The Thesis Committee for Kristina Nicole Goldman

Certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:

Serving the Underserved: San Diego Museum of Art's Community

Partnership Programs Serving Court-Involved Youth

APPROVED BY

SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:

Supervisor:

Melinda M. Mayer

Paul E. Bolin

Serving the Underserved: San Diego Museum of Art's Community Partnership Programs Serving Court-Involved Youth

by

Kristina Nicole Goldman, B.A.

Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

December, 2012

Dedication

To Mom, Dad, Marc, and Shelby. Thank you for always supporting me and pushing me to do my best.

Acknowledgements

There are several people I would like to thank who made this research possible along the way.

First, thank you to my family for supporting me in every way possible. You kept me motivated and inspired me to work hard all the way through the to the end.

Thank you to Melinda Mayer and Paul Bolin for everything you have offered me along my journey over the last two years. I came into this program with two professors and am leaving with two wonderful friends and mentors. I'll never forget all of our wonderful talks about art and museum education…but mostly the ones about life.

Thank you to Brian Patterson and the staff at the San Diego Museum of Art for participating in the study and offering time and information in aiding my research process.

Thank you to the Angela Gigliotti, National City Juvenile Court and Community School, and Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility, for allowing me to observe and interview over the last year.

I would also like to extend gratitude to all my fellow graduate students who have been an amazing support system throughout the writing process. I would have never made it through to the end without the wonderful friends I have made during my time at The University of Texas at Austin.

Lastly, I would like to thank those individuals (there are several) who constantly told me to finish writing and work hard until the end. Even the smallest words of encouragement made the biggest difference during the thesis writing process.

Abstract

Serving the Underserved: San Diego Museum of Art's Community Partnership Programs Serving Court-Involved Youth

Kristina Nicole Goldman, M.A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2012

Supervisor: Melinda M. Mayer

This research provided an in-depth look into a museum striving to put into practice qualities of a socially responsible museum by providing educational programs for an underserved audience. The purpose of this research was to study the qualities and characteristics of two Community Partnership programs for court-involved youth at the San Diego Museum of Art. Identifying the qualities and characteristics of this particular museum program could be utilized by other museums in creating similar programs. Detailed data collection in the form of observations, interviews, and documentation provided a comprehensive view of this program. The research concludes with recommendations for other museums implementing similar programs and is based on the findings from the San Diego Museum of Art's work with court-involved youth.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

Chapter I: Introduction

Art museum education provides educational options for many audiences. Museum educators implement programs inside the museum such as tours, art classes, and family events. Additionally, outreach programs extend education to individuals or groups throughout the surrounding geographic area of the museum who are unable to visit the museum regularly or at all. Museum educators who bring collection-based art education programs outside the walls of the museum aid in the expansion of potential museum audiences and build and strengthen bridges between the institution and community groups. Over the last 40 years the American Association of Museums (AAM, 1992; Hirzy, 2002) and authors Barbara Newsom and Adele Silver (1978) have been encouraging museum staff to diversify museum communities by including underserved audiences. This idea of expanding museum education to underserved audiences has led to increasing museum staffs' awareness of the social responsibility of the museum. Social responsibility has become a frequently discussed topic in the museum field bringing to the surface the necessity for a museum to serve rather than simply represent society (Crooke, 2007; Janes, 2007; Sandell, 2002). In recognizing responsibility for education and serving audiences, museum education programs must also adjust to different learning styles in order to well serve communities and become more actively engaged in the teaching and learning process (Dodd, 2002; Hein, 1998; Hooper-Greenhill, 2002). However, there are some audiences who are still overlooked in the process of implementing museum programming for underserved audiences.

Art is occasionally offered to court-involved youth in court schools and detention facilities; however, it is rare to find museum education departments that offer art classes to that group. Court-involved youth includes individuals who are under the age of

eighteen and who have been through a court system for minor or major offenses to the law. The youths may be placed in county court schools or juvenile detention facilities for an amount of time determined by the court (O'Thearling & Bickley-Green, 1996). This particular audience must be served in a specific manner because of the limitations and the sensitivity of the individuals. Art education programs for court-involved youth are often implemented by the detention facility or court schools or through private groups that support the theory that art education can serve as a means of creative self-expression and communication for this audience (Anderson, Walch, & Becker, 2003; Arts for At-Risk Youth Program, 1998; O'Thearling & Bickley-Green, 1996; Venable, 2005). Although art education in general proves to be beneficial on educational and therapeutic levels, art museum education departments are rarely creating outreach programs for court-involved youth. However, the San Diego Museum of Art[1] is one example of a museum education department serving court-involved youth through outreach programming.

CENTRAL RESEARCH QUESTION

What are the qualities and characteristics of the San Diego Museum of Art's Community Partnership programs serving court-involved youth? What can be drawn from these programs that could be utilized within other art museums?

PROBLEM STATEMENT

I pursued these Central Research Questions in order to address art museum outreach education for communities of court-involved youth. As communities change so too should museum education. Currently, communities are growing, becoming more diverse, and groups may be coming together to form new ones. The definition of community will not be defined in this research as a neighborhood or a segmented area of

---

[1] The San Diego Museum of Art will be referred to as "SDMA" in this thesis.

a city. Instead, I will define community as a group of people coming together under similar circumstances and having a "we" feeling among them (Crooke, 2007).

Community programming at museums is responsible for serving groups and to make the institution relevant to many different audiences (Crooke, 2007; Kadoyama, 2007; Watson, 2007). The museum is no longer an institution for the elite; it is an institution of representation, relevance, and social responsibility where diverse audiences are taken into consideration when creating education programs (Janes, 2007; Janes & Conaty, 2005). Communities should be the driving force of exhibitions, funding, and programming so the museum stays relevant to said communities (Janes, 2007; Janes & Conaty, 2005; Kadoyama, 2007; Sandell, 2002). This case study examined the San Diego Museum of Art's effort to bring the museum out to a community audience. Not only is it creating programs that involve physically working in the community, but also it serves an audience who may not be targeted by many museums in the city or even the country.

