EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
WHY QUALITY? WHY NOW?

In recent years, Chicago has made great strides in expanding arts access within the Chicago Public Schools (CPS), thanks to collaborative efforts among CPS, the arts and arts education sectors, Ingenuity, philanthropic and cultural leaders, and the public at large. The individuals and organizations involved in this effort share a commitment to providing an equitable arts education to all youth in Chicago. Equity requires both access and quality. Now that access efforts are well under way, it is time to turn to quality—to understand what quality is, what it requires, and what it will take to make sure all students have access not just to arts education but to quality arts education, thus achieving our common goal of equity.

Ingenuity launched the Quality Initiative in November 2015 to define, assess, and enhance quality in arts education. This report explains the work of Phase One of the Quality Initiative, presenting insights from the 22 quality conversations conducted from January–July 2016. The second phase of the Quality Initiative is planned for October 2016–July 2017 and is discussed further on pages 54-58 of this report.

We begin with an introduction to the Quality Initiative as a whole. We then interpret the data with respect to the Lenses of Quality developed in The Qualities of Quality, a landmark report that catalyzed significant national interest in researching and supporting quality in arts education. The Five Lenses analysis helps us to understand where Chicago stands with respect to national expert perspectives on quality. We next interpret the data with respect to existing measures of professional educator practice, which helps us to understand the ways in which arts partners’ perspectives on quality teaching and learning align with research-based components of instruction. Finally, we offer a fuller interpretation of the uniquely Chicago understandings of quality that surfaced in the conversations, which lays the groundwork for our Values of Quality, Ecosystem, and next steps.

Such conversations made clear that this community shares core values such as student-centered and student-driven teaching and learning; reciprocal relationships with students, families, schools, and neighborhood community members; the embrace of diversity; and many more described in this report. This philosophical unity is a major asset as we move forward in working toward quality.

The quality conversations also clarified the work we have yet to do and the substantial gap that exists between our ideals and reality.
Participants in every conversation mentioned the need for more resources—material, human, financial—to ensure equity across the system. Teaching artists and partner organizations are hungry for increased collaboration and communication with schools and classroom teachers, students and their parents, funders and cultural leaders, and with each other. All stakeholders need tools to help clarify their expectations of each other and build long-lasting, mutually beneficial relationships. Further, though members of the arts education community hold many values and priorities in common, some of these values—such as embracing diversity or teaching effectively to all types of learners—need more conversation and research to be put into practice across the system.

Chicago’s arts education community is united in its conviction that quality is both a component and result of an equitable arts education. This community’s shared set of values is crucial to creating equity of quality in practice, moving from conversation to action.

The quality conversations articulated a vision for quality; we have work yet to do to understand how this vision is or is not currently enacted in practice.

Thank you for your insights thus far. We look forward to continuing this work together.
INTRODUCTION
The first phase of Ingenuity’s Quality Initiative has yielded a set of values and priorities for quality and a working hypothesis about how different actors within the arts education ecosystem must collaborate in pursuit of quality.

The Chicago arts education community has proven itself to be passionate, reflective, thoughtful, and intentional, and to have a wealth of ideas, practices, and approaches to quality in action in and out of the classroom.

### PHASE ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Initiative Launches</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Quality Conversations Analysis + Coding</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values of Quality and 6 Professional Development Areas Identified</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase One Quality Report Released</td>
<td>November 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### QUALITY CONVERSATIONS

The 22 quality conversations that comprised this first phase brought together 240 members of Chicago’s arts education community: teaching artists and administrators from arts partner organizations; CPS-certified arts teachers, principals, and administrative staff; and foundation staff. Complete quality conversation participant data is presented in the appendix of this report. We have also developed a graphic model representing the arts education community as an “ecosystem” in which various types of actors interact, located on page 51. For ease of reference, we will use the phrase “Chicago’s arts education community” or the like throughout this report to refer to the types of stakeholders represented by the group that both participated in the quality conversations and is modeled by our ecosystem graphic.

### VALUES OF QUALITY

The Values of Quality are both a definition and a description and resonate with national concerns and priorities across the arts sector. The Values of Quality are embedded in the daily rhythms and realities of life in the arts education sector. They are responsive to the challenges that the arts education sector faces and recognize its joys and successes. These values will connect this work with the next phases of the Quality Initiative and will be the foundation of the Arts Partner Quality Framework that Ingenuity will launch in 2017.

### PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

In the course of the quality conversations, participants repeatedly mentioned desires for more professional learning around trauma-informed practices, classroom management, designing and using assessments, and communicating and engaging with families. The remaining two areas—setting learning objectives and outcomes, and record keeping, documentation, and student portfolio review—are areas that we have identified by analyzing quality conversation data against existing measures of professional educator practice.
INTRODUCTION

• The 22 quality conversations—focus groups engaging 240 members of the Chicago arts community from 127 organizations in discussions on what quality means to them and their organizations.

• The quality conversations provided an opportunity for practitioners to come together and think deeply about quality, and generated data for research and further work.

• Outcomes: Phase One Report; Values of Quality; determination of next steps needed to build toward framework.

QUALITY INITIATIVE, PHASE ONE
JANUARY–SEPTEMBER 2016

VALUES OF QUALITY
SEPTEMBER 2016

This research process has identified six major areas for professional learning:

• Setting learning objectives, with particular attention to describing and defining student outcomes.

• Designing and using student assessments.

• Engaging practical tactics and strategies for classroom management.

• Understanding and using trauma-informed teaching and disciplinary practices.

• Conducting record keeping, documentation, and student portfolio review.

• Communicating and engaging with families.

IDENTIFYING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS
SEPTEMBER 2016

• High-level description of the priorities, values, and practices of quality.

• Will provide the key elements to be developed further in the Quality Framework.

• See the values on pages 47–49 of this report.
PHASE ONE DATA ANALYSIS
Ingenuity used qualitative, community-based ethnographic and interpretive methods to collect and analyze the data from the quality conversations held during Phase One of the Quality Initiative (see pages 60–62 for our research methodology). The quality conversations functioned both as community-building exercises in thinking about quality as a sector, and as opportunities to collect data for this report’s analysis.

This section outlines our analyses of participant definitions of quality compared with two existing definitions of quality: Project Zero’s Five Lenses of Quality and the CPS Framework for Teaching. Then, we analyze the complex and deeply thoughtful insights acquired from participants that were not already included in these two existing definitions of quality.
**THE FIVE LENSES OF QUALITY**

Our goal in the initial phase of the Quality Initiative was to learn how members of Chicago’s arts education community—who are in many ways representative of the national arts education community—think about and define a quality arts program. Our point of departure in this effort was *The Qualities of Quality: Understanding Excellence in Arts Education*, a landmark research report that describes four key lenses through which quality in arts education can be defined: Student Learning, Pedagogy, Community Dynamics, and Environment. They also created a tool to support conversation about quality based on these categories, entitled “Four Lenses on Quality: A Tool for Identifying Specific Elements of Quality in an Arts Learning Setting.”

It became clear in the early stages of this project that one important way of thinking about quality in arts education was missing from this list: considerations of social justice and equity. Arts partners in Chicago, and probably in many other cities, are strongly committed to social justice and equity. Many place social justice and equity on par with student learning, pedagogy, community dynamics, and environment in describing and defining the quality of a program and of the arts education ecosystem more broadly. With this in mind, we added a fifth lens, Social Justice/Equity, to the framework laid out in *The Qualities of Quality*.

These five lenses then shaped the protocol that we used to organize our quality conversations, which surfaced, explored, and organized participants’ beliefs about what defined quality in arts education. In turn, we organize our analysis in this section of the report by these same five lenses, presenting the way in which they were defined in *The Qualities of Quality* in comparison to and contrast with the insights of participants in the quality conversations.

In general, Chicago participants added substantial nuance to the definition of each lens; revealed the ways in which all of these elements of quality are fundamentally interconnected; and added novel perspectives, which are critical to our future work in the ways described below.

---

2. Ibid.
The Qualities of Quality highlights the following elements as central to high-quality student learning:

- **ENGAGEMENT**
- **PURPOSEFUL EXPERIENCES CREATING OR ENGAGING WITH WORKS OF ART**
- **EMOTIONAL OPENNESS AND HONESTY**
- **EXPERIMENTATION, EXPLORATION, AND INQUIRY**
- **OWNERSHIP**

Quality conversation participants’ perspectives on student learning can broadly be organized into three categories: what students should be learning, how they should be learning, and the orientation or attitude that students have toward learning.

Largely due to the way in which the quality conversation questions were structured, participants were relatively nonspecific regarding what students should be learning. Many participants offhandedly mentioned that developing discipline-specific arts skills was important to their practice but were not able to spend time discussing exactly what that entailed. The discussion of pedagogy helps us to gain more insight here: students should be learning artistic processes with rigor and intention, and skills should be scaffolded appropriately within and across lessons.

Participants had substantial debate about what was realistic to expect in terms of skill attainment outcomes.

Working within the time and resource constraints that many programs face, it is not possible to fully develop students’ artistic skill sets to the highest degree of excellence within a given discipline. Some participants argued that this means that the sector should advocate for changes in funding and scheduling that would allow students to pursue in-depth, discipline-based arts education; others felt that time and resource constraints provide an opportunity to think creatively about the other skills and outcomes that may be possible through arts education programming. As one dance teaching artist said, “We’re not going to create the next version of Baryshnikov, coming in once a week for an hour. They’re there to learn about the art form, to learn about basic steps and movement, but what we want to instill in them is courage, commitment, and self-awareness.” Further, participants raised some issues regarding social justice content through this lens, as described above under “Social Justice/Equity.” To investigate the question of what arts partners believe students should be learning in greater depth, Ingenuity will be convening discipline-specific focus groups and expert working groups throughout the next phase of the Quality Initiative.
“Purposeful experiences creating or engaging with works of art” and “Emotional openness and honesty” aligned best with concepts of how students should be learning. Participants discussed “creating works of art” twice as often as “engaging with works of art,” consistent with the emphasis in the “Pedagogy” lens on artistic process. However, the concept of “purposefulness” proved even more important. Participants emphasized the need for alignment and clarity between teachers and students in learning objectives, setting goals and outcomes and being mutually accountable to those goals and outcomes, and the need to have an intentional plan for student growth as an artist. As one participant said, “Especially when there’s a major social issue, it’s not just haphazard, just draw a happy face and say ‘no violence.’ From my experience, where the arts were used to really help students overcome and find positive solutions, they were actually in a lesson plan.” Students bring their own sense of purpose to the table, as described below, and instructors need to be responsive to this to ensure quality in student learning.

