

# Monitoring National Arts Education Systems (MONAES)

International expert-meeting, February 27 and 28, 2015

Utrecht, Netherlands

## REPORT

### Introduction

On February 27 and 28, 2015, an international expert-meeting on comparative research in arts education was held in Utrecht, the Netherlands. Experts from twelve countries –Austria , Belgium (Flanders), Canada, Colombia, France, Germany, Israel, the Netherlands, Norway, Singapore, Spain and the United Kingdom – gave presentations, offered comments and took part in discussions about issues of comparative arts education research, about available data for international comparison and about a draft questionnaire for the project *Monitoring National Arts Education Systems* (MONAES).

The aim of the conference was to clarify concepts and methodologies for the MONAES-project by putting this project in a broader context of comparative research in (arts) education. The MONAES-project was initiated in 2011 by the International Network for Research in Arts Education (INRAE) and it is coordinated by the UNESCO-Chair in Arts and Culture Education at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg: Prof Dr Eckart Liebau, Prof Dr Benjamin Jörissen and Dr Ernst Wagner. The project's purpose is to monitor the extent and the ways in which recommendations of UNESCO's *Seoul Agenda: Goals for the Development of Arts Education* (2010) are being followed by civil society, professional organizations and governments in UNESCO member-states. It should help to keep issues like access to arts education and high-quality delivery of arts education on political and policy agenda's and to stimulate progress in desired directions. The project consists of three parts: a survey among arts education experts in countries across the world using a questionnaire with mainly closed-ended but also open-ended questions; using available international data for adding contextual information and for secondary analyses; and qualitative case-studies focusing on innovative and best practices. At the meeting in Utrecht, a draft questionnaire for the survey was presented and discussed.

The meeting was organized by Dr Teunis IJdens of the Netherlands Centre of Expertise for Cultural Education and Amateur Arts (LKCA) in cooperation with Dr Ernst Wagner, executive coordinator of the UNESCO-Chair in Arts and Culture Education at the Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nuremberg.

This report gives an account of the presentations, comments and discussions at the Utrecht-meeting. It was prepared by Vera Meewis and Marie-José Kommers and edited by Teunis IJdens (LKCA). The full list of participants is attached to this report.

Friday, February 27

### Issues for comparative (arts) education research

The first part of the meeting focused on key issues for comparative (international, cross-national) research in (arts) education. It was moderated by Larry O'Farrell, UNESCO-Chair in Arts and Learning at Queen's University (Canada) and President of INRAE.<sup>1</sup>

- Word of welcome by Ocker van Munster, managing director LKCA

Ocker welcomes all the international guests and Dutch colleagues. In the Netherlands there is a firm discussion about the curriculum. Aspects of cultural awareness and tradition seem to become more prominent, next to the more economic education agenda of the 21<sup>st</sup> century skills. Another big question is whether to integrate the arts with other subjects or keep them as a separate domain. And the discussion on the primary school teacher who can't do everything and feels insecure about teaching the arts. The cultural infrastructure can assist schools, but there is the question of quality. These types of questions are now asked everywhere. Research on arts education is very important to tackle some of the questions we are faced with. And so is international exchange on research subjects, like we are doing today.

- Opening speech by Larry O'Farrell, moderator

The MONAES monitoring project started in 2010 with the development of the Seoul Agenda, which was accepted by all the member countries of UNESCO. A group of people involved with the agenda asked the question: How will we know what happens with arts education and the principles of the Seoul Agenda? After a couple of years of struggling with this question we now present the result of our efforts to provide an answer. These two days we're going to have a thorough discussion of different aspects of the problem, with presentations and responses. Starting from the general and working towards the particulars.

- Keynote speech by David Johnson, University of Oxford

*Comparing – what, why and how for Arts Education? Modes of representation and meaning-making.*

How is meaning made through multiple modes and multiple media? The modalities through which we make meaning draw on a multitude of modes which were talked about in the lecture. David's main point is that there are different ways of meaning-making and we need to be careful when making comparisons amongst countries. Globalisation places new demands on broad literacies, and cultural globalisation questions how we express meaning. There's a shift to electronic communication, and people engaging with media. What type of knowledge does the 21. century require? How are literacies best developed in the school curriculum and outside of it? How can we assess it?

In the world of schools and communities the effects of globalisation are a copresence of diverse forms of representations, texts, image, music, speech, writing. Hollywood and Bollywood mingle. New givens are accepted but we do not always understand them. We don't really have the tools. In the world of school new demands are countered, made sense of, by old certainties. We need to rethink pedagogy and forms of representational modes. The successful learner in our century needs to be autonomous and self-directed, using different modes of meaning mak-

<sup>1</sup> Larry was so kind to replace Eckart Liebau (UNESCO-Chair in Art and Culture Education at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg) who had fallen ill and could not attend the conference.

ing; oral, visual, spatial, gesture. And also needed are new tools of meaning-making and thinking with cultural tools.

The multicultural nature of society asks for plurality. People need new tools to be able to arrive at shared meaning. New ways of meaning making in the curriculum requires not narrow, but broad ways of understanding. Being able to negotiate regional differences is an important skill for students. Also spatial literacy is important. Being able to read McDonalds for example as not a space to linger for coffee but to eat your food fast and make room for new customers. Or the casino as a place where you are expected to linger, to clean you out. Not many of us are taught what to do with gestural literacy. The linguistic mode is one form to be comfortable with, but the spatial and the gestural are other forms. In groups you can use these different forms of modality to give meaning to a task. Reading and literacy are embedded in social practice. But reading is different from for instance knowing the genre, which is the soul of literacy.

We need to review what we mean with literacy. How come so much assessment is done in the mode of writing? When for example the science curriculum is very much made up of images. In assessment we seek recourse in the only thing that we know, which is writing. That is an enormous contradiction. We don't recognise multimodality in assessment. Language and arithmetic's are the old basics. Multimodality and multimediality are the new.

Comparing among countries is not always done right. It is naïve to conclude that when children of the same age from different countries can't do the same thing or are not as adept, cognition is delayed. American students do better than Botswana students with pen and paper, Botswana students do better with wire. When the material is new for everyone, both groups do equally poor. Cognition is situated in the community where we live.

If we compare, how do we compare and what interpretations can we reach? What can we compare? Reading 100 words in a certain amount of time is easily comparable amongst countries. This is the reading fluency. We know what the reasonable speed is, and the difficulty of the text. Comparing non-readers in the same language is not difficult. But different languages can't be compared. One language might be more difficult than the other. We can't be certain of the cognitive demands of different languages.

Schools are important for the promotion of written literacy. But communities are also important. We sometimes ignore the importance of the informal. Art is also bountiful in informal settings. The formal and informal are not integrated enough as a driver of learning.

We found that the share of non-readers in Nigeria was shockingly high. When Nigerian children were given a book, back to front and upside down, only half could show the front of the book correctly. When children were asked to use the art work, the illustration, as tools for thinking they also couldn't give an answer. Both text and images were not able to stimulate reason. Schools do what they can, you can't put everything on their door. Early concepts are established in interactions with others. In Nigeria children were not exposed to this to use concepts. We need to relate (art) education to human cognition. If we want to compare we should not only think of the easy ways to do it, but also of the things we can't easily see.

- Comment by [Shifra Schonmann](#) (Israel)

Shifra reflects questions and thinking raised by David. Her comment consists of three points.

1. We always want to make comparisons to be able to judge. In arts education we started to compare only recently. We should ask the question how. How is research done intellectually? What kind of work is being done in the field of comparative arts education research in a world in flux? Intuition is one of the components that make up epistemic knowledge. We always deal with a lot of complex data in comparative research and complex calculations. Are relations

being made correctly? We should use our intuition in dealing with and interpreting data for comparison.

2. Researchers need to take a stand on standardization. On what basis do we answer our stance, on ideology, on cost? Is there more standardization in schools? There are different views on this. Why does politics want to define achievement? We have to think about this. Indicators don't have the same meaning in different countries. Do we need to create a universal model? We should try to go beyond the standard. Judgment cannot be reduced to rule, as said Eisner. Dealing with art is dealing with nuance. Nuance is also critical in comparative research. We need criteria, not standards.

3. What do we want to achieve with comparison? The potency lies in the process of comparing, and not in the results. Critical thinking about a variety of outcomes is needed in order to contribute to human understanding. We have to steer research through pitfalls, and need good answers to the question of how to do this.