This study focused on programs for the underserved audience made up of court-involved youths. There are few museum institutions that cater to this audience. The SDMA staff envisions museum education as more than looking at an object, but instead wishes to expand audience participation and encourage self-expression through constructivist teaching methods. Learning in the museum has shifted from being object focused to learner focused (Hooper-Greenhill, 2002) and the San Diego Museum of Art has created programs that move themselves directly to where the audience is and enables participants to create and express themselves through art. This case illustrates the specifics of the educator and teaching process that make the program most beneficial to the audience and the museum.

MOTIVATIONS FOR RESEARCH

Originally, I was interested in how museums were put into the position of assuming the responsibility for art educator in the public schools in California due to the current poor economy and budget cuts. As I was researching museum education programs I came across SDMA's Community Partnerships programs. There are seven partnerships in total (with more being added), however I felt most drawn to the two sites that serve court-involved youth. These programs utilize teaching philosophies and techniques in alternative school settings that I believe should be in all museum community partnership models. My personal motivation stems from my belief that art education should be about the learner, what the learner can bring to the art (whether creating or looking at art), and encouraging critical and creative thinking that can be applied to other aspects of the learner's everyday life. Additionally, I was interested in looking at programs working with uncommon audiences. The court-involved youth audience stuck out to me because of the limited programs and the therapeutic characteristics of art education for juveniles in the court system. For example, these programs are not just outlets for creative expression. They also enable the learners to expand how they think about art, to see what it takes to be an artist, and provide empowerment through encouraging the use of art as a communication tool.

Professional motivations also played a role in this research. I think the San Diego Museum of Art has taken museum education in a direction I would like to be a part of in the future. This research provided information and examples of how I can work with museum community programs or how to develop programs working with court-involved youth.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION RELATING TO THE STUDY

The mission statement at the SDMA provides a base for building the museum's education programs focusing on expanding audiences in a socially responsible manner: "The San Diego Museum of Art's mission is to collect, preserve, interpret and display the finest works of art that men and women have created throughout time for the benefit of the broadest conceivable audience" ("Mission and history", n.d.). The notion of benefiting the "broadest conceivable audience" is visible in the majority of the education programs provided by the San Diego Museum of Art.

The education department at the San Diego Museum of Art continues the effort of the museum's mission statement to benefit the broadest possible audience through four possible veins, which are family programs, schools, docents, and Community Partnerships (see Figure 1).

The four offshoots of education at the San Diego Museum of Art offer onsite and offsite programs for families, kindergarten through twelfth grade students, groups from around San Diego, and underserved audiences. The first three–Family Programs, Schools, and Docents–serve the audiences who are more typical to a museum through mostly onsite programming that encourages exploration of the museum collection on display in the galleries. The programs combine games, art making, scavenger hunts, and docent led tours in the galleries.

Figure 1: Education Programs at the San Diego Museum of Art

Docents provide offsite programming options for students and adult groups as well. These programs are an extension of the programs that are already offered and meant to be supplemental to onsite tours at the museum. For instance, docents can present PowerPoint lectures at schools around the city. For adult audiences, docents promote trips to offsite lectures by artists or museum professionals as well as promote bus trips throughout Southern California's various cultural institutions. The onsite and offsite efforts of the programs try to diversify the educational opportunities audiences can take advantage of at the museum. There are also efforts made by School and Docent programs to extend museum learning to students in inner-city schools and physically disabled in San Diego, both of which are collaborations with other efforts in the city.

The SDMA works with the School in the Park program, which brings students from inner-city schools to several different San Diego Cultural institutions throughout the school year ("School in the park: An innovative instructional program," 2009). Docents also lead tours for Alzheimer's patients and the deaf. Efforts are made to serve the broadest audience possible through family programs, school programs, and docent programs. However, Community Partnership programs are the only museum education offerings labeled "outreach."

The Community Partnerships are the outreach programs of the San Diego Museum of Art that serve audiences in the community rather than in the museum. Museum educators are the only museum staff who conduct Community Partnerships. The purpose of these programs is to "bring arts to underserved audiences" in San Diego by tailoring art lessons to each group ("Community Partnerships," n.d.). Community partnerships eliminate the financial barriers underserved audiences may face due to travel or admission costs ("Community Partnerships," n.d.).

There are seven current programs (with more being added) that work towards providing art programs to underserved audiences. The majority of these programs work specifically with at-risk youth middle schools for expelled students, afterschool teen programs, a school for homeless and at-risk children, artist-in-residence programs, county court schools, and a juvenile detention facility ("Community Partnerships," n.d.).

Lucy Eron, an SDMA museum educator, emphasizes the give-and-take relationship as another important aspect of the Community Partnerships at the San Diego Museum of Art (personal communication, November 15, 2011). It is expected that each partner in the programs continue to support the museum whether it be inside or outside the walls of the institution.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research methodology that best suits my study is a descriptive case study. This study focuses on the SDMA Community Partnership programs for court-involved youth at two specific sites: The National City Juvenile Court and Community School[2] and the Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility[3]. The full names for these sites are The San Diego Museum of Art Teen Art Program at Juvenile Court and Community Schools (National City), and The San Diego Museum of Art Teen Art Program at Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility. Data is presented in the form of any printed documents on the programs for court involved youth, interviews with stakeholders in the program including museum and school educators, and observations conducted on three separate occasions at both sites. Relevant documentation includes brochures, printed program descriptions, and material found on the San Diego Museum of Art website,

---

[2] The terms "National City Juvenile Court and Community School" and "National City" will be used interchangeably from this point forward.

[3] The terms "Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility" and "Kearny Mesa" will be used interchangeably from this point forward.

www.sdmart.org. My data is triangulated through three different collection sources in order to help validate my research (Gillham, 2000; Simons, 2009; Stake, 1995; Tellis 1997; Warren & Karner, 2010; Woodside, 2010; Yin, 2012). Interviews were semi-structured (Gillham, 2000) and recorded and transcribed for accuracy. Lastly, I am a participant observer (Merriam, 2001) throughout my data collection. I was able to communicate with the youth and help with the teaching during my observations.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Art-Therapy

Art therapy is a mental health profession that uses the creative process of art making to improve and enhance the physical, mental, and emotional well being of individuals of all ages. It is based on the belief that the creative process involved in artistic self-expression helps people to resolve conflicts and problems, develop interpersonal skills, manage behavior, reduce stress, increase self-esteem and self-awareness, and achieve insight. ("Art therapy: definition of the profesion," 2012)

At-risk Youth

At-risk youth are individual youths who have are unable to experience healthy social development because of negative circumstances in their lives and being marginalized in the general education system (O'Thearling & Bickley-Green, 1996; Wallace-DiGarbo & Hill, 2006). At-risk students are sometimes isolated from the rest of the student population because it is believed by some that they cannot integrate into the educational system.