Quality conversation participants conceived of “Emotional openness and honesty” as methods and practices of learning, facilitating greater engagement with the material and greater student ownership. As discussed more fully in the “Safe Space” section of “Insights on quality from Chicago’s arts community,” student comfort with emotional openness helps students engage more fully with the material and concepts at hand, facilitates ownership over the learning process, and facilitates practices of constructive critique in the classroom, whether between student and teacher or student and student. Further, emotional openness facilitates the self-expression, use of personal narrative, and individual creativity necessary to create meaningful, challenging, and individual works of art.

The elements of “Engagement”; “Experimentation, exploration, and inquiry”; and “Ownership” can be gathered under the umbrella of students’ orientations and attitudes toward learning. All of the data we gathered in these categories can be summarized by saying that student learning is most effective when students desire to be in the room, are eager to learn and grapple with the material at hand, and have agency in the learning process.

The precise word “engagement” came up repeatedly in the quality conversations, and all of the tangible indicators that participants offered speak to these concepts of desire, willingness, eagerness, agency, and thus ownership: students work and engage voluntarily, they make eye contact with each other and the teacher, they enthusiastically raise hands to volunteer answers to questions, they come up with their own ideas for activities or approaches to the work, they are productive, they are energetic, they are enthusiastic and passionate, and they are “hungry” to learn.

In turn, this desire, energy, and enthusiasm leads students to want to explore material further, whether outside of class or by throwing their efforts into novel approaches to in-class work, experimenting with materials and ideas.
Similarly, desire and ownership are profoundly connected. When students want to learn, when their desires are honored and respected, and when they are engaged and enthusiastic, they take pride in what they are doing, internalize it as part of their identity, and are empowered as budding artists. In this sense, desire is the spark that creates a through-line of continuity centered around the student, enabling the student to move from being a mere participant in an arts activity to someone who develops an artistic identity and is motivated to continue to nourish that identity. Students who take ownership are coupling their desires, agency, and choices with emerging rigor as artists, developing self-knowledge and self-discipline within an artistic practice over time. Ensuring quality in student attitudes toward learning, then, does not happen only in the classroom. It requires that adult stakeholders plan programming carefully, engaging students in the planning process, and then provide subsequent opportunities for students to continue to pursue their interests and develop their artistic skills.
PEDAGOGY

In *The Qualities of Quality*, “Pedagogy” encompasses the following elements of quality:

- AUTHENTICITY
- MODELING ARTISTIC PROCESSES, INQUIRY, AND HABITS
- PARTICIPATION IN THE LEARNING EXPERIENCE
- MAKING LEARNING RELEVANT AND CONNECTED TO PRIOR KNOWLEDGE
- INTENTIONALITY, FLEXIBILITY, AND TRANSPARENCY

For the purposes of analytic clarity, we separated “intentionality,” “flexibility,” and “transparency,” and coded them individually.

Rather than speaking to specific pedagogical skills or methods, participants in quality conversations overwhelmingly brought forth general attitudes toward and philosophies of pedagogy, centering the relationship between the teacher and learner and highlighting the productive tension between the teaching artist’s role as a teacher and as an artist.

Participants were substantially oriented toward teaching artistic processes as opposed to artistic products. Part of this was simply practical: programs cannot often allocate enough time to produce highly refined artistic outcomes, but teaching artists are able to teach students a process or a segment of a process within a limited time frame. Further, most participants felt that artistic processes are more critical to artistic quality than artistic products: several gave examples of instances in which they were pressured by administrators to come up with a “shiny” final product, and did so to the best of their ability, but at the expense of teaching students underlying concepts, skills, and methods within that art form. To paraphrase several musician participants, the objective is to teach students *musicianship*, not how to play individual pieces of music.
Participants were also oriented toward process in the context of their roles as artist-teachers. Many participants conceived of their work as teaching students how to become artists themselves, which revolves around developing an artistic identity and practice. Understanding methods, working practices, and artistic habits of mind better prepares students for artistic work in the long term and fosters their own creativity and ownership of their practice. This concept of process is intimately connected with the ways in which participants think of scaffolding and long-term scope and sequence planning, where objectives and skills are practice oriented rather than content oriented.

Intentionality, a key concept in The Qualities of Quality, was likewise critical in our conversations, in dialogue and balance with flexibility. Participants stressed the importance of planning and preparation, both for individual lessons and across the arc of a program, but they also noted that circumstances change rapidly in the school setting, and that teaching artists need to be skilled in responding and adapting to these circumstances. Teaching artists should be prepared with a “toolbox” of pedagogical strategies, activities, and approaches, and they need to skillfully and flexibly choose which to deploy at any given moment, using a variety of means to work toward a positive outcome.

Beyond process, participants did articulate several high-level guiding pedagogical concepts, which will require further development as we build the Quality Framework. First, participants preferred hands-on and project-based learning. Because students are developing as artists, they need to work in ways analogous to artists in their given field such as actively exploring materials and working to create and engage with works of art. Participants commonly articulated the teaching artist’s role as that of “a facilitator, not a lecturer.” Second, participants were excited by the possibilities of arts integration and desired more in-depth collaboration with classroom teachers to better weave arts into their academic curricula. Third, lessons and curricula should be oriented around “big ideas” and “guiding questions” that permit multiple points of entry and exploration, and where there are no right answers. These ideas and questions are thus more fruitful and generative of inquiry.

Finally, teaching artists commonly oriented their pedagogical philosophies around a mutual, dialogical relationship between teacher and learner.

The following description represents participants’ articulations of their own visions for pedagogical philosophy and practice: the protocol that we used asked participants to dream big and share their visions, but we do not yet know precisely how these values play out in the classroom. Understanding the ways in which this vision both overlaps with and departs from classroom practice is a major objective of future Quality Initiative work.
Teaching artists desired to be accountable to students, to see and hear them clearly, to honor and respect them on their own terms, and to center the content and structure of their teaching work around the needs, priorities, and interests of students. To do so requires cultural competence and intentionality, as described above; it also requires deep reflection on one’s own identity, work, and role as a teacher. Where relevant and appropriate for the activity, collaboration with classroom teachers and certified arts teachers was a top priority for teaching artists here, not least because of school-based teachers’ intimate acquaintance with students. Differentiation, whether by learning style, interest, age, demographic, personality, or anything else, is critical to this philosophy. Differentiation is not only widely recognized as good practice by education experts but also, for teaching artists in our quality conversations, is an ethical duty by which one centers instruction around the learner. As with cultural competence, differentiation is a rich and important topic around which many participants requested further tools and information, so Ingenuity will convene differentiation, diverse learners, and child development expert working groups in the next phase of the Quality Initiative.
ENVIRONMENT

In *The Qualities of Quality*, “Environment” encompasses the following three core elements of quality:

• FUNCTIONAL AND AESTHETIC SPACE AND MATERIALS
• THE ARTS OCCUPY A CENTRAL PLACE IN THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT
• SUFFICIENT TIME FOR AUTHENTIC ARTISTIC WORK

In analyzing data from the quality conversations, we separated the first bullet point into “functional space,” “aesthetic space,” and “materials” for greater clarity.

Quality conversation participants took an expansive view of the idea of “environment.” For our participants, the concept of “environment” included both physical, tangible elements of the space, and a more abstract but no less real emotional feel of the space—the interpersonal atmosphere. This was consistent with the analysis in *The Qualities of Quality*. Participants described substantial frustration with the quality of the spaces and materials generally available, but also described substantial resourcefulness and creativity in dealing with these issues day-to-day.

Photo courtesy of Chicago Opera Theater.
Our participants defined quality in the given elements of “Environment” as follows:

FUNCTIONAL SPACE

- **A physically safe, clean space** that meets the fundamental physical needs of students and instructors (e.g., heated and cooled appropriately).
- Ideally, a space that is dedicated to and designed for the given art form.
- **A consistent space**: Participants recognized that schools may not always have state-of-the-art facilities and are able to adapt to less-than-ideal spaces so long as these spaces are consistent from lesson to lesson. Creative adaptation is less possible when teaching artists are scheduled in different spaces each time.
- **A private space**: During instruction time, the space should be reserved for the given activity, with no interruptions or disruptions, whether intentional or unintentional.
- **An accessible space**: The space should be accessible to students with disabilities, and logistically convenient for students, families, and community members where possible.
- **A flexible space**: The space should be adaptable to multiple uses and, if in a school, administrators and classroom teachers should be open to flexible uses of the space for the purposes of the arts activity—for example, moving furniture around to facilitate ease of movement through the space for a dance or theatre program, or accepting a certain level of messiness during a visual arts class.
- A space equipped with appropriate and high-quality materials for the given activity: See discussion of materials on page 20.

AESTHETIC SPACE

- The space should show aesthetic consideration: Where possible, participants stressed the importance of programming taking place in a well-considered space with an appealing aesthetic. Aesthetic features do not have to be expensive or fancy; participants mentioned such things as natural light, plants, furniture arranged in a pleasing manner, posters and decorations on the walls, and colorful paint or decorative items. Participants see aesthetic consideration as a sign of care toward and pride in students’ arts activities, which in turn motivates students and makes them feel that the rest of the school community is invested in their artistic work and success.
- The space should have a “studio aesthetic” and should, where possible, differ from the experience of being in a standard classroom.
- The space should have elements that appeal to all senses.
MATERIALS
- Materials should ideally represent the highest in quality for that art form by making use of excellent instruments, beautifully-crafted paintbrushes, up-to-date theatre technology, and so on.
- At a minimum, materials should be adequate to perform the relevant activity. Instruments should make a decent sound; crayons should be intact if not new.
- Materials have dedicated, neat, clean, and organized storage space where they will be safe and respected when not in use.
- There are enough materials; a diverse array of materials is available; and sufficient materials are available for all students and schools, regardless of socioeconomic status: Participants have a strong sense that funding for and availability of materials is unequal across the neighborhoods of Chicago; quality means that all students and schools have access to appropriate materials.
- Classroom is already equipped with basic materials, such as whiteboards.
- Schools and arts partner organizations come to a mutual understanding and make an intentional plan regarding who provides which materials.

THE POSITION OF ARTS IN THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT
- Student work is exhibited in the space, both for aesthetic appeal and to demonstrate pride in student work.
- Where relevant, exemplary works of art are on display.
- Where appropriate, programs feature a culminating experience to which many stakeholders are invited.

TIME
- Enough time is scheduled for program activities—both per session and longitudinally.
- There is sufficient time for planning, preparation, collaboration (among students, and between teaching artists and classroom teachers), and reflection.
- The challenges surrounding scheduling within schools should be overcome.
Overall, participants experience challenges with the environments in which they work and feel that they are not conducive to arts teaching and learning of the highest quality.