- Comment by Willem Elias (Flanders)

The multi-interpretability of art is important. The aim of research is to collect the right information to stimulate improvement. Monitoring is a first step, not the whole process. It's not diagnosis and treatment. Decent analysis and recommendations are needed. Linking findings to what other scholars have found. The bigger picture. Research is about the questions, its formalized curiosity. Are we asking the right questions, whose questions are these, and why are they relevant? Why do we want an international monitoring system on arts education? Do we want to check assertions?

What worries me with arts education in schools is that only the lowest levels of skills are looked at in primary education. Only in secondary education reflection and higher order skills come into play. Too little too late. But there is less time in secondary education, and educators focus too much on repetition and technical skills. Reflective arts education is neglected. Arts production is reduced to frivolous and for decoration purposes. Art and art education theory has moved on. Art is also a strong cognitive tool.

- Comment by Larry O'Farrell (Canada)

The risk of comparison is colonization of the other, especially developed countries. Transferring methods from one country to another is a risk, especially for goals and values. Even though we have these concerns, and ways of looking differ, we still want to compare between systems. Western ideas of theatre is something different than African ideas of theatre. In Brazil the curriculum is ballet, but the dance culture there is very rich. Recognizing diversity should be made a strong concern in comparative research.

- Reply by David Johnson

Intuition is indeed an important concept when thinking about the design of new tools. It plays an important role, also for researchers. There is a dialectical relationship between the production of art and the use of it in the way we think. The use transforms the object. Transformation and intersubjectivity are important and cannot always be captured. We should be careful in how we compare. Comparison is a way of life, but you have to think about it from your own field.

- Presentation by Teunis IJdens (The Netherlands)

*Comparative policy research in arts education: prolegomena for a review*

Policy may not be the sexiest subject for arts education researchers, but it requires and attracts attention. Public policy may influence arts education's infrastructure and practice by allocating budgets, by setting goals, and by imposing rules of conduct and performance-criteria for publicly funded educational and cultural institutions.

Patricia Dewey has proposed to engage in comparative policy research in arts education within the larger field of comparative *cultural policy*.<sup>2</sup> But why *cultural policy*? Why not *educational policy*, which is the obvious alternative as the arts are part of school-curricula in nearly all countries? Or as a subfield of *youth and family policy*, which would be relevant for Germany where non-formal arts education is partly funded and regulated from this perspective? Or, why not study arts education policies like any other policy area in terms of general theoretical frameworks for policy research?

These considerations have led me to reflect on some basic questions of comparative policy research in arts education. This paper is intended to prepare the ground for a comprehensive review, hence its subtitle. First I will discuss comparative descriptive policy studies, and then go on to ask what is needed to move 'beyond descriptives'.

If anywhere, comparative studies are likely to proliferate in countries with a *decentralized policy system* for education and culture. The urge for 'unified standards' for educational assessment across states/provinces certainly is a driver for comparative descriptive research in countries where curriculum-decisions are made at subnational levels. Some cross-national descriptive reports have been *one-off* studies prepared in connection with European or international conferences. Other efforts reflect a more continuous interest in comparable facts and trends. [Teunis refers to articles and reports exemplifying types of descriptive studies.] Descriptive studies offer a lot of information about subnational and national arts education policies. Loose narratives covering few cases may offer 'thick description' while formatted narratives usually provide 'thinner' information about more cases, sometimes presenting comparative tables. Statistical analyses are virtually absent. It seems that descriptive studies have sometimes been carried out without reference to similar previous or parallel efforts covering the same issues. This is not efficient to say the least.

Descriptive policy studies are not designed to *understand* or *explain* differences and similarities across countries or states/provinces. Comparative arts education policy research needs to move beyond descriptives. In order to do so, three 'big questions' need to be addressed:

1. Why are arts education policy *systems* similar or different?
2. Why are specific arts education policies and programs developed, designed and implemented differently or in similar ways?
3. What is the impact of different or similar arts education policy systems and policy programs?

Several issues may be addressed in these 'big questions'. Why are arts education policy systems, including concepts and definitions of arts education, different across countries? How do international discourses and supranational policies affect national policies with regard to *curricula*, *educational standards* and *teachers' training and professional development* through various stakeholders' agency? Why are similar and different policy programs stimulating *coop-*

<sup>2</sup> Patricia Dewey (2008). A comparative approach to arts education policy research. *Studies in Arts Education*, 49 (4) 277-293.

eration between schools and cultural organizations and artists developed and what is their impact in different countries? Why are *public management approaches* and implementation strategies in arts education policy similar or different, and does it matter for their impact on educational practice and learning outcomes?

The third question, about the impact of similar and different policies on educational practice and outcomes has the highest stakes. Finding universally or even regionally valid outcome-variables for countries' systemic performance in arts education would require considerable scholarly efforts and political and diplomatic skills. It is probably more realistic to compare specific policies with regard to *specific issues*. Some of these – standards and assessment, teacher policies, cooperation between schools and 'outside' agencies and public management approaches and policy implementation strategies in – have been outlined.

The challenge for comparative policy research is in explaining or understanding variation in policy systems and programs on the one hand and arts education practice in and out of school on the other, and in finding contingencies and causal relations between policy and practice. I use the term 'understanding' deliberately to include qualitative and exploratory analyses. Lacking 'hard data' about arts education in many countries, there is a temptation to start comparative research from the need for comparable information. This is a laborious and costly dead end street unless it is guided by strong, selective research-questions. And as such questions cannot be derived from a specific policy theory for this field – for there are only theories of policy *applied to* a field – they can only be developed from policy *issues* or *problems* in arts education that are being observed, talked about, reasoned about, interpreted and discussed.

Final remark: A sustainable discourse about comparative (policy) research in arts education cannot do without an infrastructure for sharing information, expressing views and interests and achieving consensus. There is a heterogeneous infrastructure of journals, conferences, networks and international arts education organizations across the world, but I get the impression – admittedly based on these incomplete and inconclusive *prolegomena* – that efforts in comparative research could show more connection and cumulative consistency. *Let's do something about it.*

- Comment by [Gemma Carbó](#) (Spain)

There has been data gathered on the topic of the role of culture in development. Culture contributes to policy and is a driver for sustainable development. Now, the Millennium Goals do not include culture. Gemma proposes indicators to reach a common goal for culture. Some of the data is the same as in the MONAES project. She proposes a couple of percentages which are countable. Percentage of instructional hours dedicated to arts education in relation to total amount of instructional time, of educated staff, of schools who have a library, of population that participate in cultural activity. We are talking about data in the cultural and the education sector. We need to analyze the process in which data is gathered. This is also qualitative research. Now there is project in Spain (300 children) and Mexico (2000 children). We are comparing how we're doing the project. How are we training the teachers? How are we bringing the arts in the school? These are things that aren't countable but worth researching.

- Comment by [Caroline Sharp](#) (NERF, United Kingdom)

Caroline was involved in three of the studies Teunis cited. She agrees with many things in the paper. For UNESCO policy as an important focus for research, and going beyond the descriptive. You should ask the three questions in the paper. But the question of impact on the children is the most important. Is a review study intended in MONAES? How is a review related to the survey? There was no definition of arts education. It is a difficult thing to define across

different countries. They're all contested terms. Why not look at the Seoul Agenda goals for the review? TIMMS, PIRLS and PISA were mentioned, but quickly dismissed. Could you do something with them for arts education? They're heavily written, but you could use different forms and modalities for research. But why would you wish to do it? That is the fundamental question. Teunis states taxonomy is needed. Is it? A taxonomy could also emerge from the study. There is a degree of commonality in the stated aims of arts education, and with the Seoul Agenda it would be possible to agree on outcome variables. Countries could respond to the Seoul Agenda goals. Do they recognize them? Is their system aiming at developing them? That could be alternative questions. Comparing policies on issues is a recommendation. You need a frame of reference for this. We need quite detailed studies to do this. Teunis mentions the importance of the academic infrastructure. It's bound with the differential status given to the arts in society, and the disparate nature of it. It is important to collect the information we already have. Policy making has to move from faith to evidence base.

- Comment by [Andreas Wiesand](#) (ERICarts Institute)

Researchers have a dilemma in dealing with empirical data: bird's eye view or frog's perspective? I sympathize with the frog, but earn my living with the bird. What do we lose when looking for international big data? Arts education has been pushed mainly from the arts side. We need to locate this research in a bigger frame. We do not see the *Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe* as comparative research. We're aiming at an information and monitoring system – food for thought in further comparative research. In 1999 the first issue of the *Compendium* came out. The first grid didn't have a chapter on cultural education, dealt with it under "Current Issues". Later on this has changed. Now there is a whole chapter with subchapters located in "Promoting Creativity and Participation".

