Martin Barnes in the Canon Gallery about the photography exhibition *Breathless*, for which he was curator;
- direct observation of and a chance to 'interview' a group of year11 school pupils who were visiting the V&A;
- opportunities to discuss and present strategies for gallery teaching in context with other teachers;
- practical experience in undertaking a curriculum development project with one group of pupils for which a visit to the V&A provided the main stimulus;
- action research - recording and evaluating teaching and learning in museums and galleries, and  evaluating  the impact on pupils' learning presented as a 4,000 word assignment.

**Whose Interpretations?:** *Whose Interpretations?* shared the same aims and objectives as *Critical Interventions* but in a condensed form using the standard one day structure favoured by many museums and galleries. The thirteen teachers who attended, had been recruited through a targeted mail out to departments of Art and Design in inner and outer London secondary schools.

The three taught sessions that *Critical Interventions* participants thought to be the most important were retained, giving the following session content to the day:

- *Working with Objects*
- *Critical Interpretations*
- *The Curator's Voice*

At the end of the day, time was allowed for discussion and a further interpretative workshop exercise using a range of contemporary and modern photographic images from fine art advertising and fashion.


**Long Term Impact: general observations**

All 32 participants were sent a questionnaire six months following the completion of the INSET sessions or CPD course previously outlined 75% (24) were returned.

There were six main issues covered in the questionnaire:

- memory of INSET session or CPD course
- acquisition, development  and use of new educational strategies derived from the course
- frequency of use of new educational strategies
- impact of the INSET session or CPD course on others
- perceptions of the value of the INSET session or CPD course
- professional development in terms of skills, knowledge and confidence gained

**Memory of INSET session/CPD course**
When asked to register how clearly they remembered the INSET session or CPD course, 11 out of the 24 (45%) remembered 'very clearly', nine 'clearly' and four could remember 'only some aspects'. No one replied to the fourth category 'vaguely'.

**Forming and using educational strategies**
22 out of the 24 (92%) found that the INSET session/CPD course gave them the basis for developing new educational strategies, which they then used with their students.

Respondents described the educational strategies that they had gained as:

- the use of a range of interpretative approaches
- encouraging students to engage more critically with exhibits through debate
- examining the role of the curator in shaping and interpreting collections and exhibitions
- placing more value on students' responses to exhibits

Teachers appeared to be using these educational strategies in school and for museum/gallery visits.  One respondent wrote:

> "(I have gained the) *ability to stimulate discussions about artefacts, and ways of looking.."*
>
> (*Whose Interpretations?*INSET participant)

Some respondents made specific references to their increased ability to transfer the strategies that they have developed to other museum/gallery contexts.

> *" I used the personal objects activity (p 42) as a starting point to get students looking at objects in a different way before visiting Tate Modern."*
>
> (*Whose Interpretations?* INSET participant)

The second question relating to use of educational strategies/activities was concerned with frequency of use during the six months period between attending the INSET session or CPD course and completing the questionnaire. 22 out of the 24 (92%) had used newly gained educational strategies a number of times; either frequently, quite often or occasionally.

**The impact of INSET day/course on others**
17 out of 24 Art and Design teachers noted that their attendance of an INSET session or CPD course had had an impact on pupils and/or colleagues within the department. Descriptions of the impact on students learning fell into the following categories:

Increase in students' knowledge and understanding, for example:

> *"Students have broadened their minds to using a variety of resources for their artistic progress and subsequently have gained confidence in working in and from the museum environment."*
>
> (CPD Course participant)

Increased independence of students' use of museum and gallery resources:

> *"..by encouraging the students to attend exhibitions, for use of the print room (V&A) themselves, has not only helped develop for them a better understanding of photography but helped them to feel greater independence."*
>
> (*Photography at the V&A* INSET participant)

Higher grades/exam marks (2 mentions), for example:

> *" Years 10 and 11 pupils taking GCSE Art and Design gained distinctions this year. I feel their increased ability to cross reference between artists' work and their own has helped them to gain higher grades."*
>
> (*Whose Interpretations?* INSET participant)

These comments are similar to those made by Art and Design teachers in Questionnaire 1, when asked how they evaluate a successful museum and gallery visit (see page 21).

A number of statements described the dissemination of information from the INSET session or CPD course to colleagues either in the department or in the school as a whole. For example:

> *"(We) shared ideas about teaching in the gallery, the best ways to manage pupils to get the most from a gallery "*
>
> (CPD course participant)

Several comments drew attention to raising the quality of museum and gallery visits, for example:

> *".. department attitude to gallery visits has changed- students are now very directed and work hard when (they) go out."*
>
> (*Photography at the V&A* INSET participant)

Other teachers made reference to pupils' coursework as an outcome of their attendance of an INSET session or CPD course.

> *"(I am now) building in interpretative methods to improve KS3 - getting pupils to be critical and place in context the work of others in relation to their own work."*
>
> (*Whose Interpretations?* INSET participant)

**The value of an INSET session/CPD course**
The respondents were asked to rate the value of the INSET session or CPD course in relation to their own continuing professional development. The questionnaire offered five categories from 'very valuable' to 'not valuable at all'. All (24 out of 24) respondents ticked the three positive categories, 'very valuable', 'valuable' to 'some extent valuable'. Not one respondent had found the INSET/CPD course 'not very valuable' or 'not valuable at all'.

When placing the data on **value** alongside that collected on the **memory** of the INSET session/CPD Course and the **frequency** of using educational strategies, an interesting finding was revealed. The results showed that there was a significant relationship between memory, the value placed on the INSET session/CPD course and the frequent use of educational strategies employed following the course. The (29%), seven individuals who rated the INSET session/CPD course as being very valuable, had a clear memory of it, had also frequently used strategies developed from the INSET session/ CPD course.

These seven teachers found that there was evidence of change (impact) with students and colleagues as a direct result of the INSET session/CPD course. Whereas half of those who used strategies only sometimes felt there was no impact on the department. The less teachers used strategies, the less they found the INSET session/CPD course valuable, or conversely the less the INSET/CPD course was valued the less the educational strategies were developed and used.

From our data there appears to be contrary evidence. The two teachers who said that they did not develop any educational strategies, wrote that they remembered the INSET well and valued it.

> *" Found course very valuable and commented I found the day personally extremely stimulating and thoroughly provoking despite the fact that I haven't highlighted any effect it has had on my own teaching."*
>
> (*Whose Interpretations?* INSET participant)

The use of the word 'despite' hints towards the belief that INSET sessions/CPD courses can **only** be useful/valuable if the course/session results in concrete evidence within a short space of time (six months). This view must be of concern to all in the educational field. For teachers to deny any opportunity for intellectual and professional stimulation, which may not immediately translate into educational strategies, is to deny themselves the chance to reflect on their practice, maintain an enthusiasm for their subject and feel personally invigorated as a professional.

**Professional development in using museums and galleries**
Questionnaire 4 (six month follow-up), asked the attendees to say if the INSET session/CPD course had increased their skills, knowledge and confidence to use museums and galleries as a resource for learning. The results were very positive: 22 out of the 24 attendees replied that they had gained skills, whereas 23 out of 24 attendees had gained knowledge and confidence. This can be seen as a record of success.

**Contrasts and Comparisons: a Closer Look at the INSET Sessions/CPD Course**

The emphasis in the pilot courses (*Whose Interpretations?* and *Critical Interventions*) was on facilitating teachers' acquisition of interpretive skills and improving their confidence and ability to communicate with students in the gallery spaces. The questionnaire findings (see Table 14) show the types of skills/areas of knowledge that participants from the pilot courses felt they had gained. The INSET *Photography at the V&A* focused on accessing the facilities available for study and this was reflected in the responses of those who had attended.

*Table 14: Attendees of monitored INSET sessions/CPD course reflect on specific outcomes*

| *Outcomes of attending INSET / CPD 6 months on* | *1 day INSET* <br><br> *% of 8, Photography at the V&A attendees who answered Yes* | *1 day INSET* <br><br> *% of 10, Whose Interpretations attendees who answered Yes* | *Accredited CPD Course* <br><br> *% of 6, Critical Interventions attendees who answered Yes* |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Improved communication skills in the museum/gallery* | 25% (note this was not the focus of this particular INSET) | 50% | 68% |
| *Greater awareness and use of museum and gallery facilities* | 62% | 10% (note this was not the focus of this particular INSET) | 17% (note this was not the focus of this particular INSET) |
| *Acquired a range of interpretive approaches to use with pupils* | 12% (note this was not the focus of this particular INSET) | 60% | 83% |

When examining general aims and objectives relevant to all three forms of INSET/CPD provision, it can be seen that overall form and content of an accredited CPD course has a substantial effect on long term professional development.