Part of this is due to a lack of funding and resources within specific schools and/or across the district; part of this is due to communication challenges with schools. The ability to adapt to varying environments is a key professional skill upon which teaching artists rely. Indeed, a number of teaching artist participants expressed the idea that teaching artists are “guests in a school,” implying both a hospitality and generosity needed on the part of the school, and a flexibility, humility, and graciousness needed on the part of the teaching artist. Environments speak volumes, representing, both visually and tangibly, the care and commitment of the school community and the arts partner to the positive experience of the student, and, in some cases, families and community members. Getting the environment right sets the foundation for success in all other areas—tangibly and materially, as described here, and emotionally, as described on page 43 under “Safe Space.”
COMMUNITY DYNAMICS

In *The Qualities of Quality*, the three primary elements of quality in “Community Dynamics” include the following:6

- RESPECT AND TRUST AMONG ALL PARTICIPANTS, ALONG WITH A BELIEF IN STUDENT CAPACITIES
- OPEN COMMUNICATION
- COLLABORATION

As in the previous categories, for analytical clarity, we separated the first bullet point into three unique codes: respect, trust, and belief in student capacities.

The concept of community dynamics in *The Qualities of Quality* was limited to “designing a positive social climate in a classroom” (Ibid.). Though this was the starting point for discussion of the Community Dynamics lens in the quality conversations, participants were insistent on a much more expansive definition of community and thus a more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics among various stakeholders. That conceptual framework has informed the design of our visual ecosystem contained at the end of this report.

“Community” is a broad and flexible term, and it is important to be specific about the way in which we, and participants, use it here and throughout Quality Initiative work. Participants typically used the word “community” to refer to the broader constituencies of the school in which their work takes place and the neighborhood in which that school was located, rather than, for example, a smaller concept of “the community” as comprising the students and teacher within the classroom or within the school, as in much of the research literature in education. Indeed, future work on arts education in Chicago should foreground the neighborhood: Chicago is often called the “City of Neighborhoods,” and Chicagoans orient themselves to their city and their community on the neighborhood scale. Chicago is distinctive in this regard: substantial research in urban studies shows that the idea of the “neighborhood” is of critical importance to concepts of identity and belonging in Chicago and significantly shapes one’s opportunities in life, perhaps more than in many other American cities. Students and their families form the most direct and tangible link between neighborhoods and arts programs. When arts educators in Chicago speak about relationship-building with “the community,” they most often mean a sense of the local neighborhood community as represented and embodied by students and their families. Issues of cultural competence must also take account of the cultural, as well as spatial, implications of the concept of the neighborhood. For participants, ideas about relationship-building with neighborhood communities often imply relationship-building across racial, cultural, and socioeconomic divides.

6. Ibid., 38.
Participants held much the same values toward this broader conception of community as those specified in *The Qualities of Quality*: terms like “respect,” “trust,” “communication,” and “collaboration” arose multiple times in every conversation. Part of this respectful, trusting, communicative, and collaborative approach to community dynamics includes accountable, humble, and mutual relationships between teaching artists and arts partner organizations on the one hand, and schools, families, and communities on the other.

Participants were insistent upon the importance of recognizing the assets that already exist in the community—whether local institutions or the knowledge, expertise, and values held by residents—and engaging these assets as core building blocks of their programming.

Quality community dynamics are built on frequent and honest communication, feedback and accountability, and the intentional creation of multiple levels of positive, warm, and inviting group culture. Further, students, families, schools, and neighborhood communities expect consistency from teaching artists and partner organizations, both within an individual program and over time. The emphasis on consistency highlights the need for long-term planning for program sustainability at the district, funder, and organizational levels.

Participants did also address community dynamics in the classroom, where a safe, respectful environment was of paramount importance. A number of participants spoke about the prevalence of bullying in local schools and the need to set rules, boundaries, and expectations within the classroom of mutual support and encouragement. As discussed more fully in the analysis of “Safe Space,” creating an atmosphere of trust, where students feel that they are truly a community—or as many participants put it, an ensemble—rather than a random assortment of kids, allows students to take risks and stretch themselves artistically. Thus, high-quality student learning is built on a foundation of trust and respect in the classroom.

Moving outward from building community within an individual classroom, participants spoke at length about the rewards and difficulties of building community within an individual school. Participants are in general eager to build relationships with other arts partners working at the school and build strong relationships with classroom teachers and certified arts teachers. They are aware that students in arts programs are more motivated and successful when they are supported and recognized by their peers who are not enrolled in arts programming—when their work is valued by others in their school community. Again, relationships are critical to this practice.

Finally, participants were clear in articulating that broader community dynamics are inseparable from what happens in the classroom. Some elements of quality community dynamics are precursors to a lesson or a program; others happen simultaneously; still others are the results of an arts program. Community buy-in, support, and relationships are the matrix in which classroom teaching and learning sit.
Social Justice/Equity was a lens of quality not included in *The Qualities of Quality*, but was added in response to the priorities of Chicago’s arts partner community and the national arts sector more broadly. In this context, Social Justice/Equity includes the following key elements:

- Culturally and linguistically responsive curriculum
- Strengths-based approach
- Openness
- Inclusivity
- Supportive of student critical thinking
- Student willingness to ask questions
- Student willingness to share knowledge and abilities

The first four elements—“culturally and linguistically responsive curriculum;” “strengths-based approach;” “openness;” and “inclusivity”—are broad values that all stakeholders, such as teaching artists, classroom teachers, arts partner organizations, school administrators, parents, and students, may share. The latter three elements—“supportive of student critical thinking;” “student willingness to ask questions;” and “student willingness to share knowledge and abilities”—are tangible practices that teaching artists can implement in the classroom, in their day-to-day interactions with students.

Participants aligned with all of these points, and went beyond them to articulate a much more expansive concept of what social justice and equity in arts education entails.

This was the lens in which there was the greatest degree of productive disagreement among participants.

The subsequent analysis presents multiple viewpoints in an effort to reflect the diversity of opinion across Chicago’s arts education sector.

Participants discussed social justice/equity at several distinct levels of scale: the interpersonal interaction; the planning and execution of arts education programming; the relationships among teaching artists, arts partner organizations, schools, and the local neighborhood community; and a systemic analysis of city- and region-wide social justice and equity issues.
At their core, the differences in opinion among participants stemmed from several common goals and philosophical orientations. In nearly all of the quality conversations, the following core values emerged:

- Cultural competence and relevance
- Embrace of diversity
- Equity of funding, resources, and access
- Building respectful, reciprocal, and trusting relationships with students, families, schools, and communities
- Student-centered and student-driven curriculum and pedagogical methods in which instructors and students share authority, supporting student agency, student self-discovery, and student self-empowerment
- Creating a safe space for students (see further analysis under “Insights on quality from Chicago’s arts community)

Systemic inequities were at the front of many participants’ minds. Challenges in securing funding and both material and human resources came up in every quality conversation.

Participants widely believe that schools in wealthier neighborhoods of Chicago have greater financial means to support arts programming than schools in poorer neighborhoods, whether because of the public funding that each school has or because of the additional resources that parents and families may be able to contribute and raise. Further, participants expressed a belief that students from wealthier families typically have had more arts access outside of school than students from poor families and stated a desire to do more work in lower-income neighborhoods to rectify this imbalance. This should not be taken to indicate that any CPS schools necessarily have abundant funding—the district is underresourced as a whole, not only with respect to the arts—and participants indicated a need to increase resources in the system as a whole as well as to rectify imbalances within the system. Quality requires full and equitable funding so that all schools and students can have access to a wide array of arts programming and so that the programming itself can be of the highest quality.
Participants also noted the ways in which social justice and equity issues affecting all Chicagoans enter into the arts classroom. Due to our city’s epidemic of violence, many students have directly or indirectly experienced traumatic, violent events.

Several participants expressed a desire to learn trauma-informed teaching and disciplinary practices so as to better support these students.

Participants also noted that students’ basic needs being met is a prerequisite to quality arts teaching and learning; if students come to class hungry, for example, it is difficult for them to focus. Sometimes, schools and fellow partners have resources to address these challenges—for example, some arts partners have communicated with school administrators about student hunger, and they have been able to find ways to serve a snack before the program begins. These efforts cannot solve the systemic challenges facing our city and our education system, but they can begin to mitigate some of their effects.

Arts partners grapple with social challenges in very different ways. Some partners and teaching artists put social justice and equity issues at the core of their practice in terms of the content that they teach and the outcomes that they seek; for example, designing curricula explicitly around social justice issues, or using arts education and broader artistic practices as a mechanism for addressing community or student-specific needs. In contrast, other partner organizations and teaching artists take a different, though no less committed, approach to equity issues; for example, some bring their programming to schools and communities that would not otherwise have access to their art form, and in doing so empower students to become proficient in arts skills.

Issues of diversity, cultural competence, and relevance matter at the organizational and individual levels.

Participants were united in their desire to embrace diversity and difference in all its forms, but many struggled with the best way in which to accomplish this goal.

In several quality conversations, participants discussed the need to diversify the ranks of arts organizations themselves, recruiting more teaching artists and administrators of color. This diversification is important not only for reasons of employment equity within the arts sector, but also so that the diverse students and communities of Chicago see themselves reflected within arts partner organizations at their schools, thus facilitating relationship building and curriculum development.
Participants were, again, united in their desire to have culturally competent and relevant curricula and programming, but, due to the design of the quality conversation protocol, did not have time to discuss this more specifically beyond the notion of having materials available in the preferred languages of students and parents.

Further, several participants raised pressing questions about how cultural competence is practiced within organizations: Who decides what the most culturally competent or relevant curriculum is for students? What is the process by which these decisions are made? Who is at the table?

Even though cultural competence was a high priority for participants, substantial debate and uncertainty remained. Therefore, Ingenuity will convene a cultural competence and diversity expert working group as one of the next steps in the Quality Initiative to delve into these issues in greater depth and provide tangible recommendations for partners.