How can international monitoring of arts education policy be achieved? Clear requirements for monitoring are the development of indicators that cover policies, the availability of information and secured verification procedures. With the *Compendium* we try to improve year by year. Classical monitoring systems cannot easily be adopted and a lot of work has still to be done. Last year, the European Cultural Foundation asked me to check the feasibility of a European Cultural Vitality Index. In that context, different stakeholders presented different reasons why such an index could be useful. These questions have to be solved early, before constructing the actual monitoring system. Our mapping of resources showed that only four indicator sets for cultural education were feasible. In the end, I had to vote against the Vitality Index project. Instead, different data resources should be explored and combined in a meaningful design. 'Making Compromises to Make Comparisons in Cross-national Arts Policy Research' is the title of a legendary article published 1987 by the late Mark Schuster. This insight would be even more relevant for ongoing monitoring activity.

- Comment by [Michael Wimmer](#) (EDUCULT)

What is the reason for comparative studies? To learn from each other, to exchange, to defend a mainstream of colonial approaches? What are the advantages of this effort? Have we made use of other efforts? We start one project after the other. What will bring us forward? There should be a problem to address. Where does arts education research belong to? Cultural policy or educational policy means different ways of dealing with it. There is a need for evidence to legitimize decisions. Are the results we're producing relevant for decision making processes? What is the position of cultural policy research in the policy process? In the educational realm this is different. Politicians see PISA results as very relevant for their policy making. Arts education, arts education policy and arts education research are different fields. Our aim is to make a

connection. Research could also be a broker between the practice and the policy. Research could also be like a bird between two fighting sites. We need to think about the relations between the three. We're seeing a change in the welfare state in Europe. This has consequences for arts education provisions.

- Reply by Teunis IJdens

Teunis is thankful for the comments and will improve his paper. He hopes that his intention was clear. He wanted to address underlying questions, doubts and challenges that come with comparative policy research in arts education, in order to enrich the discussion about the MONAES project we are having tomorrow.

- Questions, answers, and discussion

Larry O'Farrell thanks David, other presenters and commentators for their interesting, relevant and well-informed contributions. He opens the floor for other participants to ask questions and discuss several presentations and comments.

[One of the participants] asks David Johnson to give some examples of the changes in research approaches he talked about in his keynote speech. David replies with a description of the perception of qualitative and quantitative research by students, policy makers and the general public. Every year students are very much impressed by PISA. But the real challenge and the most interesting is to compare what is learned, with localized ways of teaching, sense of pedagogy and different cultural history. This doesn't mean David is opposed to quantitative research. Data are one thing, the other thing is using it, how to get the highs and lows. The power is to answer the interesting questions in multivariate analysis. In order to have better policy makers, who don't rush forward, uninformed. Sensitivity (historical e.g.) for the context is very important, because it allows us to use data properly.

Michael Wimmer asks David about his perspective on the different situations in Western systems, the differences with African societies and the challenges they are both facing. And asks him how it would be possible to compare literacies globally. For example: how to compare results from Nigeria to results from the same research conducted in the suburbs of Leeds or Bradford? David endorses this point, and states that we have also grave problems in Europe (unemployment e.g.) with young people who produce problems in neighborhoods. We have to provide kinds of literacies that are strong enough to counter narratives that aren't helpful.

Gloria Patricia Zapata Restrepo (Colombia) responds to this discussion that Colombia is facing a lot of problems. Colombia is considered to be one country, but there are in fact many different situations, who ask for different policies. Results from research is planted in South America, without discussion. With four researchers Gloria is training people to make their own research. Many of them don't think arts education is a subject. Gloria wants to share this problems because a lot of research projects are imposed, and they don't work. This two days Gloria would like to discuss this problems and be critical about it.

Stéphan Vincent-Lancrin (OECD) states he misses a subject in the discussion: a reflection about why we have comparative research, or want comparative research in arts education (i.e. the questionnaire). Indeed there are differences between countries, but you take them for granted. It's not a catastrophe if not all countries participate, and if there is not a strict definition. Important is why you want the indicators, and what the impact is. What kind of effects should it have? Should people be able to read a book, go to a cinema, know about creative industries, be able to sing? What is the minimal level?

Ludwig Stecher (Germany) stresses the importance of a definition on arts education ('it is the key'). To be able to go beyond a western view with the questionnaire we should come to

consensus. Also on what we need from arts education, with the Seoul Agenda we agreed on in mind. With a combination of tools we should be able to come to comparable data.

Larry O'Farrell replies that we don't have to go the definition of a European perspective. The difference between 'land of education versus land of culture' is an interesting point of view he points out. Unfortunately, adds Gloria Patricia, in Columbia education and culture are two sides of the brain, that are not connected.

Pat Thompson (United Kingdom) would like to add that it is deeply problematic to talk about things without definition. We are producing policy and culture, as a part of the process. The emphasis should be on what we want policymaking to be.

David Johnson insists on an efficient definition. Sustainability and citizenship are interesting concepts, but not if you can't measure them. At the same time we have to be clear about what doesn't lead to the how and why. PISA is not assessing learning but the functioning of educational systems. And we need and want that perspective. David concludes: 'My suspicion is that the real problem is what wasn't on the matrix, namely the interpretation about the matrix'.

Susanne Keuchel emphasizes that the MONEAS project is more than only a questionnaire. It also contains case studies and other statistic indicators about arts education. It includes both the bird's eye view and the frog's perspective. She is thankful for Michael Wimmer's remarks about the difference between arts education, arts education policy and arts education research. She herself would not classify her research as policy research. But of course research provides indicators that policy makers can use.

Shifra Schonmann remarks that the subject of today should have been *issues of arts education in comparative research* instead of issues for comparative (arts) education research.

- Today's closing remarks by [Larry O'Farrell](#)

Larry closes this part of the meeting by thanking all participants for the discussion about the issues. He looks forward on discussing the methodology to deal with these issues tomorrow.

## Saturday-morning, February 28

### International data for comparative research in education and culture

In the second part of the meeting, Saturday-morning, three presentations were given and discussed about the availability and use of international data for comparative arts education research and about a new research project developed by the OECD's Centre for Educational Research and Innovation.

- Introduction by [Teunis IJdens](#) (LKCA), moderator

In 2011 the INRAE Steering Committee has initiated the MONAES-project for monitoring the Seoul Agenda. It consists of three parts: 1. a survey among arts education experts in countries across the world using a questionnaire with mainly closed-ended but also open-ended questions; 2. using available international data for adding contextual information and for secondary analyses; 3. qualitative case-studies focusing on innovative and best practices. This afternoon we're going to discuss the draft questionnaire for the survey. But first we will hear presentations by Henk Vinken (LKCA) and José Pessoa (UNESCO Institute for Statistics) about using available international data for comparative arts education research. And we will hear Stéphan Vincent-Lancrin (CERI) presenting a new research project concerning education for creativity and critical thinking.

- Presentation by Henk Vinken (LKCA)

#### *Secondary analysis TALIS 2013*

The Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) is a periodical survey under auspices of the OECD among teachers and principals in primary and secondary education:

<http://www.oecd.org/edu/school/talis-2013-results.htm> TALIS 2013 was held in 32 countries across the world (including England, Flanders and Alberta). Survey-questions for teachers refer to some personal characteristics, to their pre-service training, and to how they feel about their work and competencies. The emphasis is on professional development. The database has all kinds of weighing levels which makes it difficult to use. You need to install an Analyzer developed by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

We have carried out an exploratory descriptive analysis comparing lower secondary arts teachers with other teachers in ten more or less similar countries, just to give an example of how the TALIS-data can be used for comparative research in arts education. Results are merely descriptive: they show similarities and differences between arts teachers and other teachers across selected countries. A paper with comparative tables is included in the conference-map. Results beg for interpretation and explanation, which cannot be given at this moment.