*Table 15: Attendees of INSET session/CPD course reflect on general outcomes*

| Outcomes of attending INSET /CPD 6 months on | 1 day INSET % of 8 Photography at the V&A attendees who answered Yes | 1 day INSET % of 10 Whose Interpretations? attendees who answered Yes | Accredited CPD Course % of 7 Critical Interventions attendees who answered Yes |
|---|---|---|---|
| Improved strategies for managing pupils' learning in museum or gallery | 62% (Particularly relevant to this INSET) | 40% | 100% |
| Plans for future CPD | 0% | 10% | 67% |
| The Course had an impact within the department/school | 62% | 70% | 83% |

Table 15 highlights a number of points regarding the structure and content of the INSET sessions/CPD course. The length and intensity of study seem to substantially affect teachers' motivation for seriously considering their own continuing professional development. Teachers who were part of the accredited CPD course were by far the most committed to the value of continuing professional development. These same participants generally indicated that the CPD course had a greater long-term impact on their teaching and learning in comparison to those who had attended a one day INSET. It can also be seen that the school and/or department are/is more likely to benefit more from the dissemination of the CPD course content.

Although the one day INSET *Whose Interpretations?* intended to address the same needs as the CPD model *Critical Interventions,* the limitations of the standard one day INSET model would appear to render it less effective in achieving these aims.

### *Critical Interventions:* **three teachers as case studies**

Three *Critical Interventions* CPD course participants were selected as case studies to track the impact of the course on their professional development. The course aimed to provide transferable skills and encourage conceptual development. It promoted learning through reflective practice and collegiality between course participants. The case studies were selected to acknowledge contextual factors, perceptions and attitudes that contribute to outcomes.

The case studies are presented in a chronological sequence to allow an understanding of the developments in knowledge, confidence, understanding and practice that took place over a period of nine months. Like the INSET attendees, the *Critical Interventions* participants were interviewed six months after completing the course - taken to be the date for handing in written assignments.

*Case study A*

<u>Academic background including use of museums and galleries</u>
Case A graduated in 1993, studied Art and related Arts, specialising in Fine Art with
Music Literature and Dance.  She completed her PGCE studies in 1995.  Has been
teaching for 6 years and was Acting Head of Department in 2000-2001 for maternity
cover.

Both her undergraduate and PGCE experience of museums and galleries was minimal:

> *"I don't think we actually went to museums and galleries...at the end of
> the course we went to Venice and Munich, but I don't remember museums
> and galleries at all  ...it was more up to you to go out to museums and
> galleries."*

<u>Views on using museums and galleries prior to the course</u>
Found it difficult teach in the museum or gallery, and like many other teachers she said
that she "*felt less confident to do that in a gallery*".  Her descriptions of herself in the
galleries showed a preoccupation with organisational issues:

> *"I'm always looking to see where the security guards are ... .. it's like
> you're not a teacher."*

She had previously used museum and gallery educators to teach sessions for her groups,
she had used these services more than the other teachers in the CPD group, but was also
the most critical of them.  She thought that the practical workshop at one gallery were ill
considered and produced work that she considered to be *"absolutely dreadful"*.  Of
another gallery she found the taught sessions were perfunctory and too impersonal,
inhibiting the pupils' involvement.

<u>Initial reaction to taught CPD course</u>
Case A initially identified '*Critical interpretations*' as the most significant session and
stated that she aimed to encourage pupils' own response and to work with use her own
interpretations more, she also wanted to encourage more critical interpretations of art
and artefacts.  At the end of the taught part of the course her comments suggest that she
is questioning some initial assumptions and starting to feel more confident about using
museums and galleries independently.  She talks about her previous reticence to work
outside particular specialist areas that she felt "*comfortable with*" and realised that she
would typically have handed over to other people rather than extend her own
knowledge.

<u>School visit to the V&A</u>
Case A prepared a scheme of work for eleven, year 13 students  that  used the *Critical
Interpretations* session as the basis for her approach.  The visit had as its focus the
Canova carving of the 'Three Graces' situated in the Sculpture galleries.  Case A led a
discussion, with herself standing behind the students, on possible interpretations of the
work.  She elicited responses from students and gave her own opinions on the piece.
Students spent time sketching and were encouraged to consider different opinions and
viewpoints.  Their task in school was to research and explore other artists'
interpretations of the piece before commencing their practical work.

<u>Follow up - reflections on the changes in own practice</u>
The major change for Case A had been the development of using museums and galleries without relying on taught sessions, of which she had been initially critical before the course. Case A made the following comment on her teaching methods in museums and galleries prior to the course:

> *"I think the way that I taught at a gallery wasn't the way I normally teach in the classroom. I never though of transferring the skills I had across into the gallery, just didn't occur to me at all".*

After the course, she identified changes in her approach to teaching:

> *"The course has made a huge impact on my confidence in using artefacts in critical studies. I'm not so afraid to look at a sculpture and discuss that with the class and it's given me more confidence, I've actually started teaching critical studies to GNVQ that's one thing I'd never have thought of doing."*

<u>Impact on Students' Learning</u>
Case A recognised that the confidence she had built up in teaching critical studies empowered her students to take their researches further than they had prior to the visit:

> *".. some of them had actually done more critical studies than I've ever seen before* (as a result of the visit*). They're coming to me and showing me the different examples and they're telling me what sort of direction that their work is taking as well, which again I think is what I wanted from the whole thing."*

<u>Impact on Colleagues in the Art and Design Department</u>

> *"One of my colleagues, she's looked at these sketchbooks as well and I think she's seen the differences already, so I think it's encouraged her. What she's thought about, like we actually do need to take the students out, and be more confident about just standing there and talking about the piece which I think we don't do as teachers, or we forget to do."*

*<u>Reflections on the Course 6 months on</u>*
Case A was still very positive about the effect the course has had on her use of museums and galleries, particularly by providing:

> *"..reflective space for planning the project, I really don't think I would have been able to do it if I didn't have that time to actually come out and sort of think about it away from school, away from what was going on. "*

> *"And again I think that being able to do that* (come out of school*) also gave me a chance for me to meet people from other schools.......when you are in school you sort of end up feeling like you are the only one on this planet that is doing this and it's just nice to meet people from other schools are actually going through the same thing and also trying to extend their professional development by doing courses like this."*

<u>Over view</u>
Case Study A had little personal educational experience of using museums and galleries in undergraduate experience or PGCE course. As a teacher she had taken student

groups to museums and galleries but like many of our questionnaire respondents had not felt confident to lead these sessions herself.  Instead she had relied on the teaching services provided by certain museums/galleries and stated that she would delegate responsibility rather than extend her own knowledge and skills.  She had recognised that there were problems with abdicating responsibility especially when she was unsure of the abilities of museum and gallery educators to meet the needs of her student groups. She felt that she lacked the confidence to be more independent.

Outcomes in terms of continuing professional development

- Much more independent in use of museums and galleries;
- No longer reliant on museum and gallery educators running sessions for her;
- Now able to value and work with students own interpretations through valuing and trusting her own;
- Confidence was gained with the realisation that there was more than one interpretation, more than the authoritative text or museum label;
- Noticeable benefits for students both quality of work, motivation and increased student confidence.

## Case study B

Academic background including use of museums and galleries
Case B studied Printed Textiles and graduated in 1993.  She thought that museums and galleries played "quite an important role" in her undergraduate education although this was not a formalised part of the course.  She says that:

> "We *visited galleries (*but*)… we weren't really taught in galleries, it was more sort of going round in groups of friends talking about work ….. we were just left just kind of wandering, doing our own thing. We were definitely taught how to look at work and we were told about all the different movements."*

Case B completed her PGCE year in 1998 and has taught for three years.  She visited a museum as part of her course of studies and remembers the content of the session:

> "We had to go and find information for a year 10 GCSE project and then afterwards we had to talk through what project we would set for them but it was only a day and maybe half a day feedback really and we all had to do an A1 sheet, we did drawings in the gallery.  It was on African sculpture.  It was kind of practical really, how could they get a project that they could use for their exam."