Long-term, reciprocal, and trust-based relationships are at the core of participants’ concepts of social justice and equity and are crucial to implementing programs in a just and equitable way. Relationships at all levels of scale—with school administrators, parents, families, and community members, as well as fellow arts partner organizations, and students—need to include dialogue, mutual input, open communication, and shared authority. Many participants requested more tools and further training on how to do this effectively, but valued this approach nonetheless. Quality requires that partners and teaching artists be open to feedback from all sides, and that they approach schools, families, communities, and most of all students from a perspective of respecting and honoring the strengths and expertise that they bring to the table. In particular, many participants highlighted classroom management and discipline as a key opportunity to do this, which would allow even kids who have been labeled as disciplinary challenges the opportunity to “start fresh,” as one participant said. Every program, or even every lesson, could be utilized so as to see and bring forth each student’s strengths, while utilizing disciplinary tactics that are gentle, nonoppressive, and founded on respect. Justice and equity are not only about systemic issues but also about individual interactions within the classroom.
ALIGNING WITH EXISTING MEASURES OF PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR PRACTICE

Because arts partners work in the context of the Chicago Public Schools, and because the role of teaching artists is complementary to that of CPS arts teachers, it is critical to understand the ways in which arts partner definitions of quality do and do not align with CPS’ own definitions of quality in arts education. Throughout the quality conversations, participants emphasized the notion that collaboration and shared expectations are critical components of quality partnerships between arts partners and public schools in Chicago. To facilitate this collaboration and communication, one of our primary goals in this phase of the Quality Initiative was to assess partner alignment with established CPS standards for excellence.

This alignment is also important on the national scale. To our knowledge, existing efforts to create a vision for quality—both in the research literature and in practice in other cities—have focused only on defining arts partner quality in and of itself. However, in keeping with our ecosystem approach to defining and enhancing quality in arts education, we believe that it is critical to view the work of arts partners and CPS arts teachers in dialogue. This represents a substantial shift in the way that the national arts education community thinks about quality and about the different, but complementary, roles played by different kinds of arts instructors in the broader context of a student’s overall arts education.

We used two existing frameworks as our benchmarks in defining how CPS arts teachers think about quality. CPS has adopted a version of educator and education consultant Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching as a tool for describing and evaluating quality pedagogical practice. The CPS Framework for Teaching is not specific to a discipline or content area, but rather provides uniform attributes of quality teaching. The CPS Department of Arts Education has created an arts addendum to the framework, which helps to guide both certified arts teachers and school administrators on how attributes of the framework look in practice in the arts context. In order to understand the ways in which the arts partner community’s perspectives on teaching align with those of CPS, we coded the data set generated by the quality conversations according to the CPS framework and the original Danielson’s framework.

BOTH THE CPS FRAMEWORK AND DANIELSON’S FRAMEWORK ARE AVAILABLE ONLINE FOR EASY CROSS-REFERENCE WITH THIS SECTION:

CPS FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING
cps.edu/ReachStudents/Documents/FrameworkForTeaching.pdf

DANIELSON’S FRAMEWORK
danielsongroup.org/framework/


Overall, arts partner visions of quality teaching aligned with the critical attributes of the framework. This was surprising; many participants expressed the belief that the arts partner community has very different values for quality than does CPS. However, a careful analysis of the data shows substantial agreement on most core values. For example, both perspectives on quality share a student-centered approach, an emphasis on challenging and coherent instruction, a desire to make the classroom environment a safe and respectful space that facilitates learning, and both prioritize student engagement. In some cases, participant data added some details of quality teaching specific to the role of teaching artists—for example, with respect to engaging students and creating a culture of learning. In other cases, an absence of data shows that partners either do not prioritize a given area, or do not yet have the skills or language to align with that area—for example, with respect to setting outcomes, and record-keeping and documentation.

The following analysis explores alignment and professional learning opportunities in greater detail, moving through each of the four domains of the framework and their components in turn. Note that in the framework, each component has descriptive attributes for a teacher’s level of proficiency in each area: unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished. We focus here on “distinguished” given our goal of creating a vision of high-quality teaching and learning.
PLANNING AND PREPARATION

DEMONSTRATING KNOWLEDGE OF CONTENT AND PEDAGOGY

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “Teacher demonstrates knowledge of the relevant content standards within the grade level and across grade levels, as well as how these standards relate to other disciplines. Teacher’s plans demonstrate extensive knowledge of the disciplinary way of reading, writing, and/or thinking within the subject area. Teacher demonstrates deep understanding of prerequisite learning and relationships among topics and concepts. Teacher’s plans include a range of effective pedagogical approaches suitable to student learning of the content/skills being taught and anticipate student misconceptions.”

Alignment with quality conversation data: Participants’ beliefs were highly aligned with this description. Participants also emphasized the skillful use of anchor works of art; the incorporation of art appreciation into art-making activities; developing students as artists; using project-based pedagogical strategies; and the need to have highly trained and qualified teaching staff as a prerequisite to knowledge of content and pedagogy.

DEMONSTRATING KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the active nature of student learning and attains information about levels of development for individual students. Teacher purposefully and continually gathers information from several sources about all students’ individual backgrounds, cultures, prior knowledge, skills, language proficiencies, learning styles, multiple intelligences, interests, and special needs.”

Alignment with quality conversation data: Participant beliefs aligned with and went far beyond this, emphasizing a desire to have students take an active part in shaping the learning process, to relate to students as individual personalities and to support their individual aspirations, and in viewing cultural competence and relationship-building strategies as going beyond the individual student to encompass their families and neighborhood community.
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SELECTING LEARNING OBJECTIVES

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “Learning objectives are standards-based, clear, written in the form of student learning outcomes, aligned to methods of assessment, and varied in whatever way is needed to account for individual students’ needs. Teacher sequences and aligns standards-based objectives to build toward deep understanding, mastery of the standards, and meaningful authentic application. Objectives reflect several different types of learning and provide multiple opportunities for coordination and integration within and across the disciplines.”

Alignment with quality conversation data: Most participants emphasized the need to set outcomes and have a detailed and nuanced plan for achieving the outcomes, similar to what is described in distinguished teaching above. However, participant responses diverged regarding the precise nature of the outcomes to be set: are outcomes tangible results of arts learning, such as a performance or completed work of art, or are they skills or process based, such as student mastery of a particular technique or creative process? Most participants were far more comfortable with the idea of process-oriented rather than product-oriented outcomes. Danielson’s writing on this subject makes it clear that outcomes are things a student learns rather than activities a student does in class. If the partner community wishes to focus on process-oriented outcomes, it will be important to make sure that outcomes describe skills and processes that students have learned and mastered, rather than simply describing activities that have taken place in the classroom. The tension between process- and product-oriented outcomes is a key area for further discussion and alignment between partner expectations and practices, and CPS and State of Illinois standards.

DESIGNING COHERENT INSTRUCTION

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “Teacher coordinates in-depth knowledge of content, students, and resources (including technology) to design units and lessons. Learning tasks are aligned to objectives. Tasks are cognitively challenging for individual students and require students to provide evidence of their reasoning. There is evidence of scaffolding and differentiation for all students to access the content/skills. The units and lessons are paced appropriately. Units and lessons include grade-appropriate levels of texts and other materials so every student can access the content/skills. The lesson or unit has a clear structure that incorporates student choice, allows for different pathways of instruction aligned with diverse student needs, and uses instructional groupings intentionally.”

Alignment with quality conversation data: Participant beliefs from quality conversations are highly aligned with this description. Further, participants added the following concepts that would fall under this category: including opening and closing rituals in the lesson or sequence of lessons, emphasizing technical rigor as a through-line for instruction, and bringing coherence to the instruction by balancing teacher control and student freedom in the classroom.
DESIGNING STUDENT ASSESSMENT

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “The plan for student assessment is aligned with the standards-based learning objectives identified for the unit and lesson. Assessment methodologies have been designed or adapted for individual students as needed. Assessment criteria are thorough, describe high expectations for students, and provide clear descriptors. Teacher’s formative assessments are complex, well designed or selected, and tailored for individual students, when necessary, in order to measure varying degrees of each student’s learning and growth effectively. Teacher uses assessment results to design units and lessons that target the diverse needs of every student.”

Alignment with quality conversation data: Participants in our quality conversations struggled with the idea of assessment. A number expressed a desire to learn more about assessment practices to better select and make use of the types of assessment that would be most relevant to their work. However, a number of participants also expressed concerns about assessment, feeling that testing and other quantitative assessment practices are poor fits for arts education. More work is needed to help partners use and develop assessment tools that work well for the practices and objectives of arts education.

DEMONSTRATING KNOWLEDGE OF RESOURCES
(FOUND IN ORIGINAL DANIELSON’S FRAMEWORK ONLY)

Danielson’s framework language for distinguished teaching: “The teacher’s knowledge of resources for classroom use and for extending one’s professional skill is extensive, including those available through the school or district, in the community, through professional organizations and universities, and on the Internet.”

Alignment with quality conversation data: Participants generally had a more expansive concept of resources than that described by Danielson, including human resources, support systems within schools and communities, and resources provided by fellow arts partner organizations. They also conceived of resources as things that teaching artists and partner organizations would draw on for their own work and professional development—for example, the concept of “creating a pedagogical toolbox” for oneself. Applying the Danielson attributes in this category to arts education creates an opportunity to expand our thinking about what resources for arts education could and should entail.
CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

CREATING AN ENVIRONMENT OF RESPECT AND RAPPORT

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “Patterns of classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth and caring. Students contribute to high levels of civility among all members of the class. Interactions are sensitive to students as individuals, appropriate to the ages and development of individual students, and to the context of the class. The net result of interactions is that of academic and personal connections among students and adults.”

Alignment with quality conversation data: Participant beliefs align strongly with this description, and add concepts of “safe space” and “cultural competence” as critical to creating this type of classroom environment. Further, student “contribut[ions] to high levels of civility,” for partners, entail students being accountable to each other in maintaining group culture.

ESTABLISHING A CULTURE FOR LEARNING

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “The teacher creates a classroom culture that reflects a shared belief in the importance of learning and hard work. The teacher conveys high learning expectations for all students and develops structures that enable practice and perseverance for each individual student. Students assume responsibility for high-quality work by persevering, initiating improvements, addressing critiques, making revisions, adding detail and/or helping peers.”

Alignment with quality conversation data: Participant beliefs align strongly with this description, and the participants added that creating a safe space is a prerequisite for the creation of such a classroom culture, as students will not buy into or be willing to take ownership of their learning unless they are willing to take risks and be vulnerable to themselves and to each other.

16. Ibid.
MANAGING CLASSROOM PROCEDURES

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “Effective classroom routines and procedures maximize instructional time. The teacher orchestrates the environment so that students contribute to the management of instructional groupings, transitions, and/or the handling of materials and supplies without disruption of learning. Students follow classroom routines without the teacher’s prompting. Teacher productively engages volunteers and/or paraprofessionals in tasks that make a substantive contribution to student learning and are well integrated into the classroom community.”