One in eight teachers in lower secondary education (ISCED 2) is teaching arts. Overall, teachers are pre-dominantly female (63%), arts teachers even more so (68%). Especially in the Netherlands and the UK the share of female teachers is much higher in the arts than in other subjects. In most countries most teachers (overall average 81%) work more than 90% of fulltime hours at school, arts teachers a little less so (average 76%); in the Netherlands the share of fulltime teachers is exceptionally low (43%), among arts teachers even lower (20%). There are interesting differences between countries in how well prepared arts teachers feel for their work. Overall a small majority of arts teachers feel prepared in the *content* of teaching arts, less so in Finland, France and Norway, more so in Australia, Sweden, the USA and the UK. Overall one third of arts teachers feel prepared in the *pedagogy* of teaching arts, less so in Finland, France, the Netherlands and Norway, more so in Australia, Denmark, Sweden, USA and UK. Overall four out of ten arts teachers feel prepared in *classroom practice* of teaching arts, less so in Norway, more so in Australia, Denmark, France, Sweden, USA and UK. Overall 70% or arts teachers took part in courses or workshops for professional development, 14% in in-service training, 38% in a professional development teacher network and 32% in individual or collective teacher-research in the twelve month preceding the survey. Arts teachers in e.g. Australia, USA, UK and the Netherlands tend to participate more in professional development activities than arts teachers in e.g. France, Finland and Denmark.

All in all TALIS is a rich dataset that makes key comparisons possible and can answer some basic questions for the MONAES-project for countries who take part in the TALIS-survey. There are differences in age, gender, preparation for the job and professional development activities between arts teachers across countries. Most of these differences seem to more or less reflect general differences between teachers (arts *and* other teachers) across countries, with some notable exceptions like the high share of female arts teachers and the very low share of full-time arts teachers in the Netherlands. Showing international variation is a first step. The next step would be to develop hypotheses about relationships that may be tested in further analysis, linking variables, scales and levels (teacher, school, country).

- Presentation by José Pessoa (UIS)

*Arts Education Data at the UNESCO Institute for Statistics*

What does UNESCO have in cultural statistics for the MONAES project? Data has to be harmonized for comparability, in some way. UNESCO has a Framework for Cultural Statistics that allows us to define culture and helps to develop indicators. There is a transversal domain for education and training in the framework for understanding the cultural sector.

The framework provides a definition for education and training. It's a broad definition that includes arts education. It does not consider education in its entirety, but only when it is a means of transmission of cultural values or cultural skills:

'Learning activities support the development, understanding and reception of culture, including processes of critique (e.g. art and dance schools, literary criticism). Education is the process by which culture is transmitted between generations. It is also the means whereby people learn to appreciate or form value judgements (e.g. a critique) about cultural activities or products. Education is a process of socialization by which culture is imparted and develops creativity that can challenge existing cultural norms. Education and Training in culture help an individual to acquire skills to create and make cultural goods. It teaches people to appreciate the outcome of the consumption of cultural goods and services or the social benefit of a participation in a cultural activity.'

There are several tools that can serve international comparability. ISCED is the International Standard Classification of Education. ISCED 2011 provides fields of education, there is the humanities (includes languages) and arts field.

The existing data UNESCO has focuses on the tertiary level of education. This gives contextual data of where arts professionals are coming from. There is data on degrees and enrollment. For instance enrollment in arts and humanities as a % of total enrollment in 2012 and graduates in arts and humanities programs as a % of total graduates in 2012. You can compare male/female. There is data on mobility of tertiary students for OECD countries, the number of foreign students enrolled in humanities and arts 2012.

There is a new survey on cultural employment. It will gather data about persons employed in cultural education and training occupations and facilities. There are some classification codes that are relevant: the International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities (ISIC) code 8452 (cultural education) and the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO) codes 2354 (other music teachers) 2355 (other arts teachers) and 2353 (other language teachers).

There is also a handbook on cultural participation that has a section on arts education (section C). With examples of survey questions (map 7 arts education). Finally, in the UIS Data Center you can find the data, handbooks, guidelines etc. It's all free.

<http://www.uis.unesco.org/culture/Pages/framework-cultural-statistics.aspx>

<http://www.uis.unesco.org/culture/Documents/IP23-culture-employment-metadata-en.pdf>

<http://www.uis.unesco.org/culture/Documents/UIS%20Proposal%20cultural%20Employment%202014.pdf>

<http://www.uis.unesco.org/culture/Pages/fcs-measuring-participation-handbook.aspx>

- Comment by Eva van der Boom (Netherlands)

Eva was national project manager for TALIS. There are 32 countries in the data set (40 expected in 2018 cycle). In 2013 eight countries also looked at primary education. TALIS is designed for international analysis and offers free access to data. The main disadvantage is that it's not designed to be a monitor. It's designed for countries to compare themselves and to learn from each other. Some questions are recurring every cycle, but perhaps not in the same

way. There are strict rules for analysing the data. The scales do not allow for international comparisons, only for within-country differences and relations. You cannot say country A performs better than country B. In the 2013 cycle there is a lack of 'mirrored' questions in teacher and principal questionnaire. Principals are more positively biased towards school policies. Some comments on the LKCA analysis. The USA cannot be included in any analysis due to low response rate. There are large differences between education systems that should be included in the analysis. It is possible to construct new variables, using SPSS. WesVar offers a wider range of statistical analyses than the IDB Analyzer. Data we have on schools can be added to the data set for the Netherlands (DUO). TALIS data is a good source but it can be enriched further.

- Comment by Jessy Siongers (Flanders)

We should strive for more clearly defined concepts. We use ISCED and ISCO also in national studies. Analysis on secondary datasets are a starting point rather than an answer. What is arts education? In Belgium we used a framework based on the International Civic and Citizenship Study (ICCS). There are a lot of things alike, like the home environment and social capital, extracurricular activities, and the school culture climate. This last variable has a stronger impact than the school curriculum. Teachers that do amateur arts have a positive effect on the school climate for arts. We can learn from ICCS about cultural perception, school wellbeing and arts participation. There are links between social values and arts education. Limitations of comparative research are representativity, easy accessible data, language barriers (Anglo-Saxon studies have a strong impact on what we study). Different modes of questioning lead to different results, this affects reliability. For instance Eurobarometer reported a lower percentage of non-participants than the national survey in Flanders. When comparing you have to take note of these differences and the differences in methodology. It's important to go beyond the formal curriculum. A lot of students participate in extracurricular activities. There are a lot of differences within countries. You also have to take that into account.

- Questions, answers, and discussion

Does the high percentage of women in arts education have an impact on quality? There are policy recommendations in the TALIS report, but nothing specific on arts education. Implications are about raising the quality of teachers and to retain teachers for education. For example provisions for induction programs for starting teachers. It would be interesting to take a look at the male/female ratio for arts education. It might be related to the large part of part-time workers, and instructional hours for arts subjects.

It's important to look at alternative explanations. Participation in higher vocational training for arts education might be gender related. Related to young people and their career choices. A gender imbalance can be problematic. Maybe males in arts education are discriminated against? There is the question of gender stereotypes. Perhaps that is something to look into. Money and prestige play a big role in this matter. We should rethink the gender issue, not just for arts, also for the humanities. It starts in secondary education, where boys choose technology and girls arts. Also it's hard (for women) to combine working as an artist with having a family; teaching arts may be easier to combine.

There is a problem that in official statistics a person usually has only one (main) occupation, even though questionnaires may ask for secondary employment as well. Artists who teach arts as part of their activities are classified as an artist, arts teachers who are also working as a creative artist are classified as a teacher. The UNESCO survey on cultural employment is looking for secondary employment but in the analysis the secondary job is not included. That may

be a problem. We are interested in mixed practices. Also sometimes the cultural manager is in charge of education. That is not included in the statistics now.

Has the UIS's definition of arts education been tested in the field? It's a broad framework. There is no other data than the enrollment and graduates. The framework does set boundaries. It was arrived at after a global discussion of four year. There is more work needed on the education component.

Most examples and data is on formal education. What about non-formal and informal data? What happens outside the school is very important. In a comparable way that is a difficult dataset to collect. There is no international data for cultural participation. José is been making a module to the world poll with Gallup. That would be the first attempt to measure cultural participation on a global scale. What aspects do you want to get at? Cultural participation differs globally. The concept is not perceived the same worldwide. Non and informal, there is only data on national level. For arts education we cannot focus only on the formal data. 'Learning lives' study, young people learn in a range of places. Digital interaction is not even included. We need different tools. How do you connect informal learning with the concept of a learning system? At which level do you observe? The informal system can be made visible. You have to go to the level of the participant. Are we talking about a lifelong-learning-survey? Is there something on cultural learning in the PIAC survey? We have to look into this.