Views on using museums and galleries prior to the course
Case B was the least forthcoming of all the participants and made very few contributions to group discussions.  However she did identify having felt nervous and slightly at a loss when taking groups of pupils to a gallery or museum.

> "There were 25 of them (pupils)  - I was really nervous   - you don't get many opportunities on PGCE, I didn't involve educators at all, I just rang them and booked at the last minute."

<u>Initial reaction to taught CPD course</u>
After the taught part of the course Case B identified: *Critical Interpretations* as the most significant session for her. She stated that she aimed to address:

> *"Creative questioning and looking at symbols and meanings alongside*
> *teaching pupils how to discuss with confidence and promoting critical*
> *historical knowledge."*

Her comments at this time show her reflecting on an imbalance between critical studies and practical art work in her own teaching and in the teaching of art and design generally. She equates this imbalance with the pressures of achieving good grades that she feels necessitates maximum amount of time devoted to practical work. She has begun to question this imbalance between understanding and doing by considering what the pupils have actually learnt.

She says:

> *"I found that you're really obsessive with what their final results are*
> *going to be, because you really need a piece of work by the end of the*
> *term, and that might be the one reason why the art history sometimes gets*
> *left out. In a way, that's a big missing thing. The drawings are good, but*
> *they haven't actually learnt anything about what they're looking at."*

<u>School visit to the V&A</u>
In advance of the visit, Case B still selected *Critical Interpretations* as the most significant session in the taught part of the course, however it was difficult to identify any connections between this session and the way she had chosen to approach her scheme of work and school visit. The aim of the visit was "*for students to creatively record information and identify with the work on show."* There is a shift in emphasis from that of "*creative questioning"* to "*creatively record*" and that symbols and meaning are now absent as is any reference to critical and historical knowledge and discussion.

The visit to the Nehru Gallery was characterised by good planning. Pupils knew exactly what they would be doing before they arrived. Practical activity dominated the session pupils chose artworks and made drawings of them onto the sections of prepared patchwork sheets of paper. Case B directing and supported them with practical tasks, giving individual advice re their drawing activities in relation to the project as a whole. The emphasis of the day was on working towards a predetermined finished product, there was little emphasis on gaining an understanding of the objects.

<u>Follow up: reflections on own practice</u>
Case B identified the following changes to her teaching were to do with the management of the museum and gallery visit:

> *"Management of the group in the gallery and that would be one of the key*
> *things and making sure they are all really prepared before they come to*
> *the gallery, they know exactly what they are going to do and they are kind*
> *of quite geared up for it, because some of them want it to be a day off. "*

However Case B's comments reflect a continuing concern that her teaching is devoid of a critical element. She did not make explicit connections between the course and what she has felt able or confident to do in terms of teaching in the museum or gallery. Instead she reiterated points that she has made on earlier occasion. Her emphasis was

centred on teaching practical skills, stating the difficulties of integrating a critical/contextual dimension into schemes of work and pressures to achieve good examination results.

> *"Reflecting on the way I teach I'm kind of hands-on practical. I mean there is some art history, but on reflection I'd like to put more emphasis on kind of looking at work and analysing it more and spending a bit longer talking about work. Because I really do feel the pressure in our school, especially to do it at GCSE to make the really good grades to have really good work straight away in year 10. I spend all the time thinking right we've got to make something and its got to be really good straight away in every lesson. Perhaps I do get too caught up in all that."*

Case B suggests that the museum or gallery educator should ideally be the person to take responsibility for the critical and contextual elements.

> *"I think it would be really good if there was someone at the gallery to give a talk to give out information."*

She now refers to "*giving a talk*" or "*giving out information*" as opposed to discussion. Case B had never used the teaching services offered by some museum and gallery education departments but was now able to see their potential to supplement her own teaching.

> *"I think also as teachers we are never going to know everything about the gallery and it would have been good, I don't know, I still think the specialists could have helped. Then I could have gone to the Indian gallery and said I want to know more about this or this, but I suppose there just aren't enough people in places as big as this (the V&A)."*

Reflections on the course 6 months on

Over a period of 6 months Case B's ability to see the relevance of the transferable interpretative approaches presented in the course appears to have diminished. Although initially enthusiastic about new approaches and how she intended to develop her own practice, she later appeared less committed. She also mentioned *artists' interventions* (session led by James Putnam) for the first time, she says that this is:

> *"Quite an interesting idea because I think that's similar to the way the schools could work, putting their work into galleries."*

It seems that Case B's recollection of the artists' interventions significantly omits the critical dimensions inherent in all the artists' practice. She has not remembered that the artists were not just exhibiting their work but entering into a critical dialogue with collections through their interventions.

Overview

Case Study B had some undergraduate experience of museums and galleries and remembered PGCE course activities in museums and galleries which she characterised as having a practical bias – making drawings for exam work. In the initial discussion

she recognised that she neglected aspects of critical/contextual studies in her own teaching and favoured an exclusively practical approach because she saw this as the way to achieve the best examination results. Early in the course she questioned this imbalance between making and understanding and set out to implement changes within her own practice. As time progressed the incentive to do this diminished and towards the end of the course she recognised that it was possible that someone else could compensate for the limitations in her teaching.

Outcomes in terms of continuing professional development

- Emphasis on planning and preliminary visits;
- Identification of strengths and limitations;
- Desire to stay with and justify existing practice;
- Realisation that other professionals (such as museum and gallery educators) could support her by providing teaching services to compliment her limitations
- Limited concept of how pupils could achieve good exam results appeared to effect willingness to develop new approaches;
- Less able to see the relevance of the course as time passed.

## Case Study C

Academic background including use of museums and galleries

Case C studied Fine Art and graduated in 1996. Museums and galleries featured in her undergraduate learning experiences but not as a formalised or taught part of the course. Works of art were not discussed in the gallery with tutors or students. She says:

> *"I remember particularly going on about two trips, one to the Royal Academy and a vague memory of going to another one with the whole of the painting section and it was just really to introduce us to the museums. There was no structure to the education or anything like that, there was no purpose behind it, it was just to introduce us to it but it was quite good because it made us go."*

Case C completed her PGCE course in 1997 and has been teaching for 4 years at which point issues relating to teaching in museums and galleries were addressed and discussed.

> *"There was a module - we went to the Fitzwilliam Museum and we had a brilliant tour of that and there was a really good educational director or lecturer who showed us round, we were in the role of the children and she was showing us all around the museum and getting us to think beyond the visual: how it got to be made and why it was there and who made it and so on. I think that has had quite a big influence on me actually."*

This aspect of the course had a strong impact but unfortunately Case C was unable to visit museums and galleries with pupils as part of her initial teaching experience.

Views on using museums and galleries prior to the course

Case C acknowledged that she had taken pupils to galleries on several occasions however she had not really considered visiting museums. She also felt that there were some clear distinctions between teaching in the classroom and teaching in the gallery:

> *"Having to think on your feet quickly because there might be a piece of work you haven't read up on or seen. So it's quite different from a classroom situation when you're in control of the resources you're putting on show."*

In approaching working with art and artefacts Case C perceived that the pedagogical modus operandi would be (in her words) "a lecture". After Martin Barnes, curator of the exhibition *Breathless*, had given an introductory talk to the CPD participants, (which did not emphasise discussion or questioning). Case C commented:

> *"That reinforced my confidence in myself, I had actually given a lecture with slides for sixth formers and it was nice to know that I'd actually been saying the things he'd been saying* (Martin Barnes from V&A*). I thought I didn't really know anything, but actually I do, and I know more than the kids."*

Initial reaction to taught CPD course

Case C initially identified *Working with Objects* as the most significant session. It was also clear from her comments that she had also absorbed a lot of ideas from the two days connected with interpretation of art and artefacts. She stated that she would like to incorporate issues on curating/collecting and encourage and promote methods of interpretation and 'de-coding meaning'.

School visit to the V&A

Case C was the only participant who selected to work with a lower school group because she was aware that these are the groups that are least often taken to museums and galleries.