Alignment with quality conversation data: Participant beliefs align strongly with this description, with the stipulation that classroom management and disciplinary procedures be nonpunitive and nonoppressive. Many participants expressed the desire to set behavioral norms collectively and through agreements, rather than by imposition. Participants spoke of classroom management skills in almost aesthetic terms—for example, managing classroom transitions in a graceful and elegant manner. Further, participants expressed a desire that materials and supplies be organized in a way that is not only productive for learning but also conducive to “studio habits” and artistic practice. Finally, though participants expressed a nuanced and clear vision of the outcomes of good classroom management, as described in the framework language, many of them expressed a desire for further professional learning on practical tactics and strategies for classroom management that will help them to achieve these outcomes.

MANAGING STUDENT BEHAVIOR

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “Teacher and students establish and implement standards of conduct. Students follow the standards of conduct and self-monitor their behaviors. Teacher’s monitoring of student behavior is subtle and preventive. Teacher uses positive framing to model and reinforce positive behavior for individual students. Teacher’s response to students’ inappropriate behavior is sensitive to individual student needs and respects students’ dignity.”

Alignment with quality conversation data: Participant beliefs align strongly with this description, especially around the concepts of student input and ownership, as well as the need for the teacher to use individualized and dignity-preserving disciplinary tactics. Further, participants discussed the ways in which student behavior is influenced by their cultural backgrounds and personal experiences and expressed a desire to learn more about trauma-informed classroom management practices and explore ways to be culturally competent in managing behavior (noting, for example, studies that show that teachers are quicker to discipline students of color and desiring strategies to avoid racial disparity in behavior management).

17. Ibid., 5.
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ORGANIZING PHYSICAL SPACE (FOUND IN ORIGINAL DANIELSON’S FRAMEWORK ONLY)

Danielson’s framework language for distinguished teaching: “The classroom environment is safe, and learning is accessible to all students, including those with special needs. The teacher makes effective use of physical resources, including computer technology. The teacher ensures that the physical arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities. Students contribute to the use or adaptation of the physical environment to advance learning.”

Alignment with quality conversation data: As described under “Environment” in the section analyzing the Five Lenses of Quality data, participants’ perspectives align strongly with Danielson’s description and go far beyond it in specifying a quality arts-specific environment. Participants particularly emphasized the unique physical needs that arts classrooms have and the need to ensure that teaching artists can either meet those needs or improvise responses to imperfect spaces. Further, participants noted and desired a qualitative difference between the feel of an arts classroom versus other types of classrooms.
INSTRUCTION

COMMUNICATING WITH STUDENTS

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “Teacher clearly communicates standards-based learning objective(s). Teacher guides students to articulate the relevance of the objective(s) to learning. Teacher clearly explains directions and procedures and anticipates possible student misunderstanding. Teacher’s explanation of content is thorough, accurate, and clear, enabling students to develop a conceptual understanding of content while making connections to their interests, knowledge, and experience; students contribute to extending the content by explaining concepts to their classmates. Teacher’s spoken and written language is expressive, and builds on students’ language development and understanding of content. Vocabulary is appropriate for the students’ ages and levels of development; students contribute to the correct use of academic vocabulary.”²⁰

Alignment with quality conversation data: Participants generally agreed with the concepts listed above but contextualized these ideas within an ethical and philosophical approach to teaching and learning that emphasizes reciprocity of communication and dialogue between student and teacher, in which students feel comfortable communicating honestly with teachers, and teachers welcome and are responsive to this open communication.

USING QUESTIONING AND DISCUSSION TECHNIQUES

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “Teacher uses a variety of low- and high-level, open-ended, and developmentally appropriate questions to challenge students cognitively, advance high-level thinking and discourse, and promote metacognition. Teacher’s discussion techniques enable students to engage each other in authentic discussions about the content under study. Students formulate questions and challenge one another using viable arguments based on evidence. All students are listening and responding to questions and answers from their teacher and peers. Students themselves ensure that all voices are heard in the discourse.”²¹

Alignment with quality conversation data: Participants frequently highlighted questioning and discussion as hallmarks of excellent teaching, relating this to the notion that good arts teaching and learning allows students to explore and make artistic, intellectual, emotional, and personal judgments for themselves. Participants take students’ desire to ask questions as a positive indicator of engagement, momentum, and enthusiasm in learning. Further, participants added that good questioning and discussion includes the ability to have healthy and respectful dialogue about difficult topics—in particular, challenging current events and deep emotional issues.

²¹ Ibid.
ENGAGING STUDENTS IN LEARNING

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “Tasks align with standards-based learning objectives and are tailored so virtually all students are intellectually engaged in challenging content. Tasks and text are complex and promote student engagement through inquiry and choice. Students contribute to the exploration of content. Teacher scaffolds and differentiates instruction so that all students access complex, grade-level, and/or developmentally appropriate text and/or tasks. The teacher’s pacing of the lesson is appropriate, and tasks are sequenced not only to build students’ depth of understanding but also to require student reflection and synthesis of the learning. Teacher’s grouping of students is intentional, and students serve as resources for each other to achieve mastery of the content/skills.”

Alignment with quality conversation data: Participant perspectives align with the above description but are based on a slightly different philosophical approach: as described in the “Student Learning” section of the Five Lenses of Quality analysis, conversation participants take engagement as an indication of students’ desire to learn and a necessary precursor to student motivation and ownership. This means that the onus is on the teaching artist, arts partner, and school, where appropriate, to design instruction that is relevant and engaging as a component of a student-centered and student-driven approach to teaching and learning.

USING ASSESSMENT IN INSTRUCTION

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “Teacher fully integrates formative assessment into instruction, and uses it to monitor progress, and to check for understanding for individual students. Students can explain, and there is some evidence that they have contributed to, the criteria by which their work will be assessed. Students self- and peer-assess to monitor their progress. Teacher and students provide individualized feedback that is accurate, specific, and advances learning.”

Alignment with quality conversation data: As with the above discussion under “Designing Student Assessment,” the attributes listed above may be the ideal, but participants by and large do not believe that they yet have the necessary experience and support in place to reach this ideal. Participants requested professional learning around the most effective uses of assessments in instruction, and many mentioned that this is a core priority for their organizations in the next year. The idea that assessment is a means of connecting with and truly seeing individual students, as described in the framework, resonates substantially with participants’ desire to take account of the individual needs of each student and differentiate instruction accordingly.
DEMONSTRATING FLEXIBILITY AND RESPONSIVENESS

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “Teacher seizes opportunities to enhance learning, building on a spontaneous world or local event and/or student interests. Teacher persists in adjusting instruction so individual student misunderstandings or advanced needs are successfully accommodated. When formative assessments show a need for intervention or enrichment, teacher makes effective impromptu adjustments that individualize instruction for students.”

Alignment with quality conversation data: Participants expressed many of the same beliefs about flexibility in instruction as those described in the framework, but they often spoke about flexibility in a more expansive sense, particularly in regard to the need to be flexible within the broader context of the school to achieve desired educational outcomes. Participant concepts of flexibility were often related to logistical considerations, such as the need to be flexible in the use of space or materials.
REFLECTING ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “Teacher makes an accurate assessment of a lesson’s or unit’s effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its objective and its impact on student learning, citing many specific examples and evidence. Teacher is able to analyze many aspects of his/her practice that led to the outcome of the lesson and the impact on student learning. Teacher offers specific alternative practices, complete with the probable success of each aspect of practice that could have improved the lesson or future similar lessons.”

Alignment with quality conversation data: Where the CPS framework’s language is tactical, conversation participants’ beliefs about reflection were philosophical and had more to do with teaching artists reflecting on their identities as individuals and as artists, and the ways in which this translates into a personal mission and vision for quality. Further, participants emphasized the need to have practices and processes of reflection within arts partner organizations. Finally, participants highlighted the need to build time into lessons in which students are able to reflect on their work, progress, and learning.

MAINTAINING ACCURATE RECORDS

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “Teacher has a detailed system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments, student progress in learning, and non-instructional records, requiring no monitoring for errors. Students contribute information and participate in maintaining the records.”

Alignment with quality conversation data: Participants did not mention records at all—no data in the data set aligns with this concept. This indicates either that participants do not view this as integral to quality; that participants do have practices of record-keeping, but forgot or declined to mention it; or that record-keeping is not a common practice among participants or that they feel they do not need to do so.
COMMUNICATING WITH FAMILIES

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “Teacher frequently communicates with families to convey information about class and individual activities, individual student’s progress and to solicit and utilize the family’s support in student learning. Teacher meaningfully and successfully engages families as partners in the instructional program (e.g., through class and home volunteering, working at home with their child, involvement in class and school projects in and out of school, and parent workshops and training). Teacher responds to families’ concerns professionally and in a timely manner, providing resources and solutions to address the concerns. Teacher’s communication with families is sensitive to cultural norms and needs, with students contributing to the communication as appropriate.”

Alignment with quality conversation data: Participants’ beliefs and discussions of their practices aligned strongly with this language. Further, participants emphasized the need for teachers to seek and listen to input and feedback from families and community members, and for communication with families to be highly culturally competent. Participants expressed a desire for professional learning opportunities around effective ways to communicate with and engage families continually through the duration of the arts program (rather than just via a culminating experience at the end).

GROWING AND DEVELOPING PROFESSIONALLY

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “Teacher initiates opportunities for professional growth and makes a systematic effort to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skill of self and colleagues. S/he uses new knowledge to improve practice of self and colleagues. Teacher invites meetings and initiates collaborations with colleagues. Teacher provides and accepts collegial support and feedback to/from colleagues. Teacher participates in and facilitates professional inquiry with school team to advance student learning and serves on a leadership and/or teaching team. Teacher welcomes and uses feedback from a variety of stakeholders (e.g., colleagues, administrators, students, parents, external education partners) to improve practice and advance student learning.”

Alignment with quality conversation data: Participants fully aligned with this perspective and added that teaching artists should develop a personal vision and mission of quality, attain the appropriate credentials and qualifications for their field or practice, and continually reflect on their own teaching in accordance with the guiding philosophy that many expressed of the “teacher as learner.” Further, participants emphasized that arts partner organizations should provide ongoing professional development opportunities for their teaching artists.

27. Ibid., 9.
28. Ibid.
PARTICIPATING IN THE PROFESSIONAL COMMUNITY
(FOUND IN ORIGINAL DANIELSON’S FRAMEWORK ONLY)

Danielson’s framework language for distinguished teaching: “The teacher’s relationships with colleagues are characterized by mutual support and cooperation, with the teacher taking initiative in assuming leadership among the faculty. The teacher takes a leadership role in promoting a culture of professional inquiry. The teacher volunteers to participate in school events and district projects, making a substantial contribution and assuming a leadership role in at least one aspect of school or district life.”29

Alignment with quality conversation data: Participants were especially aligned with and enthusiastic about this concept, viewing relationships across the broader arts sector as critically important to their work and success. Participants expressed a desire to collaborate more widely across the sector, and in particular to share resources around curricula and pedagogical strategies.