Should we look at existing datasets? What is the general feeling? It is worthwhile to invest time in finding relevant data. But what is the scope? Asking the specialists helps! If we want to improve something we have to have an idea of what we want to improve. We need an aim for development. What do we try to find out, and what are appropriate means? Get rid of comprehensive overview. Two issues, gender imbalance and double profession. Should we study this further?

- Presentation by Stéphan Vincent-Lancrin (OECD)

*Assessing progression in creative and critical thinking skills*

In his presentation Stéphan introduces a new project of the OECD concerning creative and critical thinking skills. He describes the background of the project, the challenges, the objectives, the proposed method, the assumptions, research questions etc. And also the relationship between arts education and creativity and critical thinking.

The project is a part of the (updated) OECD Innovation Strategy which focuses on what kind of skills and education are needed in innovative societies. It maps who are involved in the innovation, what kind of innovation, which skills categories are defined.

In the research three categories are pointed out: technical skills, behavioral and social skills (or non-cognitive), and skills in thinking and creativity. Some categories overlap and may reinforce each other. But they are different and cannot be reduced to a single skill (or measure). Skills are generally domain-specific: one is creative in a field, one knows how to behave/communicate in a specific context, one has problem-solving skills in a field, one has content knowledge in a field. They can become domain-generic. A skill becomes domain-generic when one has gained it in a number of domains or settings, so that it becomes a habit of mind (a disposition or an attitude) that one can apply to new fields.

With the study *Progression in student creativity in school* the OECD took the first steps towards assessment of creativity as one of the skills for innovation.

For assessing creative mindedness five categories were formed: inquisitive, persistent, imaginative, disciplined and collaborative. The prototype was tested in the field, with teachers and by students by self-assessment. The results doesn't say anything about progression, because it's just one year study.

The new project will build on this research. The challenge of the new project is how to support the monitoring and assessment of creative and critical thinking skills in formal education settings. Core research activities are: take stock of how countries or institutions explicitly assess creative and critical thinking skills (when they do so); prototype and pilot an assessment tool that will help teachers and students monitor the acquisition of these skills (or some dimensions of them); test whether language appears easily understandable and usable internationally (and learn from cultural differences in understanding); collect a set of tasks and expectations describing what students at different levels of the acquisition of these skills (could) do and thus give concrete examples of progression (or references) in these skills; provide fora for knowledge exchange on practices and ideas around the fostering and assessment of creative and critical thinking skills.

The proposed method consists of (in every country): two networks (higher education, and primary and/or secondary schools); three approaches: one STEM discipline (maths?), one arts education discipline (music?), one generic approach to innovation/creativity (design thinking?). Activities of participants are: co-designing a (new?) prototype of assessment tool; testing and finding agreement on language as we go; testing tool over one school year, and get feedback and improve the tool/frame every three months; meet two or three times internationally over 2015-16.

Research questions are: 1. can we propose an internationally acceptable qualification framework and assessment dimensions for these skills and make them tangible for teachers/students? 2. can we point to a (non-representative) variety of practices to foster these skills in educational settings? 3. in addition to development, we may also want to evaluate something, like different pedagogic interventions, the use of the assessment tool / different uses of the tool, differences of creativity across students (as measured by other tools).

Assumptions behind the project: there is a lot of tacit teacher professional knowledge about creativity and critical thinking: practitioners can help us in this endeavor; teachers cannot do this alone: academic expertise can help them operationalise these concepts as well; international comparison and exchange will help build a common language in this area and compare practices and achievements in education (and also take stock of cultural differences).

As for the role of arts education. There is a big connection between creativity and arts education. In *Art for art's sake?* the impact of arts education was described by a secondary analysis of many studies. Some of the results: most studies find a positive link between arts education and creativity, but the evidence cannot be generalised; affinities between the arts and innovation: e.g. no right or wrong answer; is it the arts or is it the kind of pedagogy used in the arts that could help foster the innovation skills?

Stéphan considers the limitations of the new project. While arts education is one of the disciplines that will likely be covered, we need to focus on a specific discipline (e.g. music education). We will need to translate the frame of reference into a concrete language and activities and accomplishments for the arts education field selected – to make the language and the criteria domain-specific. There is no assumption that creativity (or critical thinking) is more strongly related to arts education than any other field. According to Stéphan schools and teachers can benefit from the research: they benefit from a new tool and frame of reference (if all goes well) that help teachers (in at least some disciplines) to intentionally foster creativity and critical thinking; they participate in a national community of learning in this area (domestic gathering); they participate in an international (English-speaking) community of practice. People who are willing to join the research are very welcome to do so, by signing in before mid March (mail to: [Stephan.Vincent-Lancrin@oecd.org](mailto:Stephan.Vincent-Lancrin@oecd.org))

- Comment by [Ludwig Stecher](#) (Germany)

Ludwig thanks Stéphan for the initiative. He is convinced that assessing creativity and critical thinking is an important step to improve educational processes ('what we can assess we can improve'). And he is also convinced that we need more research of this kind to make learning and education more visible and to improve our knowledge about how to create effective learning environments for young people. Nevertheless, Ludwig has – as a critical friend – three critical remarks about the proposal. Two of them are interrelated to methodological questions of assessing creativity and one is interrelated to the conceptual focus of the study.

The first remark about the methodology is that creativity is considered to be a part of the self-concept (of students) and a competency at the same time (it is considered a personality trait). Using a self-assessment instrument we are assessing the creativity self-concept – not creativity as a competency. He suggests a clearer distinction in the proposal.

The second aspect Ludwig points out refers to his conviction that creativity is domain-specific – no matter if we are talking about creativity as part of the self-concept or from the point of view of a competency record. And from this conviction he foresees serious implications for the assessment by teachers, who experience their students in the narrow context of the subjects they teach. Teachers have only a situation biased limited perspective on student's creativity. He pleads for a discussion of the teachers' selection rationale in the proposal. Ludwig's final point is about 'creativity as an individual trait or a feature of the context'. If one of the aims of the study is to improve creativity in the school context, he recommends to widen the assessing focus to the educational quality of the context as well, and also maybe to the creative atmosphere in the family or within the peer group.

- Reply by [Stéphan Vincent-Lancrin](#)

Stéphan thanks Ludwig for his insightful remarks. He hopes the study can be expanded, to different areas. But there is always a tension because of what research has been done before and the research we want to do. Referring to the remarks about self-concept Stéphan says that (just like Csikszentmihalyi) he is allergic to defining creativity as a personality trait. Nevertheless, not everyone can expand creativity to the same extent. Sometimes the challenge is to improve the level from 3 to 5. Stéphan hopes that the study will make creativity more tangible as a skill for innovation. He's not sure they will succeed in that, but in trying they will document different pedagogies and contextual information in order to improve. 'If you don't try to improve, there is no change.'

- [Questions, answers, and discussion](#)

David Johnson says he is a bit skeptical about the 21<sup>st</sup> century skills, and research on creativity and critical thinking as skills for educational and economical innovation, even if this may seem to make him 'a grumpy old man'. Are the results portable and applicable from schools to workspaces, to cultural environments? They should be, because it is an expensive investment for policy makers.

Stéphan thinks that that is a pessimistic view. 'If we cannot change people, there is no progression'. He doesn't have all the answers, and says we cannot be sure, but as a policymaker you want to develop, and go beyond. And there's no harm in stimulating more creativity for people, it might be better for their well-being.

Caroline Sharp has also some remarks about the subject of creativity and critical thinking as skills for innovation. Highly creative people aren't the most communicative people. And education may foster creativity, but is also good at stopping it. Finally, concerning validity of the results: the self-concept of individuals may be smaller when they see others that are more

creative, compared with others who are more creative.

Susanne Keuchel (Germany) wonders if creativity is possible to teach, or maybe it's all about giving free room for it. And she wonders why the skill is called 'critical' thinking, not 'thinking'. Sometimes more 'positive thinking' may be needed to achieve innovation. Her last remark is about the limitation of skills as innovation for the economy, it should be broader. She missed for example 'responsibility' in the list of skills for innovation and asks what positive thinking is about. But then again, says Stéphan, the E in OECD stands for Economic.

Pat Thomson says it's important to gather the lessons that seem to be important in these change processes, for the teachers. That is where investments should go to: teacher capacity.

Gloria Patricia Zapata Restrepo wonders if assessing creativity is a good idea. What is creativity? What kind of creativity? How can you measure? Can you teach a teacher to be creative? It is hard to test.