> *"They often get overlooked particularly year seven or year eight, I think it's quite important to establish a culture within kids so that they can get some understanding of what they gain out of a museum or gallery so they can apply that to other places for the rest of their lives."*

She identified '*Critical Interpretations*' '*Working with objects*' and '*the Curator's Voice*' as the most significant sessions. Her scheme of work and visit to the V&A reflect her initial aims and emphasise: value, personal choice, issues of curatorship, displacement, display, and reservation. The aim of the visit was :

> *"Getting kids to think about what they value at home and if they could put those in a museum, what sort of museum would it be or creating your own museum within school --- or display and labelling and all of those other issues - they could, hopefully come away from the whole thing feeling more confident about a gallery experience".*

The visit was well prepared in advance and was sequenced to fall in the middle of a scheme of work. A resource pack with a series of activities was designed and provided for students to work in small groups and independently. Case C selected pieces of work to talk about in each of the galleries pupils were to work in. Students gathered round as she gave her reasons for choosing particular works, they were then asked to make their own choices reflecting on their teachers' rationales for selection.

Case C felt that the project had been extremely successful and she had gained a lot of confidence from that.

> "If I look back at my aims and objectives, I think I achieved them. I set out to create a kind of structure that they could use wherever they went, however old they were, whether they went to an art gallery or the V&A."

She also identified changes in her approach to teaching:

> "I think most importantly it's given me a fresh view of museums and what they can offer, artefacts, what they can offer the art curriculum. Automatically you go to an art gallery but not necessarily the V&A so I think that's really changed our professional practice we can now use the V&A."

She stated that she had re-thought the students' involvement:

> "I 'd like them to have some kind of ownership, and also to be quite directed as well. Quite specific tasks, but allow them their own interpretations, that's something I've learnt... I think the personal analysis the kids are really interested in, why is it we're choosing things and so on."

Impact on students

Case C started to collect evidence from which she could analyse the effect her teaching has had on pupils' learning. She used a questionnaire to find out what pupils thought they had learnt and experienced through the project:

> "The questionnaire was very good, most of them said they would like to go back to the V&A."

> "I was asking whether they considered these plaster casts bottles (the pupils' art works, see front cover) as art and had a major discussion on whether it was art or not. They said 'yes it is Art, we've made it, we've changed it!'"

Reflection 6 months on

She identified changes in her teaching: firstly that she had become much more aware of curatorial issues:

> "I now say how does one image affect the other? Why has somebody put those there? Somebody has definitely considered it, it's not by accident, you are not just walking in to a room and thing how they are left, there is a purpose to it."

She was interested in furthering her own knowledge about the interpretative methods that were explored in the course. Reflecting on Barthes' (1981) use of the terms 'studium' and 'punctum', she says:

> " It was like a particular point which was fascinating and I knew we had to dwell on that, think about it and direct it in our own way. I don't think it was directly related to how we were going to teach, I think we elected to take what we could from it."

She greatly valued the collegiality and reflective space that enabled her to plan the project and rehearse the visit to the V&A and thought that the written assignment was particularly important for her understanding of key issues, she says:

> "The actual process of thinking about it, writing about it and re writing was essential, I think the strengths are, I can't put it in words…. it's like forcing you to do beyond what you would do normally.  I think it's very easy just to sit back and do your teaching but having entered on to the course has really helped to extend it."

> "Next year I can start volunteering to have my roles in the department changed, so I can be in charge of trips to museums and galleries and be a bit more proactive in those roles."

Overview

Case Study C had some experience of museums and galleries during undergraduate studies but more as independent study than as taught sessions.  Had clear recollections of museum and gallery learning during PGCE year.  Since gaining Qualified Teacher Status, she had visited galleries quite frequently with student but not museums.  Her approaches to both choice of venue (always to galleries) and methods for managing visit (usually achieved through resources/activity packs) reflected the ethos of the art and design department in which she works.

Case C engaged fully with all aspects of the course and used it to plan an innovative scheme of work with year 7 pupils.  Over the duration of the course she increased her professional engagement with key aspects of learning in the museum and gallery context.  Through extensive reading and reflective practice she effectively implemented and analysed changes and developments within her own practice and the subsequent effects on pupils' learning.

Outcomes in terms of continuing professional development

- Overcome own and departmental prejudice about using museums as well as art galleries as resources for learning in Art and Design;
- Realised the importance of clear connections between museum/gallery visit and art practice in the classroom;
- Extended knowledge and understanding through engagement with pertinent texts on museum and gallery learning, art and design pedagogy;
- Made connections between issues of context, curatorship, interpretation and the relationship of historical artefacts to contemporary art and design practice;
- Self-initiated new role within the department - to take responsibility for co-ordination of museum and gallery visits.

**Conclusion**

These three case studies illustrate the potential for a sustained and targeted approach to using museum and gallery collections.  This has been shown to have a significant and lasting impact on teachers' use of museums and galleries as resources for learning.
It is important to note that the outcomes for individual teachers were all to some degree conditioned by their prior experiences of using museums and galleries during their undergraduate studies, their PGCE studies and during the course of their teaching.
There are internal factors, such as confidence and motivation and external factors such

as exam standards and department practice that can help or hinder the individual's progress and rate of change.


**Chapter Summary**

After six months all participants found their INSET session/CPD course valuable and had developed skills, knowledge and confidence.  The ideas and activities they developed as a result of the INSET session/CPD course had a positive impact on their pupils and colleagues.  The outcomes also corroborate earlier findings that museum and gallery INSET sessions/CPD courses are very successful in encouraging and enabling teachers to facilitate links between the exhibits and their pupils' realities.

One-day INSET sessions are of benefit to participants and they value them particularly when they can see a direct impact of the session on pupils' practical coursework.  However, there is a perception that if no discernable educational activity/strategy is formed following an INSET session it is of little value, regardless if the course has provided stimulation, enrichment and reflective thinking on practice.

Evaluation from the pilot accredited CPD course *Critical Interventions* demonstrates that, in comparison to one day INSET sessions, this form of CPD is more effective in enabling **all** participants to gain and sustain new or refined educational strategies and in increasing their commitment to CPD.

For each INSET session/CPD course, every participant will have a different starting point (previous experience in using museums and galleries) and opportunities and constraints (e.g. status, exam pressures, departmental practice) that will influence the developmental route they take and how far along the route they will travel.

# CHAPTER 7: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**Summary of Findings**

**Teachers' undergraduate and ITE experiences**
- Art and Design teachers' undergraduate art and design courses and how they were taught directly influence their confidence and ability to use museums and galleries as an educational resource.

- Successful completion of a Post Graduate Certificate in Education course in Art and Design does not significantly develop teachers' abilities and confidence and ability to teach in museums and galleries.

**Teachers in the museum / gallery context**
- Art and Design teachers perceive a distinct change in their role when they take school groups to visit museums or galleries moving away from an 'active educator' and becoming a more 'passive organiser' in the gallery space.

- The majority of teachers take years 10 – 13 students (those who have elected to take Art and Design as an examination subject) to museums and galleries. Years 7 –9 are taken much less frequently.

- Art and Design teachers use a range of criteria to select which museums and galleries to visit. They recognise the strengths and weaknesses in educational services provided e.g. quality of publications, provision of workshops / gallery talks and attitudes of staff towards school groups.

- Art and Design teachers usually undertake preparation for museum and gallery visits in their own time (after school and at the weekends) and frequently incur personal expenditure.

- Written materials and preliminary visits are most frequently used forms of preparation for a museum or gallery visit.

  - Art and Design teachers do not consider teachers' evenings provide an appropriate opportunity to study the content of exhibitions in depth. However, these evenings are regarded as an opportunity to gain free access and to acquire reference materials.

**Museum / gallery INSET**
- Within their first five years of employment, few teachers of Art and Design in London and the South East attend a museum or gallery INSET session.

- Art and Design teachers who have attended a museum / gallery INSET session are more confident to make links between exhibits and pupils' personal realities but do not gain the confidence needed for effective communication in museums and galleries or adequate knowledge of interpretative methods.

- Art and Design teachers acknowledge the value of museum and gallery INSET because it allows them to gain skills, knowledge and confidence. However they value it less than other educational services provided by museums and galleries.

- There are anomalies between what museum and gallery educators think they are providing through INSET sessions and what teachers of Art and Design think they have received.

- In comparison to one day INSET sessions, the pilot accredited 30 hour CPD course proved to be more successful in both enabling teachers to develop and sustain educational strategies and increasing their commitment to the value of CPD.

**Museum and gallery educators**
- The pedagogic methods that teachers use in museums and galleries differ from those used by museum and gallery educators. Teachers use sketchbook and worksheet activities to record information about, while museum and gallery educators employ discussion and questioning techniques to help pupils to interpret exhibits.