DEMONSTRATING PROFESSIONALISM

CPS framework language for distinguished teaching: “Teacher has the highest standards of integrity, always holds student and required school information confidential, and is honest in professional and student/family interactions. The teacher is proactive in serving students, seeking out resources when needed. The teacher makes a concerted effort to challenge negative attitudes or practices so that all students, particularly those traditionally underserved, are honored in the school and prepared for success in school, college, career, and life. Teacher takes a leadership role in decision-making for the school and helps ensure that such decisions are based on the highest professional considerations. Teacher complies fully and takes a leadership role with school and district regulations. Teacher has a responsible and professional attendance record.”30

Alignment with quality conversation data: Participants generally aligned with this description (modifying appropriately to account for teaching artists’ differing roles within the school setting). Further, participants who were arts administrators emphasized the need for teaching artists to maintain healthy boundaries with parents and school-based faculty and staff, especially under duress; to dress appropriately; and to be consistent in communication.

INSIGHTS FROM CHICAGO’S QUALITY CONVERSATIONS

Though the Five Lenses protocol was explicitly designed to surface tangible descriptors of quality in the classroom, participants also contributed complex and deeply thoughtful understandings of the broader ecosystem of quality, highlighting the ways in which quality in the classroom depends on so much beyond the classroom. These understandings directly influenced our development of an ecosystem model of quality, as described on pages 50-53.

The three themes presented here—creating a safe space for productive discomfort and personal growth, issues of teaching artist agency, and culture and support beyond the classroom—all go beyond the pedagogical encounter between student and instructor to highlight the reciprocal exchange between the classroom and the rest of the arts education ecosystem.

The idea of “safe space” contrasts the arts classroom with other types of classrooms and with the often difficult world students navigate outside the classroom. Issues of teaching artist agency necessarily implicate teaching artist interactions with arts partner organizations, funders, schools, and CPS arts teachers. Finally, the importance of culture and support beyond the classroom speaks for itself, highlighting the ways in which excellence in the classroom depends on excellence outside of the classroom. Though these themes may have particular relevance in Chicago, we believe that the idea of the arts ecosystem, and the need for all its components to work together in support of quality in the pedagogical encounter, has universal relevance.
CREATING A SAFE SPACE FOR PRODUCTIVE DISCOMFORT AND PERSONAL GROWTH

In nearly every conversation, participants surfaced a remarkably consistent and coherent concept of a “safe space.” Creating a safe space is a prerequisite to students' ability to create authentic, meaningful, personal, and challenging work and is both a precursor to and a result of relationship-building work with students, families, and communities. Though this concept was discussed in *The Qualities of Quality*, our quality conversation participants developed the idea much more fully.

THE CONCEPT OF SAFE SPACE HAS TWO PRIMARY DIMENSIONS

- **The arts classroom as a respite from external challenges:** Students in Chicago often face substantial challenges in their day-to-day lives—particularly from violence, the risk of violence in their neighborhoods, or from other sources of trauma in their lives. Further, many neighborhood schools are underresourced, and certain students may experience bullying. Many participants viewed the arts classroom as providing a respite for students from these external challenges—a place where all students are physically and emotionally safe and where all are welcome to express their authentic selves without reservation.

- **The arts classroom as a place to challenge oneself and grow:** Nearly all participants believe that growing and developing as an artist requires risk-taking, failure, learning from mistakes, and the willingness to be vulnerable. Excellent teaching pushes students to the edge of their comfort zone, stretching them and encouraging them to challenge themselves. Students need to bring their full and authentic selves to the arts classroom. This process cannot happen without a baseline level of trust and emotional safety between student and teacher and among students. For example, students in a dance class need to know that they can try new, complicated dance moves and look goofy doing so without being teased by peers—critical to artistic exploration and skill development within dance—or that they can produce work that deals with deep and often personal emotions in a way that is honored and respected by teachers and peers.

Safe spaces are created through the intentional and collaborative efforts of teaching artists, arts partner organizations, classroom teachers, school administrators, the school community, and students themselves. They are predicated on equitable rules and boundaries, shared expectations and norms, respect, trust, rapport, accountability and practices of managing conflict, dialogue, and a student-centered approach that values students’ existing expertise, ideas, knowledge, and beliefs. When done right, teaching this way results in deeper learning and student self-empowerment.
ISSUES OF TEACHING ARTIST AGENCY

Our participants repeatedly surfaced discrepancies between the ideals of quality that they were discussing in the quality conversation, and the real-world experiences they were having in which quality seemed difficult if not impossible to reach.

Participants who were teaching artists expressed a wide range of views on their own agency: some felt that they had very little ability to affect quality in practice, as they were severely underresourced and undersupported; others felt optimistic and strongly desired to advocate for an ideal vision of quality in arts education.

Most, of course, fell somewhere in the middle, stating that they resourcefully and creatively made do with the resources given to them to provide the best experience for their students, but that their work would ideally receive far more support than they currently have.

It is important to recognize that quality in the classroom—at the level of the teaching artist-student relationship—is dependent on the actions, resources, and relationships of all of the other stakeholders. Chicago participants in quality conversations were insistent that the teaching artist’s role, and ability to provide quality instruction, is inseparable from a broader understanding of quality as dependent on an ecosystem of many actors and institutions. Part of enhancing quality in arts education in Chicago depends on developing a fine-grained understanding of this ecosystem of connections and determining how to support all of them in working together toward a common goal.
CULTURE AND SUPPORT BEYOND THE CLASSROOM

As described above, participants consistently discussed the interconnectedness of a wide array of stakeholders and the ways in which this influenced quality in the classroom. In particular, participants discussed the crucial role that schools, classroom teachers, and school administrators played in working with teaching artists and arts partner organizations to ensure—or hinder—quality work.

QUALITY IN ARTS PARTNER PROGRAMS IN SCHOOLS DEPENDS ON THE FOLLOWING

• Communication and collaboration—true partnership—between teaching artists and classroom teachers
• Communication and setting of expectations—again, true partnership—between arts partner organizations and school administrations
• Excellent communication and dialogue flowing from arts partner organizations to their teaching artists regarding expectations set with school administrators, and the same between school administration and classroom teachers regarding expectations set with arts partner organizations
• School assistance in engaging families and community
• School commitment to providing the best-quality physical environment and materials possible, and to doing so consistently
• Buy-in from all parties regarding mission, vision, values, practices, and outcomes
• Collaboration among all arts partners working at an individual school to reinforce and support each other’s work as appropriate

If done right, all of these elements ensure that the day-to-day classroom is fully functional—for example, that teaching artists are always scheduled in an appropriate classroom space—and that longer-term relationships are strong, healthy, functional, and mutually beneficial.
PHASE ONE CONCLUSIONS
THE VALUES OF QUALITY

The Values of Quality are both a definition and a description and resonate with national concerns and priorities across the arts sector. The Values of Quality are embedded in the daily rhythms and realities of life in the arts education sector. They are responsive to the challenges that the arts education sector faces and recognize its joys and successes. These values will connect this work with the next phases of the Quality Initiative and will be the foundation of the Arts Partner Quality Framework that Ingenuity will launch in 2017.
VALUES OF QUALITY

1. Student-centered & student-driven
2. Process-focused
3. Physically & emotionally safe
4. Pedagogically aligned best practices
5. Collaborative, relational, & relationship-based
6. Embraces diversity & cultural competence
7. Strengths-based
8. Requires equity
9. Purposeful & intentional
10. Is in the physical, tangible details
11. Is the right of all students
Quality arts teaching and learning is **student centered and student driven**, both in and out of the classroom. Quality teaching and learning supports student agency, self-knowledge, self-discovery, self-expression, and self-empowerment.

Quality arts teaching and learning is **process focused**—at all levels of scale, from classroom-based activities to understanding partnerships and relationships as processes.

Quality teaching and learning can only take place in a **physically and emotionally safe space** where students have the opportunity to grow through vulnerability and productive discomfort.

Quality teaching and learning by arts partners makes use of research-tested **pedagogical best practices** and includes alignment and collaboration with CPS teachers and administrators.

Quality is **collaborative, relational, and relationship based**. Quality relationships are equitable, respectful, trusting, and reciprocal. Quality in the classroom depends on strong relationships among all stakeholders, which in turn ensure that all parts of the arts education ecosystem work together to provide a quality experience for students.

Quality is built on an embrace of Chicago’s **diversity** and on strong practices of **cultural competence** in all stakeholder relationships.

Quality is **strengths based** at all levels, making use of the assets that all stakeholders bring to the table.

Quality **requires equity** in terms of funding, resources, and access, including access to excellence and to a wide variety of artistic experiences. Quality thus requires advocacy by the arts sector and collaborative support from funders and policymakers.

Quality is **purposeful and intentional**. Expectations and outcomes are clear, shared, and planned for.

Quality is in the **physical, tangible details**. Fresh crayons and the right classroom space are as important as big-picture curricular strategies.

Quality is the **right of all students** and is an end in itself.

### VALUES OF QUALITY

| 1 | Quality arts teaching and learning is student centered and student driven, both in and out of the classroom. Quality teaching and learning supports student agency, self-knowledge, self-discovery, self-expression, and self-empowerment. |
| 2 | Quality arts teaching and learning is process focused—at all levels of scale, from classroom-based activities to understanding partnerships and relationships as processes. |
| 3 | Quality teaching and learning can only take place in a physically and emotionally safe space where students have the opportunity to grow through vulnerability and productive discomfort. |
| 4 | Quality teaching and learning by arts partners makes use of research-tested pedagogical best practices and includes alignment and collaboration with CPS teachers and administrators. |
| 5 | Quality is collaborative, relational, and relationship based. Quality relationships are equitable, respectful, trusting, and reciprocal. Quality in the classroom depends on strong relationships among all stakeholders, which in turn ensure that all parts of the arts education ecosystem work together to provide a quality experience for students. |
| 6 | Quality is built on an embrace of Chicago’s diversity and on strong practices of cultural competence in all stakeholder relationships. |
| 7 | Quality is strengths based at all levels, making use of the assets that all stakeholders bring to the table. |
| 8 | Quality requires equity in terms of funding, resources, and access, including access to excellence and to a wide variety of artistic experiences. Quality thus requires advocacy by the arts sector and collaborative support from funders and policymakers. |
| 9 | Quality is purposeful and intentional. Expectations and outcomes are clear, shared, and planned for. |
| 10 | Quality is in the physical, tangible details. Fresh crayons and the right classroom space are as important as big-picture curricular strategies. |
| 11 | Quality is the right of all students and is an end in itself. |
The graphic on the following page serves as a model for how quality works in practice, particularly in terms of who is responsible for working toward quality and the relationships among those actors.