Community

1) Community is defined as a group of diverse individuals connected by one common situation. Each individual is part of the whole community and has a "we" feeling when part of the community (Crooke, 2007).

2) The term "community" for museums is beginning to blur and is no longer meaning people in specific demographic areas. Community, now, has a more expansive definition that includes a wide range of diverse groups brought together for many reasons such as symbolic similarities not related a specific physical space (Crooke, 2007).

3) For this thesis, the term community is not bound by physical limitations, but rather incorporates Crooke's (2007) definitions of groups of individuals who share a common situation. In this case study, court-involved youth is the defined community being presented.

Community Partnership Programs

Community Partnership programs at the San Diego Museum of Art provide arts and art education to groups and individuals in San Diego through outreach designed to bring audiences into the museum or outreach that extends art museum education to various audiences. The museum programs partner with groups beyond the museum doors to create experiences for communities that may not have easy access to the physical museum. The San Diego Museum of Art has partnered with Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility and the Juvenile Court and Community Schools to bring arts to the audience made up of juvenile offenders ("Community Partnerships," n.d.).

Court-Involved Youth

Those youths under the age of eighteen who have committed criminal acts against persons or, property, or been convicted of crimes relating to substance abuse (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2000).

Creative Self-Expression

The individual expresses feelings, emotions, and thoughts in making art. The importance of the art is not in the content of the final product, but in the expression of self that is involved in the product. The process is more important than the product (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1970).

Museum Outreach

Museum education programming conducted away from the museum and in the locale of the audience being served. In some cases, the audience visits the museum prior to or after the museum educator travels to where the community is located.

Museum's Social Responsibility

A museum's role in fulfilling all audience needs through engaging activities and an active and visible role in "civic life." There is a responsibility to engage, represent, and stay relevant to all audiences and not just to a small, specific audience (Janes, 2007).

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

I limited my study to two community partnership programs at the San Diego Museum of Art, which focus on court-involved youth. These are the programs at Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility and the National City Juvenile Court and Community School. I also limited my study to the observation of the museum program. I did not observe the participants of the program, but rather focused attention on the program itself

by shadowing educators and interviewing those involved in teaching and administering the program.

CONCLUSION

This case study presents the reader with the qualities and characteristics of two of the San Diego Museum of Art's Community Partnership programs. Relevant literature is presented to support the study and the data collection. The collected data describes, in detail, the process involved in the SDMA programs in order to analyze and offer recommendations to other museums and museum educators creating programs for court-involved youth.

Chapter II: Review of Pertinent Literature

The following literature supports this case study research on museum education programs for court-involved youth. The discussion of the reviewed literature brings awareness to the aspects of creating socially responsible programs in museums. This section discusses the evolving museum to community relationship as playing a vital role in fulfilling social responsibilities to museum audiences. The literature also reviews different meanings of the term community and how the correct use of the term can provide empowerment to groups being served by museums. Additionally, the literature touches upon the changing role of the museum educator and the learner as they correspond to the social responsibility taken on by museums. Finally, I explore literature on art education for at-risk and court-involved youth, as a preface to my data specific to art museum education for court-involved youth.

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Museums and Social Responsibility

The focal point of this research brings to light the necessity of social responsibility in museums. Museums are not expected to solve society's problems, but they can help to assist positive change (Dawson, 2011). Social responsibilities have become greater than providing basic art lessons to schools that have eliminated art education programs or providing tours for the visually or hearing impared. Instead, socially responsible museums recognize the needs of current audiences as well as identify the audiences who are not being served (Crooke, 2007; Janes, 2007). Sheila Watson (2007) categorizes those individuals who are overlooked by much of society and museums under the term "social exclusion." A useful definition of social exclusion is as follows:

An individual is socially excluded if (a) he or she is geographically resident in a society, (b) he or she cannot participate in the normal activities of citizens in that society, and (c) he or she would like to so participate, but is prevented from doing so by factors beyond his or her control. (Burchardt, Le Grand & Piachaud, 1999, p. 229)

In short, social exclusion describes groups or individuals who are marginalized in one-way or another by general society (Watson, 2007).

Socially responsible museums make efforts to eliminate social exclusion and to practice inclusivity. Janes (2007) defines socially responsible museums as having four distinct qualities: idealism, intimacy between museum and community, depth, and interconnectedness. All four of these qualities in museums work towards improving the human condition (Janes, 2007). The San Diego Museum of Art uses museum education as a tool for fulfilling this responsibility of improving the human condition by offering art education to court-involved youth. This may be a daunting task for some museum staffs; however, workers in these institutions must recognize the importance of the qualities in programming that serve diverse communities (Janes, 2007).

Idealism requires museum staff to think about how things should be *and* taking action with those thoughts (Janes, 2007). Individuals in the museum may develop theories or think of ways to change current status of the human condition rather than accepting it, but now social responsibility is calling for those thoughts to be turned into action (Janes & Conaty, 2005). Museum staff, board members, and funders can have a dialogue with the communities involved, but the ideas must become reality in order to properly serve both the museum and the community. The SDMA uses museum education programs as their means of actively trying to improve the condition of underserved audiences. In doing so, partnerships with communities have been built based on trust, accountability, and communication, which are qualities of intimacy between museum and community.

14

Intimacy between museum and community instills the trust necessary to build partnerships. Trust is not built on dialogue, but rather on the *quality* of the communication between the museum and its audience (Janes, 2007). Dialogue must be present, but if that dialogue does not have depth on both the museum staffs' and the community members' end, then communication between the parties will likely fade. Museum to community relationships in socially responsible museums are built on quality communication that builds trust in communities regarding how museums will fulfill the needs of the community and maintain the relationship (Janes, 2007). As dialogue becomes deeper and more valuable, there is a better understanding from both the museum and community regarding how they can better serve each other.