- A significant proportion of museum and gallery educators are critical of teachers' abilities to conduct successful independent visits.

- Museum/gallery educators and teachers do not always share an understanding of each others priorities for a successful school visits. Teachers evaluate success by evidence of the visit in pupils' course work, museum and gallery educators evaluate success by pupils feeling 'at home' in the museum or gallery and wanting to return.

**Recommendations**

**Museum and galleries are encouraged to:**
- reconceptualise the role of INSET, the aims, objectives and intended outcomes to develop teachers' independent use of museum and gallery resources. We recommend that this process brings the opportunity to create a new name which incorporates the ethos of collaboration and sharing expertise

- work along side Further and Higher Education lecturers of Art, Craft and Design to increase opportunities for integrating structured critical use of museums and galleries in undergraduate degree course requirements

- provide a variety of INSET activities in recognition that teachers in the first five years of teaching are currently the lowest attendees of museum and gallery INSET and that Art and Design teachers have different needs - their various experiences, training, professional expertise and confidence will define their needs, use and response to INSET

- offer teachers and lecturers the opportunity to explore new ways of teaching and learning in gallery spaces along-side their students

- maximise teachers' use of preliminary visits by finding ways to facilitate and support them.

**Implication for governmental agencies regarding initial teacher education, and continuing professional development of teachers and museum and gallery staff.**

DfES should:
- encourage the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) and the General Teaching Council (GTC) to have discussions with the museum and gallery sector, with the aim of to developing strategic partnerships that will increase the use of their resources by the education sector as a whole

- acknowledge and strengthen the importance of partnerships between the cultural sector and the education sector in  BEd and PGCE courses.

ITE providers should:
- recognise the importance of prior learning at undergraduate level on students' confidence to use museums and galleries as a learning resource

- ensure that all student teachers are given the opportunity to experience aspects of learning and teaching in museums and galleries during their ITE period

- examine the effectiveness of various pedagogical approaches in museums and galleries

- Work in partnership with museums and galleries to develop and offer CPD courses for trainee teachers.

TTA / GTC should:
- recognise the importance of museums and galleries in the continuing professional development of teachers by creating a strategic  framework that includes: sabbaticals and  exchanges, to enable teachers to develop skills and knowledge over a period of time

- accelerate the implementation of recommendations by other bodies (such as Resource and the DCMS) allowing trainee teachers and newly qualified teachers to use museums and galleries as an alternative place to the classroom for developing their professional skills.

Institute of Learning and Teaching in Higher Education should:
- recognise the importance of teaching through the use of museum and galleries and encourage lecturers to use these resources with students in a structured and integrated way.

OFSTED is invited to consider:
- monitoring the extent to which group visits to museums and galleries feature in programmes of work at key stage 3.

The Department for Culture Media and Sport should:
- ensure that Resource and the Arts Council are actively seeking ways in which standards of INSET / CPD delivery are considered and improved.

<u>Resource should:</u>
- include in its Standards for Learning the need for quality INSET / CPD and continue to give advice and promote areas of good practice
- encourage sustained INSET provision which is linked into courses with Institutions of Higher Education
- continue to act as advocate on behalf of museums and galleries regarding policy and legislation developed by QCA, TTA and OFSTED.

<u>Arts Council should:</u>
- monitor and evaluate the use of INSET / CPD and other collaborations between teachers and arts agencies during the Creative Partnership scheme
- monitor and evaluate examples of good practice from schools in the Arts Mark Scheme.

<u>Professional Groups (such as Group for Education in Museums and **engage**) should:</u>
- encourage and collaborate in the provision of training/ conferences on the role of INSET and other CPD initiatives for teachers and museum and gallery educators.

**Recommendations for schools / teachers**

<u>Schools should:</u>
- monitor the visits made to museums and galleries by all age groups and work along side museum and gallery education staff to increase the opportunities for visits by years seven, eight and nine
- be aware of teachers' individual strengths and limitations when using museums and galleries as sites for learning
- encourage teachers of Art and Design, particularly those in their NQT year, to undertake CPD initiatives in using museums and galleries as resources for learning.

<u>Teachers should:</u>
- seek out opportunities to strengthen existing practice and address areas requiring further development
- consider the learning outcomes of visits made to museums and galleries and how the staff and pupils can raise standards by making full use of the resources available
- secure and maintain professional relationships with museum and gallery educators.

# REFERENCES

Anderson, D. (1999), (sec.ed.) *A Common Wealth*, London: The Stationery Office.

Barthes, R. (1981), *Camera Lucida: Reflections on photography*, London: Jonathan Cape

Board of Education (1931), *Museums and schools: Memorandum on the possibility of increased co-operation between public museums and public educational institutions Educational Pamphlets No.87*, London: HMSO.

Cheng, Y. and Cheung, W. (1996), A Multi-level Framework for Self - Management in School. *International Journal of Educational Management* **10** (1) pp. 17-29, Bradford: MCB University Press.

Cheng, Y. and Cheung, W. (1997), Multi-models of Education Quality and Multi-levels of Self - Management in Schools, *Educational Management and Administration* **25** pp.451-462

Clive, S. and Geggie, P. (1998), *Unpacking Teachers Packs,* London: engage.

Campaign for Learning in Museums and Galleries/Cultural Heritage National Training Organisation (2001), *Fast track to improving skills in the museums, galleries and heritage education sectors. Report and recommendations,* Bradford: clmg/CHNTO.

Dadds, M. (1993), The feeling of thinking in professional self study. *Educational action research*, **1** pp. 287 – 303, Wallingford: Triangle Journals.

Day, C. (1999), *Developing teachers: The challenge of lifelong learning,* London: Falmer Press.

Department of Culture Media and Sport/Department for Education and Employment (2000), *The Learning Power of Museums-A Vision for Museum Education*, London: DCMS/DfEE.

Department of Education and Science (1973), *Provincial museums and galleries,* London: HMSO.

Department of Education and Science (1990), *A survey of the use of museum resources by pupils aged 5-9*, *HMI Report*, London: DES.

Department for Education and Employment (1999), *Teachers' Professional Development – the challenge of change*, Technical consultation document on pay and performance, London: DfEE.

Department for Education and Employment (2000*), Professional Development: Support for Teaching and Learning,* DfEE ref. no 00008/2000.

Department for Education and Employment (2001*), Good Value CPD: a code of practice for providers of professional development,* London: DfEE.

Department for Education and Employment (2001), *Learning and Teaching: a strategy for Professional development,* London: DfEE.

Eraut, M. (1994), *Developing Professional Knowledge and Competence,* London: The Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. (1982), *The Meaning of Educational Change*, Toronto: OISE Press.

Goddard, D. (1989), GRIST: The development of the design. In: McBride, R. (1989), *The In-service training of teachers: some issues and perspectives,* London: Falmer Press.

Harland, J. and Kinder, K. (1995), *Arts in their view: a study of youth participation in the Arts,* Slough: NFER.

Harland, J. and Kinder, K. (1999), *Crossing the line: extending young people's access to cultural venues*, London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.

Harland, J. (1999), *Thank you for the days? How schools use their non-contact days*, Slough: NFER.

Harland, J. et al (2000), *Arts Education in Secondary schools: Effects and Effectiveness,* Slough: NFER.

Hooper Greenhill, E. (ed.) (1996*), Improving museum learning*, Nottingham: East Midlands Museums Service.

Hopkins, D. and Harris, A. (2000), *Creating the conditions for teaching and learning – A handbook of staff development activities,* London: David Fulton.

Joyce, B. and Showers, B. (1988), *Student achievement through staff development*, New York: Longman.

Law, S. (1997), Leadership for learning: the changing culture of professional development in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration and History* **37** (1) pp. 66-79, Leeds: School of Education, University of Leeds.

McBride, R. (1989), *The In- service training of teachers: some issues and perspectives*, London: Falmer Press.

McKenzie, B. (2001), Working with schools on the problems of looking, Engage **8** pp. 22 -26.

Miers, H. A. (1928), *A Report on the Public Museums of the British Isles,* Edinburgh: Carnegie UK Trust.

Millet, A. (1995), *Securing Excellence in Teaching,* TTA First Annual Lecture Royal Society,31st October 1995.

MORI (1995), *Survey of Continuing Professional Development: Research Study Conducted for Teacher Training Agency,* London: TTA.

National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education (1999*), All our Futures: Creativity, Culture and Education*,  DCMS & DfEE.