Our model focuses primarily on actors—individuals and organizational entities who have the capacity to act and interact for quality—rather than ideas or behaviors. We include prerequisites to quality in the classroom; the different stakeholders who need to come together to ensure quality in the classroom; and the intangible, sometimes very subtle psychological and interpersonal dynamics of quality both in and out of the classroom.

This is consistent both with our concrete, action-oriented approach, and with the relational and collaborative values articulated by participants in the quality conversations. Each entity’s sector symbolizes the dimensions and practices of quality for which that individual or organization is responsible. Boundaries between sectors symbolize the relationship between those two entities and the ways in which they need to collaborate to ensure quality. Entities are arranged not in order of importance but in relationship to how directly they affect the student experience, which we centered on this graphic in keeping with participants’ student-centered and student-driven values.

The thick line running down the middle of the graphic and wrapping around the student experience represents what we call the “pedagogical encounter”—the sum total of interactions most directly affecting the student’s experience in the classroom and the teacher-learner relationship. The bulk of the pedagogical encounter takes place in the classroom, but is of course directly affected by planning, and has immediate results that feed back into the next classroom experience. Our model is process oriented and temporal.
PHASE ONE CONCLUSIONS: THE QUALITY ECOSYSTEM

- **Pedagogical Encounter**
- **Parents, Families, and Community Members**

Diagram:
- **State and National Policymakers**
- **CPS**
- **Schools**
- **Classroom Teachers**
- **Students**
- **Teaching Artists**
- **Arts Partner Organizations**
- **Funders**
- **Arts Sector**

**Long-term causes & inputs**

**Long-term effects**
The below list describes the general dimensions and practices of quality that each entity has ownership over. These practices will then form the basis of tangible quality recommendations and supports for each entity.

**STUDENTS**
- Engagement in learning process
- Agency, desire, and motivation
- Effort and participation
- Behaving with integrity, respect, and accountability toward peers and instructors
- Willingness to be vulnerable or uncomfortable in order to challenge oneself and grow
- Ownership of learning, goals, and values

**CLASSROOM TEACHERS/TEACHING ARTISTS**
- Pedagogical strategies, tools, and best practices
- Differentiation and student-centered practices
- Lesson and curriculum planning
- Cultural competence
- Communication
- Setting expectations and norms
- Professional development
- Relationship-building with educator colleagues, schools, arts partner organizations, parents, families, and communities

**ARTS PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS**
- Relationship-building with schools, parents, families, communities, and funders
- Communication and setting expectations with schools
- Developing and implementing mission, vision, and practices of quality within an organization
- Developing and implementing curriculum, tools, and resources for teaching artists
- Aligning programming offerings with standards and curricular scope and sequence
- Hiring, training, supporting, and retaining high-quality teaching artists
- Advocating for teaching artists within an organization, with schools, and to funders and the broader arts sector
- Practicing cultural competence within an organization and in external relationships
- Securing adequate funding from funders whose objectives align with the organization’s priorities

**SCHOOLS**
- Relationship-building with teaching artists, arts partner organizations, funders, CPS, parents, families, and community members
- Aligning partner programming with curricular scope and sequence; facilitating teacher leadership in alignment process
- Facilitating collaboration between classroom teachers/certified arts teachers, and teaching artists
- Facilitating collaboration among all partners at a given school
- Providing appropriate facilities and materials for arts partner programming
- Communicating and setting expectations collaboratively with teaching artist and arts partner organizations
- Facilitating arts partner engagement with parents and communities
- Facilitating arts partner and teaching artist practices of cultural competence

**PARENTS, FAMILIES, AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS**
- Supporting student success
- Communicating and providing input and feedback
- Engaging in programming

---

*Photo by Daniel Ribar, courtesy of Chicago Shakespeare Theater.*
PHASE ONE CONCLUSIONS: THE QUALITY ECOSYSTEM

CPS
- Providing adequate financial and tactical support
- Taking leadership in providing long-range scope and sequence, curriculum, standards, supports, frameworks, assessments, and evaluations for excellence in arts teaching and learning
- Facilitating program sustainability and long-term relationship development between partners and schools
- Planning for high-quality arts facilities in all schools
- Providing guidance and definition on the role of arts partners in the schools

FUNDERS
- Providing adequate and equitable financial and tactical support
- Systemic analysis of inequities in funding, resources, and access, and shifting funding strategies accordingly
- Collaborating with arts partner organizations and schools to listen to on-the-ground needs and set expectations together
- Thinking critically about assessment, evaluation, and outcomes, shifting strategy to a focus on quality for its own sake

STATE AND NATIONAL POLICYMAKERS
- Providing adequate and equitable funding
- Communicating with all other stakeholders around values and priorities for arts education
- Embracing quality in arts education for its own sake as a desired outcome and metric

ARTS SECTOR
- Collaboration and support across the sector and within relevant sub-sector groupings, (e.g., by discipline)
- Development and sharing of resources across the sector
- Sector-wide practices of diversity and cultural competence, especially around creating a pipeline of teaching artists and administrators of color
- Creative collaboration to maximize funding opportunities
- Creative collaboration around providing equitable access to excellence and to a variety of arts disciplines for all students

LONG-TERM CAUSES AND INPUTS
This area of the graphic represents the long-term antecedents to a quality arts education experience. These causes and inputs may vary by program and situation but generally include things like preexisting relationships and programming; students’ and parents’ needs, desires, and priorities for arts education; the underlying demographics, needs, and desires of the school and local community; the arts partner organization’s history and long-term strategy; and big-picture education policy decisions. More research is required to understand fully how long-term causes and inputs shape quality in arts teaching and learning.

LONG-TERM EFFECTS
This area of the graphic represents the long-term outcomes of a quality arts education experience. These outcomes and effects are already the subject of significant research and policy attention and include student-level outcomes such as arts skill attainment and socio-emotional learning; school- and community-level outcomes, including the social justice outcomes that many arts partners value; and city-level outcomes that shift policy and practice system-wide.
NEXT STEPS: PHASE TWO
From the data collected in the first 22 quality conversations, we have established consensus values about quality held by the arts partner community and developed a set of working hypotheses around what quality is and how to support quality work.

During the 2016-17 school year, Ingenuity will build off of the quality conversations to develop an Arts Partner Quality Framework analogous to the CPS Framework for Teaching and a complementary quality toolkit to support arts partners in practices of quality within their organizations. Ingenuity is not designing this tool alone. Arts partners will be the architects, and we will build this framework together. The goal is not to put arts partners on a scale or give partners a seal of approval, but rather to create a tool that functions as a roadmap for our continual growth and improvement as a sector.

Quality conversation participants were broadly representative of Chicago’s arts partner community, but a greater diversity of perspectives is still needed and will be a priority in the second phase of the Quality Initiative. There are ways for all members of the arts education sector to get involved, and Ingenuity will publicize these opportunities as the second phase of the Quality Initiative progresses.
The second phase of the Quality Initiative (October 2016–July 2017) will yield an Arts Partner Quality Framework analogous to the CPS Framework for Teaching, and a complementary quality toolkit to support arts partners in practices of quality within their organizations.

The Quality Framework will be a tool by which we are all measured—and we will use that measurement as a needs assessment, informing strategy for supporting and better resourcing the arts education sector in the practice of quality in the classroom. The Quality Framework will serve as a common language for the sector to discuss and enhance quality, sparking new opportunities for collaboration and growth.

These next steps are directly informed by recommendations and requests that participants made at the end of the quality conversations via the Thinking Ahead sheets that Ingenuity asked all participants to complete.
Phase Two quality conversations will focus on particular stakeholder groups whose voices need to be added to the conversation in a more targeted way and follow up on key issues determined in Phase One.

- **Students:** We will solicit students’ visions for and definitions of quality in their arts instruction experiences.
- **Funders:** Funders will share valuable expertise and discuss strategies for supporting the arts partner community in the pursuit of quality.
- **CPS arts liaisons and certified arts teachers:** The voices of colleagues in CPS will provide content expertise and a better understanding of best practices for collaboration and alignment.
- **Discipline-based (visual arts, theatre, music, dance, literary arts, media arts):** These conversations will allow us to dive more deeply into what quality looks like, and requires, within discipline-specific contexts.

Groups with specialized knowledge will be tasked with providing recommendations in response to areas that quality conversation participants felt merited more explanation. Members of the partner community will have the opportunity to apply to each of these working groups.

- **Cultural competence and diversity expert working group:** Cultural competence and diversity were key priorities in the Phase One quality conversations, but participants agreed that more work was needed to determine how to put these values into action. This working group will provide definitions, strategies, and best practices.
- **Differentiation, diverse learners, and child development expert working group:** This group will address partners’ requests for more resources and insight around differentiation, working with diverse learners and varied learning styles, trauma-informed teaching, and classroom management practices.
- **Discipline-based expert working groups (visual arts, theatre, music, dance, literary arts, media arts):** These groups will build on the contributions of the discipline-based focus groups to flesh out recommendations for describing, defining, and implementing quality within their practice.

All working groups will also provide recommendations that will be used to create future professional learning tools and supports.

PUBLIC COMMENT

**WINTER 2016-2017**

Ingenuity will open an online platform for public comment and feedback on this report.
Six organizations, one from each discipline, will apply to pilot tools and supports for partners that will eventually become the quality toolkit requested by partners for quality conversations. Ingenuity will work with these organizations over the course of six months to support them in developing a definition of quality that aligns with their mission and values to assess their current practices and programs against this definition of quality and develop tools and resources that can enhance their practices of quality according to the visions and definitions they developed. This cohort will also be instrumental in developing and refining the Quality Framework.

Ingenuity will launch a beta version of the Arts Partner Quality Framework in summer 2017 for preliminary implementation, testing, and feedback.
- Analogous to the CPS Framework for Teaching
- Aligns and supports partners around common values for and practices of quality
- Provides descriptors and critical attributes for levels of proficiency in each element of quality
- Provides a roadmap for enhancing partner practices of quality

Ingenuity will address six major areas for professional learning throughout 2016–17 and beyond:
- Setting learning objectives, with particular attention to describing and defining student outcomes
- Designing and using student assessments
- Practical tactics and strategies for classroom management
- Understanding and using trauma-informed teaching and disciplinary practices
- Record keeping, documentation, and student portfolio review
- Communicating and engaging with families

Ingenuity will also develop further professional learning tools and opportunities based on the work described below.
APPENDIX
METHODOLOGY

In 2009, Project Zero, an arts education and multiple intelligences research institute at Harvard University’s Graduate School of Education, published a white paper entitled *The Qualities of Quality: Understanding Excellence in Arts Education*. This report was based on formal, in-depth interviews with leading arts education experts around the country, site visits to arts education organizations and informal interviews with their staff and stakeholders, and a review of the then-extant literature. *The Qualities of Quality* organizes thinking about quality into what the authors called the Four Lenses of Quality: Student Learning, Pedagogy, Community Dynamics, and Environment. Further, the report contains a tool based on these categories entitled “Four Lenses on Quality: A Tool for Identifying Specific Elements of Quality in an Arts Learning Setting.”