Quality communication through direct experience is essential to the development of intimacy between museum and community (Janes & Conaty, 2005). The San Diego Museum of Art exemplifies intimate, quality communication by providing direct human relationships between museum educators and community members as is detailed in Chapter IV. Depth in museums calls for thorough and complete research, discussion, planning, and implementation of a program (Janes, 2007). Deep commitment from community and museum requires taking the time to question and reflect on how best a community can be served and the resources necessary to create a sustainable and effective partnership (Janes & Conaty, 2005). Lastly, interconnectedness implies a connection between the well being of families, organizations, and environments. There is a growing awareness of how the health of society is linked to the well being of individuals and communities (Janes, 2007). Family, organizations, and environment are all dependent on each other and when one is suffering, it is not long before the others are as well (Janes, 2007). In short, social responsibility requires that museums must have full understanding of the communities being served. This understanding comes from constant

dialogue between museum staff and those being served and creating programs tailored specifically to the needs to the communities.

Social responsibility and equity in the museum is not a new topic. Museums have been encouraged to reach out to underserved and socially excluded communities and diversify the museum audience since the 1960s (AAM, 1992; Hirzy, 2002; Newsom & Silver, 1978). For instance, in the 1960s, the National Endowment for the Arts granted funds to several museums in the country in order to create programs that would encourage diversity in museums (Newsom & Silver, 1978). The American Association of Museums (AAM) reignited the discussion of the public role of museum education with their publication *Excellence and Equity* (1992) and then again with *Mastering Civic Engagement* (Hirzy, 2002). *Excellence and Equity* (AAM, 1992) enumerates ten principles defining the educational role of the museum and challenges museums to meet the rising standards of "educational excellence." More recently in *Mastering Civic Engagement* (Hirzy, 2002), the American Association of Museums opened the conversation of the educational role of museums even further to advocate for social inclusion through encouraging community collaborations (Jackson, 2002) and equalizing the power and status between museum and community groups (Kertzner, 2002). These grants and publications of the National Endowment for the Arts and AAM remind museums that it is no longer about representing communities through a collection, but serving and engaging with those communities using museum resources. Just as efforts to diversify audiences and increase social responsibility have been updated over the years, so too must programming and the ways in which communities are being reached. Museums should be taking these initiatives from 1960, 1992, and 2002 and apply them to current society.

The literature above begs the questions "What can be done for communities and society?" and "How are the efforts impacting all levels of the community?" Museums have the creative tools to enable and empower communities, but they must be utilized effectively in order for the communities to be influenced and fully engaged (Sandell, 2002). Individuals in the museum education field are taking note and updating the discussion of how the role of the museum must be changed in order to carryout responsibilities to society (AAM, 1992; Crooke, 2007; Hirzy, 2002; Jackson, 2002; Kertzner, 2002; Newsom & Silver, 1978).

Changing Role of Museums in Communities

As museums take on more responsibility in providing art museum education for underserved communities, the museum profession is shifting towards a more active role in partnerships (Crooke, 2007). The institutions must fulfill their responsibilities to the diverse community groups surrounding the museum to represent and educate with equity and quality in new and engaging ways that directly relate to each audience. Museums are approaching community relationship development with a sense of social responsibility by fulfilling community needs and through meaningful engagement with partnered communities (Janes, 2007). As Crooke (2007) writes, socially responsible museums of the future are best achieved by "rethinking the museums as a place that must serve society" (p. 25), as opposed to it being an authoritative institution that represents society. Crooke's words well describe the future of museums and the necessity of serving through outreach, rather than only representing communities and audiences through exhibitions and basic gallery education. In many cases, communities must be reached out to if they are expected to be in partnership with museums.

Crooke (2007) emphasizes the importance of developing different strategies for reaching various communities and understanding the beliefs and interests of each group. In developing tailored education strategies for various audiences, museums become relevant institutions for the audiences being served (Watson, 2007). Again, art museums are no longer solely buildings with art on the walls; they are active and engaging service institutions benefiting several audiences in various ways. Museum staff of the 21st century must consider how their institutions can best be of service and respect the interests of the communities being served (Crooke, 2007) Museum professionals are recognizing the necessity to become institutions of service for communities through active engagement beyond the walls of the museum building. Davis (as cited in Watson, 2007) states museum staff are gaining a clearer understanding of how each community is unique and are able to define how museum educators and staff can offer art museum education to audiences through onsite or offsite programming.

COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

Museum educators often question how they can best serve surrounding communities (Crooke, 2007). This study focuses on the general community of court-involved youth and, specifically, one group at a county court school and a second group of youth at a juvenile detention facility. But what qualifies these groups of court-involved youth as a "community" in a non-geographical sense of the term?

A simple definition supported by the following literature describes community as individuals sharing a common element (Crooke, 2007; Dodd, 2002; Watson, 2007). Examples of common elements can be experiences, religious beliefs, ethnic background, or even a physical space. Museums must be cognizant of the diversity of each group in order to efficiently and effectively serve the members of each unique community.

18

Defining the Community

Author Elizabeth Crooke (2007) addresses the necessity for museums to understand communities so museums can offer the most beneficial programs according the needs of the group. She argues that in the context of museums the term is used "indiscriminately" and with a lack of qualification as to how the community itself can be identified (p. 27). Crooke (2007) separates the definition of community into three categories: symbolic, civic, and social. Categorizing the term "community" provides different approaches to it and assists museum staff in the process of defining a specific community (Crooke, 2007). These three categories cover the various meanings of community that a museum could utilize when defining their communities and understanding the type of programming that would be most beneficial for each group. Museum educators can become aware of the characteristics of communities and identify how to serve rather than represent (Crooke, 2007; Janes, 2007).