Stéphan thanks the participants for their comments. He adds that he is aware of the fact that education can't do it all. We all know that family background is very important. Nonetheless, if education accounts for 30 percent of people's acquired skills, we must use it. Considering the question if we can teach creativity, Stéphan thinks that even if we don't change everything, he is still open to the idea that we can change something. As a final remark he says that he's not proposing a test for teachers, but ways to talk about things, a common idea of what matters.

**Saturday-afternoon, February 28**

### **MONAES: project and questionnaire**

The third and last part of the meeting focused on the draft-questionnaire for the *Monitoring National Arts Education Systems* survey among experts in countries across the world. The survey is supposed to cover relevant issues in the Seoul Agenda Goals for the Development of Arts Education. How can the questionnaire be improved in terms of relevance, universality, feasibility and other important criteria?

- Introduction by Ernst Wagner (moderator)

#### *The MONAES project*

It started in 2010 with the Seoul Agenda. In 2011 in Wildbad-Kreuth INRAE was founded. One of the first ideas was to monitor the Seoul Agenda to report back to UNESCO at a next world conference. How could we provide UNESCO with feedback? Have we addressed the right issues, do we develop practice? MONAES started in 2012. The INRAE steering committee cannot do it by itself. We need help from critical friends to work on the project. In 2014 we had a meeting in Montreal which was the kick-off to develop the questionnaire. But we also wanted a broader scope. We will work on MONAES with a survey and already existing data. We also have to do qualitative work on concepts and visions on arts education. We don't just do statistics. Ernst invites Shifra Schonmann to tell something about the 'wisdom of the many' project to open access to all the research, and engage in dialogue through the internet. For the *INRAE Yearbook 2015* Shifra invited many arts education researchers all over the world to write an entry on their preferred subject. 'Now we have 90 entries written. We create new knowledge on arts education that can't be obtained in other ways. In May the book will be published. We want to make a meta-analysis on the entries in the book. It's comparative in essence.'

- Presentation by Roel van Raaij (Ministry of Economic Affairs, Netherlands)

*Learning from others: monitoring the UNECE Strategy for Education for Sustainable Development*  
I'm a biologist involved in environmental education. We have a lot in common. I was chair of an expert group developing indicators for ESD (education for sustainable development). What do we want to measure, who wants to know? We have experience in this with ESD. Is it for policy makers, or politicians? They want to know if targets are fulfilled and if they are getting value for money. Researchers always have a next question. A professional wants to know how he/she can perform better? Is it for a benchmark, or is it for learning from each other? To learn or inspire is a satisfying angle.

The UNECE agenda is very similar to the Seoul Agenda. We made guidelines how to deal with indicators. What kind of process is needed to fill a questionnaire? How can we understand the data? Governments should feel responsible to fill in the questionnaire. Is that the case for the Seoul Agenda? Most of the data are on formal education, a lot of the action is in non-formal and informal education. These two have to be incorporated. The lines between school and society are blurred. The ESD has 8 objectives, the foundation for the indicators. There are a lot of questions to be answered. You have an indicator list dedicated to the objectives of the Seoul Agenda. You look at the process of implementation but also at the effectiveness of the implementation. What is the meaning of the implementation of the Seoul Agenda. <image Evaluation model>. Are people behaving in a different way after the education?

There is one difference between our indicator systems. The first stage questions are yes/no with added 'please specify'. ESD is about water, climate, consumers. All disciplines have a sub arena. How to collect the richness of what is available in reality? We asked the respondents for examples, these were more informative than the questionnaire. Try to also analyze what they mean. The first round of reporting was about how to fill out the questionnaire, the second round how to find the data below the question. The third round, with the examples, was after ten years to complete the picture.

On the national level the policy is made. In society the learning and activities are happening. The ideal is a feedback loop between the two. Education systems are changing in the network society. Try to capture the change of education in your questionnaire. Not just what is taught, but also how. How are you going to work with the questionnaire? Can people together make a meaningful national report? A national report is a multi-stakeholder issue. You can learn a lot from working on indicators together. That learning process is important. After eight years of monitoring the UNECE strategy we're still going through the mud.

- Presentation by Susanne Keuchel & Teunis IJdens

*Draft-questionnaire for the MONAES survey*

Collecting comparable information about the state of affairs in arts education in different countries poses a big challenge for research. The idea of monitoring the implementation of the Seoul Agenda was put forward by INRAE in 2011. In 2012 and 2013 Susanne undertook to develop a questionnaire for what was then called the Arts Education development Index (AEDI).

A first draft-questionnaire was tested ('first pre-test') among twelve members of INRAE in nine countries. Results were published in the *INRAE Yearbook 2014*.<sup>3</sup> It was concluded that

<sup>3</sup> Susanne Keuchel, Arts Education Development Index (AEDI) – A Comparative International Empirical Research Approach in Arts Education. In: Larry O'Farrell, Shifra Schonmann and Ernst Wagner (Eds.), *International Yearbook for Research in Arts Education*. Volume 2 (2014), pp. 42-51.

more time and a continued exchange of ideas as well as further tests would be necessary for developing a final index.

In March 2014 the project was renewed at an INRAE-meeting and a consultation with the UNESCO Institute for Statistics in Canada. A revised draft of the questionnaire was developed by Susanne, partially in cooperation with Teunis (LKCA), and again tested ('second pre-test') among eleven experts (INRAE-members and other) in nine countries in July-August 2014. From this second test it was concluded that there were still conceptual and 'technical' problems in the wording of questions and answers to be solved. An important technical issue was if answers to questions like 'how many ...' should be given in estimated or evidence-based *percentages* or in *ordinal* terms (e.g.: all, most, many, some, none). A revised questionnaire (by Teunis) with 'ordinal' answers to quantitative questions was discussed with José Pessoa (UIS) in Munich, October 2014. Thereafter the draft questionnaire for the Utrecht-meeting was prepared, now with a series of quantitative questions asking for percentages.

Teunis stipulates that this is still a debatable draft that needs to be tested once again before it becomes final. After comments at this meeting the questionnaire will be revised and then tested among experts in approximately 20 countries: primarily INRAE-members (including those from Australia, Kenya and New Zealand who were not able to attend this meeting) and members of the European network of 'arts education observatories' (most of them are present at the meeting). We hope to be able to present and discuss a possibly *nearly* final version of the questionnaire at the international arts education conference in Wildbad Kreuth, May 17-20. After Wildbad Kreuth we will prepare the final questionnaire for a worldwide survey among experts in as many of the nearly 200 UNESCO member states as possible, to be held by the end of this year. The final questionnaire needs to be approved by the INRAE Steering Committee by the end of September. In the meantime, a database of experts' e-mail addresses in as many UNESCO member states as possible needs to be built from various sources. The aim is to find at least three experts per country who will be invited to participate in the survey. Perhaps the questionnaire needs to be translated (in e.g. Spanish and French) as well. So there's still a lot of work to be done.

The draft MONAES-questionnaire is structured along two axes, as shown in the table.

Parts of questionnaire	<i>System:</i> regulation and funding	<i>Practice/coverage:</i> of arts teaching and learning, and access	<i>Policy:</i> issues, aims and programs
X. General education system			
A. Arts in formal education			
B. Non-formal arts education			
C. Teachers' training and qualifications			
D. Informal arts-learning			
E. Arts education research			

An international monitoring-instrument must meet a number of important criteria:<sup>4</sup>

- *Relevance*: in this case questions and answers must reflect issues in the Seoul Agenda.
- *Universality*: questions and answers must be valid and ‘real’ all over the world.
- *Feasibility*: experts must be willing and able to answer questions rather easily and within a limited time-frame (for instance one hour) without having to consult various sources of information; we will have to appeal to experts’ professional responsibility and goodwill because they will not be paid to participate in the survey.
- *Comparability* (of data to be collected): in time because if all goes well the survey will be repeated in three years; and across countries;
- *Reliability*: facts and estimates provided should not depend on an individual expert’s impression but on consensus among at least three experts;
- *Precision*: questions about quantities and details should be asked and answered as precisely as possible.

Can we meet all these requirements completely? Or must we accept that there will be a trade-off between relevance, universality and feasibility on the one hand and reliability and precision on the other?