Nicholls, G. (1997), *Collaborative Change in Education,*  London: Kogan Page.

Rhodes, C. & Houghton-Hill, S. (2000), The Linkage of Continuing Professional Development and the Classroom Experience of pupils: barriers perceived by senior managers in some secondary schools,  *Journal of In-service Education* **26** (3) pp. 423-434,  Wallington, Oxon: Triangle Journals.

Selwood, S., Clive, S. & Irving, D. (1995), *An enquiry into young people and art galleries*,  London: Art and Society.

Talboys, G. K. (1996*), Using museums as an educational resource: an introductory handbook for students and teachers*,  Sevenoaks: Arena.

# APPENDIX 1
# CASE STUDY:  VICTORIA AND ALBERT MUSEUM

The data given below is intended as a bench mark for other museums to aid evaluation and comparison.  Information has been gathered from a range of sources including annual reports, evaluations by V& A staff and figures for the Department of Culture, Media and Sport.

## Number of School Parties a Year

Figures for the DCMS 1/4/2000 - 31/3/01: Total 44,281
Figures from Vista bookings package records June 1st 2000 - June 31st 2001: Total 41,731

## Details Regarding the Provision of INSET

*Table I:    Details on INSET 1996–2001 (each year's figures are from September to July)*

| Year | Nos. of sessions for teachers: INSETs TE Teachers' Even. EGDD Education Group Develop. days | Nos. of teachers attending | Nos. of  sessions cancelled (INSET is cancelled if under 8 persons booking) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sept 1995 - July1996 | 30 INSET | 416  (17 per INSET) | 5 |
| | 2 TE | 866 | |
| | 11 EGDD | 153 | 1 |
| 1996-1997 | 32 INSET | 131  (12 per INSET) | 2 |
| | 5 TE | 230 | |
| | 12 EGDD | 162 | 2 |
| 1997-8 | 16 INSET | 241  (19 per INSET) | 3 |
| | 2 TE | 171 TE | |
| | 8 EGDD | 107 | 1 |
| 1998-9 | 8 INSET | 96  (16 per INSET) | 2 |
| | 4 TE | 644 | |
| | 6 EGDD | 106 | 1 |
| 1999-2000 | 10 INSET | 98  (11 per INSET) | 1 |
| | 3 TE | 530 | |
| | 7 EGDD | 114 | |
| 2000-2001 | 6 INSET | 36 | 2 |
| | 2 TE | 239 | |
| | 7 EGDD | 115 | |

Content:  V&A INSET includes the following activities: gallery tours, practical sessions (e.g. making mosaics), handling objects, talks by curators, developing and trialing activities for students, exercises for teaching in the galleries.

Aims of sessions include: raising awareness of facilities and resources, stimulating ideas for school group visits, providing an introduction to, and developing further understanding of a subject area, giving an opportunity to preview temporary exhibition (evening openings), highlighting specific links to the National Curriculum e.g. literacy and numeracy.

**Initiatives in INSET**

Over the past six years, a number of initiatives have been taken to provide greater access and offer opportunities for continuing professional development.  Sessions such as Bookmaking and Hat making have been run on Saturdays during the years 1997-9 to encourage teachers to bring along their families.  It was decided to change this provision into a two-day format; Friday includes an introduction and exploration of a theme led by an artist in the galleries, Saturday is for practical artwork inspired by the Friday session.

The V&A established links with the IoE between 1995-1997 which enabled V& A INSET courses to be accredited number of the as a part of an IoE Advanced Diploma in Professional Studies.  Unfortunately, due to poor take up, the scheme was folded.

**INSET Fees**

The cost of an INSET day to the school can be from £5-£65.  This does not include the cost of the supply teacher required to take the teacher's classes while absent.  For an Educational Group Development Day the cost can be up to £395 for a group of maximum twelve persons.  Teachers' Evenings are free but tickets must be booked in advance.

**Publicity**

A brochure outlining the term's or year's INSET/Teachers' Evenings is sent out to every school in inner and outer London area and South East England. Brochures are sent to INSET co-ordinators with a subject specific circulation list on the front cover. At present the detail of teachers and schools (such as visiting frequency/ subject area) on the Vista booking programme is not used in the mailing process.

**Return Visits Following an INSET**

The data from a random selection of INSET days over three years was examined to see if there was any relationship between teachers attending an INSET and their previous or subsequent visiting patterns.

*Table II:  The visiting pattern of teachers and schools in relation to teachers'*
*attendance of a V&A INSET session*

| Action taken | 1998-9 | 1999-2000 | 2000 -2001 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Nos. of teachers attending three INSETs in the year | 39 attendees | 36 | 30 |
| Nos. of teachers attending other V&A INSET | 9 (23%) | 8 (22%) | 3 (10%) |
| Nos. of school visiting the V&A for the first time after attending the INSET | 2 (5%) | 4 (11%) | 1 (3%) |
| Nos. of schools visiting the V&A prior to INSET | 14 (35%) | 9 (25%) | 8 (27%) |

Table II indicates that attending an INSET session is more likely to happen as a result of a visit rather than the other way round, in producing a visit.  Once a school has visited the museum, teachers become interested in, or look out for information about the INSET programme either through receiving details through the post or by acquiring literature while on the visit.


**Education Group Development Days**

These days are publicised in the V&A's INSET brochure and are tailor made to the needs and interests of the individual groups.  The most common group is primary schools who come from London and South East England.  The aim of these days is to highlight the general benefits of museum and gallery visiting and not to specifically focus on a visit to the V& A.  A number of schools have their own collections and are frequent users of a range of cultural sites and institutions in their locality.  Evidence of this non-V&A focus can be seen in the data collected by the Museum. By checking the names of the schools, out of 32 primary schools who arranged an Educational Group Development Day between 1995-2001, only 6% of the schools returned to make a class visit to the galleries while 19% had already visited (as individual classes) before the Development Day.

Other groups who participate in these days include Initial Teacher Training students and local authority advisory groups.  Tracking these groups over the years, there are a number of return visits.  However it should be noted that it is the institution which returns (i.e.  an HEI providing ITE) with new students rather than the same students returning the following year.


**How Teachers Prepare Themselves for a Visit to the V&A**

The research team prepared a questionnaire on teachers' use of museum and gallery educational provisions prior to a visit to the V&A.  It consisted of eight questions and was sent out to all teachers/lecturers (regardless of subject and age group taught) who

booked an educational group visit to the V&A.  Three hundred and fifty five forms were collected from June 2000-June 2001 of which 250 were analysed.  The forms were sent out to all schools with the confirmation letter for their booked visit.  Reasons for rejecting the remainder were as follows: incomplete or the groups were adult education, ESOL, non institutionally based e.g. education at home, extra curricular school clubs which were beyond the remit of the research.

The 250 were separated out into primary, secondary, further and higher education.  Thirteen out of the 250 were non-UK institutions (7 secondary, 4 FE and 2 HE), 17 out of the 250 were in Education Action Zones.  Fifty out of 250 were private with the remainder (80%) state funded.

*Table III: The priorities for each educational grouping in making preparations for a visit to the V&A*

| Preparing for a visit | Totals 250 | Primary (34) | Secondary (114) | FE (69) | HE  (33) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Preliminary Visit | **139** | 20 (59%) | 66 (58%) | 31 (45%) | 22 (67%) |
| Phone call | **130** | 21 (62%) | 58 (51%) | 36 (52%) | 15 (45.5%) |
| V&A Publications | **56** | 12 (35%) | 30 (26%) | 9 (13%) | 5 (15%) |
| INSET | **17** | 2 (6%) | 12 (10.5%) | 3 (4%) | 0 |

Preliminary visits and phone calls are key methods for preparing for a visit.  Telephone calls are essential if teachers wish to book the lunch room and confirm that galleries and exhibitions are accessible.  The V&A offers free entry to any teacher wishing to arrange a preliminary visit, although most teachers seem unaware of this offer.

From November 2001, the necessity for a free entry ceased as entry charges have been dropped following a DCMS and Treasury grant to those national museums that had charged for entry.