A symbolic community is characterized by the experience of the members. This category of community is not bound by physical space, but rather linked by common interest or experience thus creating an intangible notion of community (Crooke, 2007). Community becomes dependent on unique individuals coming together under the pretenses of shared experiences. The universal theme in a symbolic community is a sentiment of "togetherness…rather than isolation" amongst the members and the motivation to come together as a single, defined unit (Crooke, 2007, p. 32). Secondly, communities can be qualified as "civic," relating to public life and policy (Crooke, 2007, p. 33). This definition argues the idea that local and national governments use the term "community" as a tool of encouragement and improvement (Crooke, 2007). They also use community and community development as a means of reversing social problems, increasing community involvement, and using civic duty to improve social responsibility

19

(Crooke, 2007). When a museum takes this approach to community and gets involved, its importance to the community is magnified rather than seen simply as a luxury (Crooke, 2007). Lastly, communities can be studied in terms of social action and how a museum can empower a group. This theory demonstrated the way Crooke (2007) uses the term to suggest, "people have the power to act and shape their own circumstances, whether that is living conditions, public services or cultural representation" (p. 37). Museums can associate with particular social or political agendas of different communities and use exhibitions and programming to empower groups (Crooke, 2007). For example, on one side of the spectrum a national museum can offer empowerment to an entire country through exhibitions or family, school, or public programming events. However, on the other side a museum, such as the San Diego Museum of Art, can empower smaller, more specific communities like court-involved youth through outreach programs as well as programs that bring audiences into the museum.

How can a simple term bring together a group of very different individuals, empower the group as a whole, and aid in the implementation of a beneficial art museum education program? It is the museum staff's responsibility to define the community they want to serve and, in doing so, they find appropriate vehicles of empowerment. For this case study, individuals in these two groups of court-involved youth are linked by a physical space and the court system placing them in a county court school or detention facility. Elizabeth Crooke may argue that these particular communities being observed are best described as a symbolic community because the youth come from different ethnic backgrounds, families, and social circles, but there is the shared experience of court-involvement and incarceration or specialized education. Although the individuals are forced into the physical space, the museum staff must recognize the intangible connections among the youth. There is an ability amongst these youth to have a sense of

"togetherness" while being isolated from general society. Additionally, the San Diego Museum of Art programs for these two groups facilitates empowerment through art making for the individuals within the community. The empowerment instilled in the youth may not be to the scale of large community empowerment, however, there is a focus on utilizing art education with these groups in order to encourage and empower through creativity and self-expression. However, one must recognize that it is the *museum* that defines the court-involved youth as a community, not the youth defining themselves.

Museum Relationships with Communities

Many museum staffs of the 21st century have a desire to expand and diversify their audiences and understand how these audiences are being reached in order to provide equal access to museum learning (AAM, 1992; Spitz & Thom, 2003). The San Diego Museum of Art maintains partnerships with community groups throughout San Diego in order to expand the museum audience and bring art museum education to underserved audiences. A critical element to a strong partnership is initially recognizing the internal challenges, strengths, and weaknesses of the museum and then identifying these same traits in the communities (Thelan, 2001). These characteristics must be identified throughout the entire institution and community. Finding traits in both the institution and the community enables both entities to determine how they can benefit from each other and what can be shared between them. However, Thelan's (2001) research determines that outreach and community partnerships are "low priorities for [museums] as a whole." But why is this? Emily Dawson (2011) states in her article the lack of interest in creating programs for underserved audiences is present because museum practitioners often see developing partnerships with new and underserved communities as "confusing,

cumbersome and someone else's job" (p. 26). However, Dawson (2011) reiterates that long-term partnerships with communities are possible but require time, effort, and dialogue between museum staff and the members of the community.

In order for a partnership to be a success, the museum professionals must *listen* to the needs of the community so that programs remain relevant to each audience (Lessane, 2003). Open communication may be the key in eliminating the "confusing" and "cumbersome" aspects of opening up museum education to underserved audiences (Dawson, 2011, p. 26). Giving community members a voice also empowers them, as Crooke (2007) points out, citing them to be an important facet of a socially responsible museum. Museums must approach their potential communities with a presence of negotiation, networking, and confidence building in order to instill a sense of empowerment within them (Dodd, 2002). The SDMA exemplifies the notion of building confidence not only in communities as a whole, but also with the individuals who make up these groups. The recognition of social potential by institutions has ignited a sense of responsibility to serve and empower their communities with more than exhibitions.

The museum-community relationship has potential to grow, flourish, and survive throughout a museum's lifetime. The San Diego Museum of Art has discovered how each partner (museum and community) can contribute to the relationship, and their ability to even empower communities with change (Dodd, 2002; Thelan, 2001). More importantly, the SDMA programs are built on the notion of empowering the youth at the court school and detention facility. Not only have the SDMA education staff created strong partnerships with these two sites, they are fulfilling the museum's responsibilities to surrounding communities and society as a whole.

Developing Relationships Outside the Walls

The survival of museums is partially determined by their involvement in society and the wide range of communities being served by museums (Thelan, 2001). It is one task to develop a relationship with a community that enters the museum doors, but it is quite different to develop a relationship with a community that rarely visits the museum. Active engagement assists in the development of relationships with groups beyond the confines of the museum walls. Again, building these partnerships must develop over time as Dawson (2011) has stated.

Margaret Kadoyama (2007) cites the redevelopment of Seattle's Wing Luke Asian Museum as an example of how a museum can reinvent its mission and nurture relationships with the several different surrounding communities they hoped to support. Kadoyama (2007) attributes the changes to the actions taken by executive director Ron Chew, and his previous experience as a community organizer. Chew developed and nurtured relationships with several communities before he was appointed executive director of the Wing Luke Asian Museum and brought those relationships with him to the museum, which gained trust in the museum and laid the foundation for active museum engagement in communities (Kadoyama, 2007). The growth of the Wing Luke Asian Museum's budget, staff, and community programs calls attention to what is essential to building positive partnerships: addressing all aspects of a partnership, striving for inclusivity, and investing time to build dialogue. Confronting possible roadblocks in creating a relationship with a community at the beginning can prevent problems that may arise in the future and also help to maintain the stability of the relationship (Kadoyama, 2007).