- Comment by Aud Berggraf Sæbø (Norway)

Some comments on why. The mission is to put the Seoul Agenda in action, otherwise it will turn into a sleeping beauty. We need discussion and to learn from others about the situation in our countries. Policymakers in Norway are asking for research. What is this questionnaire? It is to make visible the possibilities in countries, curricula, teachers, training, society etc. In the first pre-test we asked for the four disciplines. Maybe we’re too far up now: there’s no distinction between the art forms anymore in the questionnaire. Put the differentiation between the four disciplines back in, and add other subjects from all over the world. Do we need to ask more in case-studies? As an expert I can’t answer all the answers. The informal is not clear: it’s hard to get data about participation and about individual and community-activities.

- Comment by Folkert Haanstra (The Netherlands)

I support the goal of the survey. I’m involved in monitoring arts education in the Netherlands. After the figures people still don’t know what’s really going on in the classroom. The procedure with three experts per country is workable. If they are asked to provide data without using available sources this however diminishes reliability. I want to know where they get the information. Percentages can differ greatly depending on operationalization. How do we draw lines between disciplines? I will plead for more validity than feasibility. What education means and how it’s done in different countries, that’s the core question. Who decides on the different aspects? Respondents should be asked to provide a link to national curriculum-documents or refer to other sources. Finally I think that the nature of informal learning prevents it from being quantified neatly.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Yvonne Sperlich & Stefan Sperlich (2012). Practical Tools for Monitoring Convergence, Integration and Development: Compare and Apply. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 14:1, 72-103.

- Comment by [Chee Hoo Lum](#) (Singapore)

In the project *Releasing the power of the arts*<sup>5</sup> we looked at more descriptive and narrative ideas in six countries in the Asia Pacific region. What are benefits of the exercise? To scrutinize our own policies, to question and reflect on the motives and intentions of arts education locally, and examine how other countries articulate their arts education policies. National policy documents are easy. Non-formal and informal there is no data. The report remained descriptive without detailed analysis. Contextual factors need to be taken in account. We need to see what's out there. That's why comparative research is useful.

- Comment by [Pat Thomson](#) (UK)

I'm interested in the language being used. What's the difference between mapping, monitoring and measuring? What might we use from the arts as research? Asking people to send their documents in as supplement might be additional. What are the discourses in these documents? Is there input data that can be helpful? I'm also interested in the quality assurance systems for arts education. What regulation is there around the training for general teacher training? What data do systems collect? Data on data. Is there a link to policy? Are there reviews made of provisions, and who does that, and when? What processes do systems have themselves to measure progress. Who else produces data? The 'Taking Part Survey' in Britain is operated from the cultural sector, not from the education sector. What is in which sector? How does art education connect with vocational systems in a country? How can qualifications be used? How does the arts education system function within the broader system of culture and education?

- Comments by [Gloria Patricia Zapata Restrepo](#) (Colombia)

Most arts education in Latin America is non-formal and informal. That gives a big diversity in content and methodology. Keeping that diversity is important. Because of migrants there is more diversity in other countries as well. We should combine different resources. Art is part of life. New technologies could be a strategy to know more about arts education. We need to strengthen networks to learn from each other. Values and social aspects is a universal concern. Funding is a challenge. Arts education is expensive and goes to the private, not the public sector. The arts education sector in Latin America is weak.

- Comment by [Lode Vermeersch](#) (Flanders)

The survey has its limitations (multiple-choice questions) and three experts will not tell the whole story about arts education. The project is challenging and ambitious. A lot will depend on the experts that will fill out the questionnaire. Will we find experts in all the countries? Will they be able to answer all the questions? Will they ever agree about questions like 'what needs to be improved'? This will be difficult. What will their answers be based on? Research, facts, numbers? Are we happy with just their opinion? And will we be able to distinguish between evidence and opinion? Concepts are difficult and vague, arts education itself is ill-defined. Even experts might have different ideas. There is no clear definition of arts education. In order to compare you need a definition.

A survey is a useful tool for collecting comparable information about arts education in different countries. But the instrument can turn into a ranking device for countries. It can be

<sup>5</sup> UNESCO Network of Arts Education Observatories in the Asia-Pacific (2013). *Releasing the Power of the Arts. Exploring Arts Education in the Asia-Pacific*. Bangkok: UNESCO Bangkok, Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education.

used in this way even if researchers do not want this. We have to be aware of this risk. The aim should be more than presenting data. It should be data with a clear argument.

- Further questions and comments

Susanne Keuchel tells a bit more about the making of the questionnaire and the intentions of the INRAE steering committee. She gives an overview of challenges the experts faced by adjusting the questionnaire to the different settings in the countries concerned. Nonetheless, this verifying process was very helpful. Hearing all the comments one thing is clear to her: 'it is important to have a conception on formal, non-formal and especially on informal education'. The informal education is absolutely necessary for a wider international perspective and not only a western, European one. She also states that she would prefer to shorten the questionnaire much more in order to make it more feasible regarding the international prospect.

Roel van Raaij says he doesn't agree with the desire for more tests. Discussions should be held within the group, not with the 'public'. He also suggests to allow some blank boxes for good practices, to ask people what they are proud of. And also room for description (What do you mean? Describe). Furthermore he thinks there should be put effort in the process for the experts. They need help with filling in the questionnaire, and on how to manage the process. Don't keep on testing. Make clear guidelines for the experts.

Larry O'Farrell thinks the questionnaire has improved since the last time. It's rather long, but he suggests that it must be a little longer. Right now he is missing information to identify the person who is filling in the form. It's important to know more about the background of the expert. Is he working at a governmental agency or at a university? And in what place? (Alberta for instance). This information adds to the reliability of the answers.

David Johnson also thinks the questionnaire has improved since the last version. For a large part of the world that is. Not for poorly developed schools and countries. Furthermore he thinks that reliable data doesn't exist. That doesn't mean it's not worthwhile pursuing, but there will be some gaps.

Barbara Neundlinger (Austria) finds the questionnaire quite complex. She wonders if it is possible for experts in the field to answer some of the questions in detail without doing a research. It would take different experts with an in-depth specific knowledge to answer the different types of questions (policy, arts and culture, etc.) She's afraid a lot of questionnaires will be returned with blank pages.

José Pessoa says it is important to distinguish opinions of experts from real data (professional estimates if there is a lack of real data). About the criteria Teunis presented (and his proposition to emphasize the first ones): they are all important, and necessary to result in good information. Don't neglect the last three.

Teunis describes the following steps of the project. 'First we need a questionnaire that is valid for arts education systems, practices and policies across the world and that is answerable without too much extra effort for experts. Then we need a database of experts. The presence of experts in a country is an indicator in itself of a country's infrastructure for arts education.' About the discussion on different views from experts (put three experts in a room and they will have four opinions): Teunis would be interested in varying expert opinions on matters of opinion; they may also have different ideas and estimates on matters of fact. However it was INRAE's intention to ask experts to describe and assess the situation in their country, which means that experts from one country have to come to an agreement about answers to the survey-questions. Also in this respect it is important to look at the questionnaire as a vehicle for communication, like Roel van Raaij said, involving members of INRAE's steering committee, the MONAES 'working committee' (Susanne, Ernst and Teunis), experts that will be invited to

participate in the survey, and other stakeholders.

Larry adds to his former comment that he thinks it will be a problem for one person to give both statistical information and expert opinions. For instance: he has to go to the Statistics Bureau in his country for the kind of data asked in some questions.

Gemma Carbó thinks it is a good questionnaire. She would like to add one question (question zero) about a good project (practice) in each country. The answers will not always be useable, and will need contextual information, but she thinks it will be a valuable addition.

John Lievens (Flanders) urges to be honest in asking questions. Sometimes it is better not to know, for the sake of comparison. He also suggests to be specific about the requested information and add clear guidelines. Furthermore when you aggregate answers, you shouldn't mix opinions with data.

The relationship between data on policy and practice is then discussed. Several questions are raised: How to compare diverse data? What do you get out of data if there is no policy that relates to it?

Then the length of the questionnaire is discussed. Jessy Siongers suggests putting in filters, so that the questionnaire will become more easy/shorter. 'Not all respondents have to fill out the whole form.' Teunis suggests that instead of leaving out a question here and there a structural reduction may be preferable, e.g. by focusing on primary education and children in questions about educational practice and access, and only ask questions about regulation and funding for all levels (ISCED 0-3) and domains (formal, non-formal, informal) of arts education.

Stéphan suggests two questionnaires: one for the government (data on policy, statistics), one for experts (what do you think..., what are the issues in your country?). And he says we should be aware that it is difficult to get people to fill it out, and also that you don't get a second chance! David endorses this and suggests to target the questions, collect existing data, and not to do everything at once.