*Table IV: Other methods used for preparing a visit or used in conjunction with one or more of those in Table III*

| Other methods used for preparing a visit | Total 250 | Primary 34 | Secondary 114 | F.E 69 | H.E  33 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non -V&A publications | **64** | 10 | 32 | 18 | 4 |
| Coursework | **57** | 9 | 27 | 13 | 8 |
| Website | **29** | 3 | 13 | 12 | 1 |
| Reviews in the media | **15** | 0 | 6 | 6 | 3 |
| Previous visits | **13** | 0 | 5 | 6 | 2 |

**What are the Groups Visiting?**

*Table V: Areas of the Museum that are being visited (Note that some groups visit both temporary exhibitions and main galleries.)*

| Visiting what? | Primary 34 | Secondary 114 | FE 69 | HE 33 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Main galleries (permanent) | 21 | 93 | 43 | 18 |
| Temporary exhibitions | 17 | 34 | 37 | 19 |
| Study collections (e.g Print Room) | 1 | 12 | 12 | 7 |
| National Art Library | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

For primary schools, further and higher education institutions, the difference between temporary and permanent is less significant than it is for secondary schools. This could not be put down to relevance, for the exhibitions covered during the period were Art Nouveau, Brand.New, the Victorians and a range of smaller photographic exhibitions held in the Canon Gallery that were all appropriate for secondary programmes of study.

Perhaps this indicates that secondary staff are not always able to respond quickly enough to the dates of temporary exhibitions. Or perhaps they experience difficulty in gaining enough information on the subject in advance to make use of the material in school.

**What Subjects are the Visits Supporting?**

*Table VI: Subject area the visits were supporting. Many groups would be covering more than one subject.*

| Subject area | Total 250 | Primary 34 | Secondary 114 | FE 69 | HE 33 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Art & Design | 116 | 14 | 60 | 33 | 9 |
| DT (inc. textiles) | 56 | 2 | 32 | 18 | 4 |
| Art History | 23 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 9 |
| Photography | 14 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 1 |
| History | 37 | 27 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Business studies | 15 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4 |
| Language | 12 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Cultural studies | 8 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Maths | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Religious studies | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Architecture & Interior Design | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Music | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Others * | 7 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |

* These are one off mentions such as: floral design, geography, performing arts, learning resources

70% of the overall visits are linked to the subject areas of Art & Design, Photography and Art History which are well represented in the collections. However it should be noted that for primary schools, the majority of visits are to extend or support the History curriculum.

**When Do Groups Visit?**

*Table VII:     Patterns of visiting on a monthly basis (June 2000-June 2001)*

| Month | Total | Primary | Secondary | FE | HE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| June 00 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| July | 8 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| August | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| September | 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| October | 28 | 2 | 15 | 6 | 5 |
| November | 45 | 4 | 16 | 18 | 7 |
| December | 23 | 2 | 11 | 7 | 3 |
| Jan 01 | 30 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 5 |
| February | 32 | 3 | 18 | 7 | 4 |
| March | 27 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 2 |
| April | 10 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| May | 15 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| June 01 | 18 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 1 |

*Table VIII:     Patterns of visiting on a termly basis (September 2000-June 2001)*

| Terms | Total | Primary | Secondary | FE | HE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sept 00– December 00 | 102 | 9 | 46 | 32 | 15 |
| Jan 01- March 01 | 89 | 8 | 43 | 27 | 11 |
| April – June 01 | 43 | 14 | 20 | 7 | 2 |

Noting that all groups, except the primary schools, favour the autumn and spring terms for visiting, as the summer term is set aside for national exams and student exhibitions.

**Temporary exhibitions programme**

Art Nouveau          March – September 2000
Brand.New            October – March 2001
TheVictorians        April – September 2001

The Canon Gallery also has a regular temporary exhibition programme.

**Analysis of data regarding the subject areas: Art and Design, Design and Technology and History of Art**

Data relating to teachers who mentioned that their visit was supporting the curriculum subjects Art and Design, Design and Technology and History of Art were further investigated. (Note a visit may have linked into more than one subject area)

*Table IX: How these teachers prepare for their V&A visit*

| Form of preparation | Total 195 | Art & Design 116 | Design & Technology 56 | History of Art 23 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Preliminary visit | **121** | 71 | 32 | 18 |
| Phone call | **96** | 55 | 33 | 8 |
| Non-V&A publications | **59** | 35 | 19 | 5 |
| Own resources/ curriculum materials | **49** | 20 | 20 | 9 |
| V&A publications | **47** | 30 | 12 | 5 |
| Website | **21** | 17 | 3 | 1 |
| Previous class visits | **18** | 10 | 7 | 1 |
| INSET | **10** | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Reviews | **4** | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Colleagues | **2** | 1 | 1 | 0 |

**To rank the preparation activities 1-5**

| Art & Design 116 | Design and Technology 56 | History of Art 23 |
|---|---|---|
| 1st Preliminary visit | Phone call | Preliminary visit |
| 2nd Phone call | Preliminary visit | Own educ. resources |
| 3rd Non-V&A pubs | Own educational resources | Phone calls |
| 4th V&A publication | Non-V&A publications | V&A publications |
| 5th Own ed. resources | V&A publications | A range |

History of Art teachers appear to be more independent and less reliant on the Museum to support them than the other two groups of teachers. This appears to corroborate the findings from the 68 Art and Design teachers discussed in Chapter 4.

**Awareness of the V&A free educational materials by the different subject areas**

- 55% of those citing Art & Design as a focus for the visit were aware
- 41.5% of those citing Design and Technology
- 39% of those citing History of Art

*Table X:* *Which V& A galleries/study areas the three subject areas visit (again groups may visit more than one area)*

| *Exhibits visited?* | *Art & Design 116* | *Design Technology 56* | *History of Art 23* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Permanent galleries | 97 (84%) | 43 (77%) | 20 (87%) |
| Temporary exhibitions. | 37 (31%) | 24 (43%) | 8 (35%) |
| Study collections | 16 | 10 | 3 |
| National Art Library | 1 | 0 | 1 |

The information revealed in Table X leads one to surmise that temporary exhibitions which are more likely to have modern/contemporary material, are favoured by Design and Technology groups, whereas the more classical/traditional collections are more frequently used by History of Art and Art and Design groups.

## ANALYSIS OF TELEPHONE DATA

Eight hundred and eighty four telephone calls made to the Learning and Visitor Services Department at the V&A between the period July 2000 to June 2001 were logged according to the purpose of the call.

*Table XI: Type of call each group made. To note that one call may be about a number of issues*

| Group | Total nos. calls | Booking a Visit | Asking general information | Request for free information | Preliminary visit | Inquiring about INSET | EAZ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Primary** | **172 19.5%** | 75 12% of booking 43.6% of primary | 61 30.2% of gen. Info 35.5% of primary | 62 44.3% of req. 36% of primary | 13 | 2 | 3 |
| **Secondary** | **339 38.3%** | 242 39% of booking 71.4% of sec | 72 35.6% of gen. Info 21.2% of sec. | 56 40% of req 16% of sec. | 13 | 3 | 1 |
| **Language** | **28 3.2%** | 25 4% of booking 89% of Lang. | 3 1.5% of gen. Info 10% of lang. | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **F. E** | **203 23%** | 159 25% of booking 78% of FE | 44 21.8% of gen. Info 21.7% of FE | 16 11.4% of req. 7.9% of FE | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| **H.E** | **141 16%** | 122 19.5% of booking 85.8% of HE | 21 10.4% of gen. info. 14.9% of HE | 5 3.6% of req. 3.5% of HE | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | **884** | **623** | **201** | **140** | **28** | **5** | **4** |

This supports the findings from the V&A publications questionnaire (250 respondents) by confirming that primary school teachers are more likely to seek advice about arranging a visit to the V&A than any other group, this includes advice on the phone, free written materials, preparing a preliminary visit. Their phone calls require more than just booking information.

HE lecturers are the most 'independent' group, as shown they phone principally to book a visit, and make little use of V&A publications and preliminary visits. The target audience for the free publications produced by the Learning and Visitor Services Department (formerly Education Department) is primary and secondary education. At present there are none targeted for tutors and lecturers from Higher Education.

APPENDIX 2:  CONTRIBUTORS TO THE RESEARCH


**The Participants of** *Critical Interpretations:* **A 30 hour Accredited CPD Course**

We would like to thank the heads and governors of the following schools for supporting their staff and the project.  In particular, we would like to thank the students who took part in the visits to the V&A for the exhibition of their work held at the V&A in June 2001.  Finally we would like to thank the seven Art and Design teachers who contributed so much to the course and the research.