Museums must also consider inclusivity when developing programs for their communities so as not to damage relationships (Kadoyama, 2007). Inclusive practices in

museums are important to today's institutions so audiences do not feel unwelcome in the museum environment (Dawson, 2011). Inclusivity can occur onsite or through outreach programs but efforts must be made in maintaining the inclusive practice (Dawson 2011). Sustaining the efforts of inclusivity requires time and building of dialogue (Dawson, 2011; Kadoyama, 2007). Nurturing and maintaining constant dialogue helps to initiate adaptability and greater understanding of how communities should be more effectively served (Kadoyama, 2007). Inclusive practices, communication, trust, and relating to community all contribute to strong museum-community partnerships. Once those partnerships are established, programs must be established and tailored to the needs of each audience.

MUSEUM TEACHING AND LEARNING STYLES

The shift towards actively engaged museums requires more than just dialogue, however. In accordance with Janes's (2007) qualities of a socially responsible museum, action must be a large component of the museum. Museum education has adjusted to social responsibilities by taking a more active (rather than passive) approach to educating in the museum (Hooper-Greenhill, 2002). The role of the educator becomes more of a facilitator for creativity and critical thinking while the learner is taking a more active role in the meaning-making process (Dodd, 2002; Jensen, 2002). Museums must justify their existence in today's society and how they can accommodate active learning and participation while developing meaningful learning experiences for diverse communities (Hein, 1998). The programs for court-involved and at-risk youth at the San Diego Museum of Art seem to adhere to post-modern museum education theories of active rather than reactive learning, creative expression, and allowing the learner to dominate

24

the meaning-making process (Hein, 2002; Hooper-Greenhill, 2002; Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1970).

The post-modern museum educator in an active learning environment takes on the role of facilitator of activities and learning experiences (Hooper-Greenhill, 2002). The educator must acknowledge the active role of learner in the museum, which, as mentioned above as a characteristic of socially responsible institution, empowers the learner (Hooper-Greenhill, 2002). And, not only are the learners empowered with authority in the meaning-making process, but they are also encouraged by the educator to personally relate to a museum's collection. Dodd's (2002) essay "Whose Museum is it Anyway?" suggests that successful museum education staff are comprised of a diverse group of professionals with distinct skills, knowledge, and vocabulary, who use these attributes to engage the learner. For the purposes of this research, it is important to identify appropriate educational approaches while working with adolescent audiences. Jensen (2002) encourages focusing on universal human experiences with teens and incorporating art and history into lessons. Art history enables the educator to utilize real life examples of artists with comparable personal histories as teens, and offers teens an outlet for expressing themselves.

Student/Learner Role

The museum visitor is no longer being generalized, but rather individualized with "particular needs, learning styles, and agendas" (Hooper-Greenhill, 2002, p. 67). The post-modern museum is learner focused and calls for all audiences to take an active role in meaning making. Age is also a factor when individualizing the learner and recognizing his or her needs. The programs of the SDMA being studied here are designed for teens, specifically for court-involved teens. It is the education staff and museum's responsibility

to provide opportunities for proper learning experiences for this age group. Jensen (2002) examines teenage learners in the museum and describes them as developing a sense of self, being imaginative and thoughtful, and their need for opportunities to self-express and learn creatively. Lowenfeld and Brittain (1970) also assert that high-school aged students begin "purposeful learning in art" (p. 287). Lowenfeld and Brittain (1970) continue explaining that the teenager is concerned with his or her identity and "independence" from authority (p. 287) and go on to use these concerns to justify the need for the opportunity for "expression of thinking" (p. 296) in art education programs. Teens must have opportunities to feel empowered in any learning situation because of their need to break free from authority (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1970). In the special cases observed in this study, art education may be the only way for them to feel a sense of empowerment because of the physical and psychological limitations imposed upon them by their living situation.

ART EDUCATION FOR AT-RISK AND COURT-INVOLVED YOUTH

The literature discussed thus far has provided a broad sense of how museums must relate and engage communities–specifically underserved communities. The shift towards a more socially responsible museum and the more engaging roles of the educator and learner have opened the opportunity for museum programs to effectively serve communities that are often overlooked. The SDMA has taken on the task of actively engaging with communities of at-risk, court-involved youth. It is important for the SDMA museum educators to understand how these specific groups of teens must be approached. Even more specifically, the facilitators of the program must have a grasp of the effects of art education on juvenile offenders. Although there are few case studies describing museum programs that provide art education for these types of communities,

there is helpful documentation regarding similar programs for at-risk youth. The following pieces of literature provided groundwork for comprehending the potential of art education for the empowerment of at-risk youth.

At-risk youth are classified as those who have not been incorporated into the general education system due to negative circumstances in their lives, which interfere with healthy social development (O'Thearling & Bickley-Green, 1996; Wallace-DiGarbo & Hill, 2006). These youth are commonly marginalized by society and isolated from their peers in the education system. However, isolation and separation of these youth from their peers may be galvanizing the delinquent behavior because of the low or non-existent expectations teachers have for these youth (Nance & Novy, 2011). Nance and Novy (2011) aptly note, "a teacher's expectation of a student's ability to learn is one of the most powerful motivators (or inhibitors) of actual achievement" (p. 8). If teachers do not expect anything from these youth, how can they expect anything from themselves? The lack of expectation from outside sources has a tendency to create low self-esteem and low self-worth within the at-risk youth. Therefore, expectations from an educator of court-involved youth are crucial to the students' progress (Nance & Novy, 2011). It must be noted, however, that expectations must be positive and the educator must use those expectations as an opportunity to offer students a chance to feel a sense of accomplishment (Nance & Novy, 2011).

Art education has been proven in several cases to provide an outlet for creativity and self-expression in ways at-risk teens rarely experience in the everyday curriculum ("Arts programs for at-risk youth," 2012; O'Thearling & Bickley-Green, 1996; Venable, 2005; Wallace-DiGarbo & Hill, 2006) Educators must have the capability to use the students' non-conformist attitudes and thought processes as tools for creativity (O'Thearling & Bickley-Green, 1996). Positive encouragement and engagement from an

art facilitator instills value in the youth's art, which enables him or her to see the object's value. The value given by the youth to the object then transfers to the self (O'Thearling & Bickley-Green, 1996).