Shifra says she is confused. 'We started with a few questions, and now it is a snowball.' She has had problems with filling in the first draft of the questionnaire. This draft hasn't improved. 'I got lost filling it in. It is too long and complicated. We shouldn't add more questions. We need a third draft, with more focus. We should reconsider, take a step back. We are not ready yet to present it at Wildbad Kreuth.'

- This afternoon's wrap-up, and next steps: Ernst Wagner

Ernst thanks the participants for the valuable comments, and says a lot of work needs to be done afterwards. He thinks it is worthwhile to continue with the questionnaire. A third draft is available soon and he proposes to use the meeting in Wildbad Kreuth to make it final.

- Closing remarks by Larry O'Farrell

On behalf of the INRAE steering committee Larry thanks all critical friends, speakers and other participants for coming to this meeting and participating in the in-depth conversations. He is convinced that the meeting will have a great impact.

And finally he thanks Teunis and his staff for organizing this meeting.

Report prepared by Vera Meewis and Marie-José Kommers,  
and edited by Teunis Ijdens (LKCA)

## MONAES EXPERT MEETING, FEB. 27-28 2015, UTRECHT, NETHERLANDS: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS (presenters, commentators, discussants)

Country	Name and e-mail address	Organisation
International	José Pessoa <a href="mailto:j.pessoa@unesco.org">j.pessoa@unesco.org</a>	UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS)
International	Stéphan Vincent-Lancrin <a href="mailto:stephan.vincent-lancrin@oecd.org">stephan.vincent-lancrin@oecd.org</a>	Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI), OECD
Europe	Andreas Wiesand <a href="mailto:wiesand@ericarts.org">wiesand@ericarts.org</a>	ERICarts Institute
Austria	Barbara Neundlinger <a href="mailto:barbara.neundlinger@kulturkontakt.or.at">barbara.neundlinger@kulturkontakt.or.at</a>	KulturKontakt Austria
	Michael Wimmer <a href="mailto:michael.wimmer@educult.at">michael.wimmer@educult.at</a>	EDUCULT
Belgium: Flanders	Willem Elias <a href="mailto:willem.elias@vub.ac.be">willem.elias@vub.ac.be</a>	University of Brussels
	John Lievens <a href="mailto:john.lievens@ugent.be">john.lievens@ugent.be</a>	University of Ghent
	Jessy Siongers <a href="mailto:jessy.siongers@ugent.be">jessy.siongers@ugent.be</a>	University of Ghent
	Lode Vermeersch <a href="mailto:lode.vermeersch@hiva.kuleuven.be">lode.vermeersch@hiva.kuleuven.be</a>	University of Brussels
Canada	Larry O'Farrell <a href="mailto:ofarrell@queensu.ca">ofarrell@queensu.ca</a>	UNESCO Chair in Arts and Learning, Queen's University / INRAE sc
Colombia	Gloria Patricia Zapata Restrepo <a href="mailto:glopaza@gmail.com">glopaza@gmail.com</a>	Fundación Universitaria Juan N. Corpas, Bogotá / INRAE sc
France	Jean-Pierre Saez <a href="mailto:jean-pierre.saez@observatoire-culture.net">jean-pierre.saez@observatoire-culture.net</a> *	Observatoire des Politiques Culturelles, Grenoble
Germany	Susanne Keuchel <a href="mailto:keuchel@akademieremscheid.de">keuchel@akademieremscheid.de</a>	Akademie Remscheid
	Eckart Liebau <a href="mailto:Eckart.Liebau@t-online.de">Eckart.Liebau@t-online.de</a> *	UNESCO Chair in Arts and Culture in Education, Uni. Erlangen-Nuremberg
	Sabine Maschke <a href="mailto:sabine.maschke@erziehung.uni-giessen.de">sabine.maschke@erziehung.uni-giessen.de</a>	University Giessen
	Ludwig Stecher <a href="mailto:ludwig.stecher@erziehung.uni-giessen.de">ludwig.stecher@erziehung.uni-giessen.de</a>	University Giessen
	Ernst Wagner <a href="mailto:ernst.wagner@fau.de">ernst.wagner@fau.de</a>	Dir. UNESCO Chair in Arts and Culture in Education, Uni. Erlangen-Nuremberg
Israel	Shifra Schonmann <a href="mailto:shifras@edu.haifa.ac.il">shifras@edu.haifa.ac.il</a>	University of Haifa / INRAE sc
Netherlands	Eva van der Boom <a href="mailto:eva.vanderboom@moozonderzoek.nl">eva.vanderboom@moozonderzoek.nl</a>	MOOZ policy research
	Folkert Haanstra <a href="mailto:folkert.haanstra@ahk.nl">folkert.haanstra@ahk.nl</a>	Amsterdam School of the Arts
	Teunis Ijdens <a href="mailto:teunisijdens@lkca.nl">teunisijdens@lkca.nl</a>	LKCA: conference supervisor (together with Ernst Wagner)
	Ocker van Munster <a href="mailto:ockervanmunster@lkca.nl">ockervanmunster@lkca.nl</a>	LKCA: managing director
	Roel van Raaij <a href="mailto:r.m.vanraaij@minez.nl">r.m.vanraaij@minez.nl</a>	Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation
	Henk Vinken <a href="mailto:hvinken@gmail.com">hvinken@gmail.com</a>	LKCA / pyrrhula research consultants
Norway	Aud Berggraf Sæbø <a href="mailto:aud.b.sebo@uis.no">aud.b.sebo@uis.no</a>	University of Stavanger / INRAE sc
Singapore	Chee Hoo Lum <a href="mailto:cheehoo.lum@nie.edu.sg">cheehoo.lum@nie.edu.sg</a>	Centre for Arts Research in Education (CARE) / INRAE sc
Spain	Gemma Carbó <a href="mailto:carbogemma@gmail.com">carbogemma@gmail.com</a>	Dir. UNESCO Chair in Cultural Policies and Cooperation, Uni. of Girona
United Kingdom	David Johnson <a href="mailto:david.johnson@education.ox.ac.uk">david.johnson@education.ox.ac.uk</a>	Centre for Comparative and International Education, University of Oxford
	Caroline Sharp <a href="mailto:c.sharp@nfer.ac.uk">c.sharp@nfer.ac.uk</a>	National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER)
	Pat Thomson <a href="mailto:patricia.thomson@nottingham.ac.uk">patricia.thomson@nottingham.ac.uk</a>	University of Nottingham

\* Absent because of illness.

## Guests from the Netherlands (Friday)

Country	Name and e-mail address	Organisation
Netherlands	Emiel Heijnen <a href="mailto:emiel.heijnen@ahk.nl">emiel.heijnen@ahk.nl</a>	Amsterdam School of the Arts
	Karin Hoogeveen <a href="mailto:k.hoogeveen@sardes.nl">k.hoogeveen@sardes.nl</a>	Sardes (private research organisation)
	Andrea Imhof <a href="mailto:aimhof@unesco.nl">aimhof@unesco.nl</a>	National UNESCO-Commission Netherlands
	Thera Jonker <a href="mailto:thera.jonker@hku.nl">thera.jonker@hku.nl</a>	Utrecht School of the Arts
	Anke van Kampen <a href="mailto:avkampen@planet.nl">avkampen@planet.nl</a>	National UNESCO-Commission Netherlands
	Ronald Kox <a href="mailto:ronald.kox@lkca.nl">ronald.kox@lkca.nl</a>	LKCA: head of cultural education department
	Maaïke Kramer-Segers <a href="mailto:m.g.segers@minocw.nl">m.g.segers@minocw.nl</a>	Ministry of Education, Culture and Science
	Viola van Lanschot Hubrecht <a href="mailto:v.vanlanschothubrecht@slo.nl">v.vanlanschothubrecht@slo.nl</a> *	SLO (National Centre of Expertise in Curriculum-Development)
	Edwin van Meerkerk <a href="mailto:e.vanmeerkerk@let.ru.nl">e.vanmeerkerk@let.ru.nl</a> *	Radboud University Nijmegen
	Diederik Schönau <a href="mailto:dwschonau@gmail.com">dwschonau@gmail.com</a>	Cito (Centre of Expertise in Educational Assessment)
Marlies Tal <a href="mailto:marlietal@lkca.nl">marlietal@lkca.nl</a>	LKCA: head of cultural policy department	

\* Also on Saturday