Maggie Cameron
BRIT Performing Arts and Technology School (yr. group 12)
60, The Crescent
Croydon   CR0 2HN


Sally Clifton
Fortismere School (yr. group 7)
Creighton Avenue
Muswell Hill
London   N10 1NS


Isabel Coney
St. Marylebone C of E School (yr. group 10)
64 Marylebone High Street
London   W1M 4BA


Margaret Douglas
City of London Girls School (yr. group 10)
Barbican
London   EC2Y


Gwendoline Frye
Hampstead School (yr. group 13)
Westbere Rd
London   NW2 3RT


Vicky Gould
The Latymer School (yr. group 12)
Haselbury Rd
London   N9 9NT


Lynn Newell
Twyford C of E High School (yr. group 12)
Twyford Crescent
Acton
London   W3 9PP

**Participating London Museums and Galleries**

19 questionnaire respondents including 8 focus group members

Barbican Art Gallery, London EC2
British Museum, London WC1
Chisenhale Gallery, London E3 *
Courtauld Institute Gallery, London WC2
Crafts Council, London N1
Estorick Collection, London N1
Hayward Gallery, London SE1 *
Horniman Museum and Gardens, London SE3 *
Institute of Contemporary Art, London SW1
National Gallery, London WC2 *
National Portrait Gallery, London WC2
Photographers' Gallery, London WC2 *
Serpentine Art Gallery, London W2
Tate Britain, London SW1 *
Tate Modern, London SE1
The Design Museum, London SE1 *
Victoria and Albert Museum, London SW7
Wallace Collection, London W1
Whitechapel Art Gallery, London E1 *

\*   Indicates the institutions which were represented by a staff member at one of two
    focus groups


**Participating Schools**

The following schools from which staff participated in the Art and Design Teachers'
questionnaire, a focus group and attended either *Photography at the V&A* INSET
session or *Whose Interpretations?* Day INSET

| | |
|---|---|
| Acland Burghley | LB Camden |
| Bacon's College (C of E) | LB Southwark |
| Bancrofts (Ind) | Essex |
| Bishop Stopfords | LB Enfield |
| Brighton Hove & Sussex 6th Form | East Sussex |
| BRIT Performing Arts | LB Croydon |
| Bushey Hall School | Hertfordshire |
| Camden Girls (Vol Aided) | LB Camden |
| Carshalton High School for Girls | LB Sutton |
| Central Foundation Girls | LB Tower Hamlets |
| Charles Darwin | LB Bromley |
| Charles Edward Brook (Cof E) | LB Lambeth |
| Chesham Park Comprehensive | Buckinghamshire |
| Christ's College | LB Barnet |
| Christ's School | LB Richmond |
| Churchill Community College | North Somerset |
| City and Islington College (FE) | LB Islington |
| City of London (Ind) | City of London |

| | |
|---|---|
| Croham Hurst (Ind) | LB Croydon |
| Davis, Laing & Dick College (Ind) | LB Kensington & Chelsea |
| Edgeware School | LB Barnet |
| Ellen Wilkinson School | LB Ealing |
| Eltham Hill Technology College | LB Greenwich |
| George Abbott School (SEN) | Guildford |
| German School (Ind) | London |
| Gladesmore Community School | LB Haringey |
| Graveney  School | LB Wandsworth |
| Greycoats  School | LB Westminster |
| Hampstead School | LB Camden |
| Harpley Special School | LB Tower Hamlets |
| Henrietta Barnett Girls School | LB Barnet |
| Heston Community | LB Hounslow |
| Highbury Fields | LB Islington |
| Hounslow Manor | LB Hounslow |
| Islington Arts & Media | LB Islington |
| John Kelly Technology College | LB Brent |
| Kingsbury High School | LB Brent |
| Langdon School | LB Newham |
| Langley Park School | LB Bromley |
| Latymer School                        . | LB Enfield |
| London International Film School | LB Westminster |
| Marie Fidelis School | LB Camden |
| Mulberry School for Girls | LB Tower Hamlets |
| Norbury Manor Comprehensive | LB Croydon |
| North Westminster Community School | LB Westminster |
| Penn School (SEN) | LB Camden |
| Pimlico School | LB Westminster |
| Putney High School (Ind)  Girls | LB Richmond |
| Queen's School (Foundation) | Hertfordshire |
| Queen Mary's College  (6th form) | Hampshire |
| Queensmead School | LB Hillingdon |
| Ravenswood  School | LB Bromley |
| Reigate College  (6th Form) | Surrey |
| Robert Clack | LB Barking & Dagenham |
| Roding Valley High | Essex |
| Roundwood Park School | Hertfordshire |
| Sacred Heart RC Girls | LB Southwark |
| St Dominic's 6th Form College | LB Harrow |
| St Marylebone C. of E. School | LB Westminster |
| St Paul's Way School | LB Tower Hamlets |
| Sir John Cass School | LB Tower Hamlets |
| Southgate Comprehensive | LB Harrow |
| Streatham Hill & Clapham High (Ind) | LB Lewisham |
| Surbiton High (Ind) | LB Merton |
| Syon Park (SEN) | LB Hounslow |
| The Heathland Comprehensive | LB Hounslow |
| The John Roan | LB Greenwich |
| Tiffin School | LB Kinston upon Thames |
| Trinity School (Ind) | LB Croydon |
| Twyford C. of E. School | LB Ealing |

Ursuline High School                    LB Merton
Vyners School                          LB Hillingdon
Waldegrave School Girls          LB Richmond
Willowfield School                  LB Waltham Forest
Woodford High School            LB Redbridge

76 educational establishments involved, 85 individual teachers involved
67 state funded schools, 9 privately funded
4 Special Education Schools, 4 schools in Education Action Zones (EAZs)
17 schools with over 22% Free School Meals (though not all information is available)
42 mixed schools, 21 girls schools, 4 boys schools

*250 respondents to the V&A publications Questionnaire*
200 (80%) were state funded
of which 13 were non UK institutions (7 Secondary, 4 FE and 2 HE)
of which 17 were in EAZs
The remaining 50 educational institutions were privately funded

*6 attendees to the Art and Design teachers' focus group*
6 state funded secondary schools (self selected from Questionnaire 1 respondents)
of which 1 is in an EAZ

**Respondents from questionnaires relating to one day INSET Sessions:**
***Whose Interpretations* and *Photography at the V&A***
21 state schools/colleges including 2 Special Schools
3 privately funded

**7 attendees on CPD course *Critical Interventions***
6 state schools
1 privately funded

**884 Telephone calls from general education groups tracked at the V&A**
172 primary schools
339 secondary schools
28 language schools
203 Further Education Colleges
141 Higher Education Institutions
From the total 4 said they were in an Education Action Zone

# APPENDIX 3:  ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

**The Consultative Group**

**David Anderson,** Director of Learning and Visitors Services, Victoria and Albert Museum
**Lesley Burgess,** Lecturer in Art and Design Education, Art and Design Education Academic Group, Institute of Education
**Peter Clarke**, Support Officer, Museum and Gallery Education Project, clmg (Campaign for Learning in Museums and Galleries)
**Carole Mahoney**, Education Officer and INSET co-ordinator, Victoria and Albert Museum
**Professor Sally Power,** Assistant Dean of Research, Institute of Education
**Roy Prentice,** Head of Art and Design Education Academic Group, Institute of Education

**Project directors**

**Lesley Burgess,** Lecturer in Art and Design Education, Art and Design Education Academic Group, Institute of Education
**Carole Mahoney,** Education Officer and INSET coordinator, Victoria and Albert Museum

**Researchers**

**Claire Robins**, Art and Design Academic Group, Institute of Education
**Vicky Woollard**, Department of Arts Policy and Management, City University

**Thanks to all administrative and technical staff at the V&A and IoE**

Josephine Borradaile, Samantha Cairns, Claire Cotton, Jim Divers, Kelvin Gwilliam, Janet McLauchlan, Hayley Restall, Peter Thomas, Alex Townsend

**Thanks to the speakers for their participation in *Critical Interventions* ( CPD Course ) and *Whose Interpretations?* ( One day INSET session ) piloted for the research project**

Martin Barnes, Lesley Burgess, Charlotte Cotton, Mary Evans, Claire Lofting, Dr Simon O'Field, James Putnam

Norwich High School for Girls

**Photographs and video stills**

Peter Thomas, Jim Divers, Sally Clifton, Stewart Kelley and Isobel Coney