At-risk and incarcerated youth typically suffer from low self-esteem, low self-confidence, and difficulty verbally communicating thoughts or emotions. Art education encourages students to channel negative emotions into their art through self-expression, offers the power to imagine and project into a positive future, and creates a comprehensible language that can be used as a form of communication (O'Thearling & Bickley-Green, 1996; Venable, 2005; Wallace-DiGarbo & Hill, 2006).

Environment is another factor that must be carefully considered when working with court-involved and incarcerated youth. Educators need to provide a safe space encouraging students to express themselves, and this can be created easily with art education (O'Thearling & Bickley-Green, 1996). Environment can include the physical space students are working in, the attitude of the other students, and the teaching style of the educator.

This research provides a strong example of how art education and art therapy can be inter-woven. However, it is important to distinguish the differences between the two fields. Art education, on the one hand, focuses on creating a product while art therapy is not greatly concerned with the aesthetic nature of a product, but rather the treatment occurring during the art-making process (Edwards, 1976). Art therapy is grounded in research stating, "the creative process involved in artistic self-expression helps people to resolve conflicts and problems, develop interpersonal skills, manage behavior, reduce stress, increase self-esteem and self-awareness, and achieve insight" ("Art therapy: definition of the profession," 2012, paragraph 2). However, art education programs for these communities of at-risk and incarcerated youths utilize art for the purpose of

creating and learning with added therapeutic outcomes (Venable, 2005). A product that is valuable to the student will naturally generate positive affects on a student's self-worth (O'Thearling & Bickley-Green, 1996).

Art museum education lessons make use of art historical resources to stimulate creativity and as examples of how artists can communicate emotion using artistic expression as a vehicle (O'Thearling & Bickley-Green, 1996). The museum's abundant art historical resources provide copious amounts of examples for the young artists to use as inspiration.

Although there have been reports regarding art education and art therapy in adult prison populations (Clements, 2004; Riches, 1994), research and implementation of art education specifically for court-involved and incarcerated youth has been very limited. However, two examples can be found on the state level and the national level. Venable (2005) examines a 15-visit program in an Indiana juvenile corrections institute of a mural project facilitated by college students. In 1998, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (a branch of the U.S. Department of Justice) funded the development and implementation of the Arts for At-Risk Youth Program. This program was based on research stating that art programs encourage discussion and dialogue with at-risk youth and inspire positive interaction and communication ("Arts and At-Risk Youth Program," 1998)

In 2003, the California Endowment published The Power of Art (Anderson, Walch, & Becker), detailing how and why the arts are an effective intervention strategy with at-risk youth. The research supported strongly the effectiveness of arts as a therapeutic outlet for incarcerated youth and is summarized with these words:

> When compared with control populations, arts programs for incarcerated youth and youth on probation have resulted in lower recidivism rates and fewer court

referrals. Youth in the juvenile justice system who have participated in art programs display important pro-social and mental health characteristics, including greater self-efficacy, the ability to express themselves, improved attitudes toward school, and appropriate behavior and communication with adults and peers. (p. 25)

These two programs provide strong evidence to support the theory that art education programs for at-risk youth and youth involved in the juvenile justice system serve as positive influences on the youths' lives during and after incarceration.

CONCLUSION

The literature discussed in this chapter presents the notion that social responsibility on behalf of museums plays a vital role in museum education, expansion of audiences, and fulfilling the needs of the communities being served by the museum. Museum staff must be aware of the changing role museums are taking in society and as socially responsible education institutions; museums must *serve* rather than represent communities (Crooke, 2007). Socially responsible museums carry out programs based on inclusivity and reaching out to underserved communities (Dawson, 2011; Kadoyama, 2007). Inclusive programming requires that museum professionals take active roles in the community and establish partnerships with groups through extended dialogue in order to understand the needs of the community (Crooke, 2007; Janes, 2007). Building relationships with communities also enables for museum educators to tailor programs specifically to the audience, whether the education is taking place inside or outside of the museum walls. Museum education must be offered in different ways because of the variety of learners that make up museum audiences (Dodd, 2002). The postmodern museum makes use of the teaching and learning theories in which the learner plays an active role in the meaning-making process of experiencing art in the museum (Hein, 2002; Hooper-Greenhill, 2002). The teen audience is also important to this research, and

Lowenfeld and Brittain (1970) as well as Jensen (2002) state the importance of art education providing freedom of expression the creative thinking for the adolescent age group. Lastly, the literature presents theories on art education for at-risk and court-involved youth. Art education is presented as general art education and not specific to art museum education. O'Thearling and Bickley-Green (1996), Wallace-DiGarbo and Hill (2006), and Venable (2005) state the value of the use of art education with at-risk youth and youth in detention facilities. The three authors also explain the behavioral and learning challenges of court-involved youth and how the art making process can be used as a tool for creativity and self-expression in order to process emotions and past problems that cannot be expressed in words. Venable (2005) also mentions the melding of art therapy and art education when used with court-involved youth. In the following chapter, the research methodology is explained in full detail to help ethically support the presentation and analysis of my collected data in Chapters IV and V.

Chapter III: Research Methodology

This study of the programs for court-involved youth at the San Diego Museum of Art required a research methodology that enabled me to obtain strong descriptive evidence to illustrate the qualities and characteristics of the programs. Case study research allowed me to observe a single case in order to define the characteristics and qualities of two of the Community Partnership programs at the San Diego Museum of Art. This methodology provided firsthand knowledge and insight into the San Diego Museum of Art's programs for court-involved youth through observations, interviews, and relevant documentation.

In general, case study research is a single "case" being investigated in its present context and boundaries in order to answer a central research question (Duff, 2008; Gerring, 2006; Gillham, 2000; Stake, 1995). Yin (2003, 2012) segments case study into three categories: exploratory, explanatory, and descriptive. An exploratory case study is very broad in its features, and fieldwork and data collection are done prior to defining the question and hypothesis (Yin, 2003). Explanatory case study research is based on cause and effect with the researcher determining how events happen (Yin, 2003). Explanatory case study research uses the question "How/why did something happen?" as a guide in fieldwork and data gathering (Yin, 2012). Descriptive case study focuses on the question "What is happening?" and offers a complete description of the case being studied (Yin, 2003, 2012).