The Four Lenses tool comprises five steps for facilitating a group discussion around the dimensions of what quality looks like in practice, as viewed through the four lenses:

1. Identifying elements of quality as seen through each of the four lenses
2. Exploring others’ ideas
3. Working toward a common analysis
4. Sharing beliefs about what quality should look like in participants’ own settings
5. Thinking ahead

We decided to base our process on the Four Lenses protocol for several reasons. First, *The Qualities of Quality* is the most rigorous and detailed research report on quality in arts education, and it brings a national perspective to defining and discussing quality. We wanted to take advantage of the excellent work that has already been done, building on it with the unique perspective of Chicago’s arts community. Second, the Four Lenses protocol was specifically designed to surface participants’ beliefs about quality, recognizing and honoring the diversity of perspectives that participants bring to the table. This aligned with Ingenuity’s priorities for the Quality Initiative, which determine that quality will be defined and driven by partners’ values and practices. Third, use of the research-tested Four Lenses protocol meant that the results of the quality conversations would be equally valid for both research and practical purposes, advancing the field in these two respects.

---

33. Ibid., 77.
34. Ibid., 77-78.
Ingenuity modified the Four Lenses protocol in several key ways to better reflect the local Chicago context. First, we added another lens, “Social Justice/Equity,” which is a key priority for many arts partners, for the broader Chicago community, and for the nationwide arts sector. Thus, our protocol is called “The Five Lenses of Quality.”

Second, we modified the fourth step of the above protocol to include both participants’ current priorities for quality—things that individuals and organizations are already doing—as well as goals for the future. Note that, although *The Qualities of Quality* provides definitions for each lens, we did not share these definitions with participants during the Quality Conversations, instead asking participants to hash out their own definitions, and interpretations of these definitions, in their group discussions. We video-recorded each conversation and captured the written notes and materials resulting from the pair, small-group, and large-group work (steps 1, 2, and 3, respectively), as well as from the Thinking Ahead sheets that individual participants completed at the end of each session.

Our research team then analyzed the materials resulting from each conversation according to best practices of qualitative ethnographic research. Researchers transcribed the discussion portions of each quality conversation word-for-word. These transcriptions, along with the written materials generated directly from the conversations, were then coded three times. In all, we analyzed 22 conversations’ worth of data, with each data set including field notes taken by a researcher on-site at the conversation, a full transcription of the group discussion, and the hard copy notes generated during each session. The notes consisted of brainstorming notes from participant pairs, Five Lenses tools completed by small groups, Five Lenses tools completed by the group as a whole, and Thinking Ahead sheets completed by each participant individually after the session had concluded.
The first round of coding tagged each data point—for example, a quote from a participant or a bullet point on a participant notes sheet—according to the definitions of each lens of quality as described in The Qualities of Quality report (plus Social Justice/Equity) and according to the definitions of each category of pedagogical best practice according to Danielson’s Framework for Teaching. (Both the Five Lenses and Danielson’s framework definitions are described in the Phase One data analysis section beginning on page 9.) This first round of coding allowed us to interpret the ways in which participant definitions of quality compared with these two existing definitions of quality.

Coding according to Danielson’s Framework for Teaching helped us to understand the ways in which the perspectives of arts partners were or were not aligned with the definition of quality teaching used by the Chicago Public Schools. The Chicago Public Schools have adapted Danielson’s Framework for Teaching into the “CPS Framework for Teaching,” a tool that defines and describes good teaching practice in a way that can be used across ages and subject areas. The framework encapsulates what principals are looking for and the standards to which classroom teachers and certified teaching artists are held and is thus a valuable tool for alignment, collaboration, and communication between partners and schools. By developing codes based on the framework, we were able to understand precisely where the partner community aligns with CPS and where the partner community contributes a different perspective.

The second round of coding was descriptive, or what is often called “open,” coding, tagging each data point with a description of what that data point contained on its own terms. For example, many participants discussed what they felt a quality “culminating experience” to a residency entailed—these data points were tagged with “culminating experience.” This step allowed us to understand participants’ perspectives that were novel—that is, not already included in the Five Lenses or Danielson frameworks.

Finally, after analyzing the patterns and perspectives arising from descriptive coding, we honed in on several key themes that were particularly important to a critical mass of participants, and developed a new code system to analyze these ideas. We called these “Safe Space,” “Ideal vs. Real,” “Quality at Scale,” and “Culture and Support Beyond the Classroom.”

All of these categories are described in the “Phase One Data Analysis” and “Phase One Conclusions” sections. We went through the data set again and coded the relevant data points in greater detail to understand how participants conceived of these key topics and why participants felt these were important to defining, understanding, and practicing quality.

Once all the data was coded, we took extensive notes, writing what ethnographers call “interpretive memos,” on each category to surface key themes. These memos formed the foundation for the data and analysis that is presented here.
The 22 quality conversations included a wide variety of members of Chicago's arts community—primarily teaching artists and administrators from arts partner organizations, as well as funders, CPS staff and administrators, and certified arts teachers.

**Participants by Discipline**

- **Theatre:** 64
- **Music:** 56
- **Visual Arts:** 51
- **Dance:** 34
- **Literary Arts:** 17
- **Media Arts:** 12
- **Multi:** 23
- **Other:** 6

Participants could identify multiple disciplines.

**English is the primary language spoken**

**Spanish is the second most common language spoken**

**240 unique participants from 127 organizations and schools attended**

**29 people attended multiple conversations**

**Photo by Raul De Lara courtesy of Chicago Artists Coalition.**
APPENDIX: QUALITY CONVERSATION PARTICIPANTS

Gender
- 72% FEMALE
- 27% MALE
- 1% OTHER

Race/Ethnicity
- 65% WHITE
- 16% AFRICAN AMERICAN
- 11% MULTI/OTHER
- 8% HISPANIC

Years of Experience as a Teaching Artist
- 23% 1-5 YEARS
- 28% 6-10 YEARS
- 8% 11-15 YEARS
- 11% 16-20 YEARS
- 12% 21+ YEARS
- 21% NO RESPONSE

Participants by Job Title
- 94 MANAGER, COORDINATOR, ASSOCIATE, SPECIALIST TITLES
- 79 DIRECTOR, PRESIDENT, FOUNDER, CEO
- 66 TEACHING ARTIST, TEACHER, EDUCATOR, PRINCIPAL
- 1 UNKNOWN

Most participants lived on the north or northwest sides, with a substantial minority residing on the south or southwest sides. Participants worked in locations all over the city, but most participant organizations are based in the greater Loop area or on the north side.

Quality conversation participants were broadly representative of Chicago’s arts partner community, but a greater diversity of perspectives is still needed and will be a priority in the second phase of the Quality Initiative.
QUALITY CONVERSATION
PROTOCOL DOCUMENTS

Below, we have reproduced the materials used during quality conversations. As described in the “Methodology” section, the protocol was composed of six steps:

1. Brainstorming elements of quality in pairs: This took place on blank sheets of paper, and thus no instruments are reproduced here.

2. Comparing pair brainstorming notes: Again, nothing from this step is reproduced here, as this step was fully oral.

3. Small group mapping of brainstorming notes to the Five Lenses chart

4. Large group conversation and mapping of small-group Five Lenses to collective Five Lenses chart

5. Group reflection on participants’ personal and organizational priorities and goals for quality

6. Individual completion of Thinking Ahead sheets to provide recommendations and next steps

The Five Lenses chart used in steps 3 and 4 is the same and is therefore only reproduced once.
EXAMPLES OF PARTICIPANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO QUALITY CONVERSATIONS

Below, we have reproduced examples of completed participant protocol documents:

1. Pair brainstorming notes from the February 17, 2016, quality conversation

   ![Brainstorming Notes]

2. A Five Lenses tool completed by a small group at the March 25, 2016, quality conversation

   ![Five Lenses Tool]

3. The Five Lenses tool completed by the full group at the June 28, 2016, quality conversation

   ![Full Group Five Lenses Tool]

4. Thinking Ahead sheet completed by a participant at the January 25, 2016, quality conversation

   ![Thinking Ahead Sheet]
APPENDIX: PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

OF THE 127
DIFFERENT
ORGANIZATIONS
WHO PARTICIPATED
IN A QUALITY
CONVERSATION,
104 CHOSE TO
DISCLOSE THEIR
ORGANIZATION’S
NAME.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>826CHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About Face Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Urban School Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Stage Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After School Matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Park Theater Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Rhythm Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Encounter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArtReach at Lillstreet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium Theatre of Roosevelt University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrel of Monkeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Arts Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Wall Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Worlds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Children’s Choir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Dance Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Human Rhythm Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Improv Productions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Jazz Philharmonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Opera Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Park District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Shakespeare Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Storytelling Guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Symphony Orchestra—The Negaunee Music Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Youth Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Youth Shakespeare, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Youth Symphony Orchestras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CodeCreate Technology Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia College—Center for Community Arts Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities in Schools of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS Office of Early Childhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS–Prescott School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS Department of Arts Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Artist Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream Big Performing Arts Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble Español Center for Spanish Dance &amp; Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanston Arts Education Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward Momentum Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Lunch Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodman Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Star Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Theater for Music and Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her Story Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard Street Dance Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park Art Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Arts Council Artist-in-Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Caucus for Adolescent Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Humanities “Road” Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Storytelling Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingenuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. Tap Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation Music Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Addams Hull-House Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUSTUSarts Educational Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karim Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Kids Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lookingglass Theatre Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyric Opera of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.U.S.I.C. Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marwen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit School of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moxie Mosaics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudlark Theater Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muntu Dance Theatre of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music House Academy of Music and Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Museum of Mexican Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Storytelling Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern Illinois University CCAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Illinois University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northlight Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town School of Folk Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach Ensemble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play in a Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravinia REACH TEACH PLAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Clay Dance Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm Revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense-Net Media/Stamps for Kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift: Englewood Youth Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SkyART (formerly South Chicago Art Center)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow City Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore Opera Company of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steppenwolf Theatre Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chicago Community Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chicago Storytelling Guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Greatest Story Never Told</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Joffrey Ballet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The People’s Music School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Port Ministries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TimeLine Theatre Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UChicago Charter School and Arts + Public Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Gateways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Threads Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writers Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolocalhosti Arts Reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Chicago Authors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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