Descriptive case study was the most effective methodology to answer my central research question. As opposed to other case study practices as well as other research methodologies (ethnography, historical, action, phenomenological), the descriptive case study concentrates on a single point in time (usually the present) in the context of the

subjects being observed (Duff, 2008; Gillham, 2000; Yin, 2012). The descriptive case study is meant to give insight to a social world or larger population (Gerring, 2006; Yin, 2012). For educational research, it is best to use this methodology to acquire a detailed account of the case being studied (Merriam, 2001) specifically because of the lack of research on the subject. My descriptive case study uses the community partnership programs at the San Diego Museum of Art to give insight into museum programs for court-involved and at-risk youth. The methodology enabled me to gather as much information as necessary to present a full description of the programs to the reader.

Due to the minimal amount of studies done on museum outreach for juvenile offenders, it was best to choose a descriptive case study to delve into the subject and gather as much detailed information as possible. The descriptive case study methodology provided the necessary tools to triangulate the research. Triangulation is the use of multiple sources of evidence for in-depth analysis in qualitative research to instill validity in my arguments (Gillham 2000; Simons, 2009; Stake, 1995; Tellis, 1997; Warren & Karner, 2010; Woodside, 2010; Yin, 2012). It is essential to have credibility and validity in research and triangulation enables me to employ different forms of evidence to find the answer to my research questions. I triangulated my data with observations, interviews, and documentation.

This descriptive case study sheds light on two outreach programs at one art museum. I chose the programs because of their stable presence at the museum for over eight years. Additionally, I highlighted them to illuminate the fact that court-involved youth are often overlooked as an audience and underserved by the majority of art museums.

It is important to note that this case study examined in detail the program itself, not the youth involved or what the youth produced. The focus of the study was directed

toward how the museum provides a successful program to a specific audience–juvenile offenders. Studying the program rather than the youth helped answer the central questions about what can be drawn from these programs by other museums in order to provide similar programs for their particular communites. Before beginning my research, I requested written permission from the San Diego Museum of Art to observe the programs for court-involved youth at the SDMA (see Appendix A).

The Community Partnerships being observed were the San Diego Museum of Art Teen Art Programs at National City Juvenile Court and Community School, and Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility. This juvenile court and community school site is intended for junior high and high school students who have been referred by probation, social services, or school districts ("Juvenile Court and Community Schools," 2012). This site is under the governance of the San Diego County Office of Education in the Department of Juvenile Court and Community Schools. Outreach occurred at the court and community school location twice a week for one-hour sessions. The Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility is a maximum-security juvenile detention facility for youth ages 10-18 waiting adjudication ("Juvenile halls," n.d.). The Kearny Mesa site is under the jurisdiction of San Diego County as part of the County of San Diego Probation Department Outreach occurred once every two weeks for two-hour sessions.

DATA COLLECTION

The nature of descriptive case study permits firsthand observations of the sites. The case study methodology may also include documentation and interviews. These three data collection techniques all provided pertinent information that enabled my research questions to be answered with thorough description. The tools provide the raw materials (evidence) of the research (Gillham, 2000).

Observations in general call for the researcher to look, listen, and occasionally ask for clarification in order to obtain data in the most direct way (Gillham, 2000). Simons (2009) states that through observations, the researcher can gain a comprehensive "picture" of the site (p. 55). Descriptive case study methodology offers different levels of observation ranging from structured to unstructured and participant to detached observer (Gillham, 2000; Simons, 2009). Structured forms of observations are for specific hypotheses being explored, often requiring observation schedules, and use built-in instruments of observation to classify what is being searched for in the setting (Simons, 2009). Unstructured observations serve as a more naturalistic form of observation with minimal constraints in the context of the research (Simons 2009). Unstructured observing tends to require more documenting and interpreting in order to "capture the essence" of what is observed (Simons, 2009, p. 56). Additionally, the researcher can be considered a participant or detached observer. A participant observer is more involved (to an extent necessary to the research) and tends to gather more qualitative evidence than a detached observer (Gillham, 2000). A detached, non-participant observer acts as an outside observer with no interaction with the individuals being observed gathering mainly quantitative evidence (Gillham, 2000). With both ends of the spectrum laid out, I then was able to discern the type of observations I chose to conduct and the degree of observer I wanted to be. Both Gillham (2000) and Simons (2009) reiterate that a researcher commonly conducts observations that fall between unstructured and structured and mix the qualities of participant and detached observer.

For this study, I chose to conduct a combination of structured and unstructured observations as a participant observer. Therefore, I was structured regarding when and where my observations took place because I was on the SDMA program schedule and I was looking for qualities and characteristics of the program. However, my observations at

the site were conducted with the intention of "capturing the essence" of the site without fully knowing what qualities and characteristics I was going to find during my observations (Simons, 2009, p. 56). As a participant observer I was to be involved in the program; however, it was important for me to remember that I was there first to gather information and second to participate (Merriam, 2001). I did not want to label myself as a detached observer due to the chance that the people involved in the observations could possibly engage me in conversation or ask for help. I observed the National City County Court School site twice (November 15 and 17, 2011). I was at the site from 9 a.m to 11 a.m.; however, the observation began and ended at the museum to ensure that I observed all aspects of the site from preparation to clean up. Due to security limitations, I visited the Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility once on Thursday February 9, 2012. This observation also began at the museum at 11 a.m. for preparation, included a two-hour lesson at the detention facility from 12 p.m. to 2 p.m., and ended at the museum around 3 p.m.

I did not take any notes while I was observing because of the sensitive nature of the sites and the participants in the lesson. However, I did keep a field notebook in which to record detailed descriptions immediately after the observation. Since I was not able to take notes during my observation and wrote my notes afterwards, it is possible that I did not record every detail of my observations. However, I was cognizant of the fact that I needed to remember as much as I could for my field notes since I did not have a recording or video to refer to, so I made sure to write heavily descriptive notes as soon as I left the site (Merriam, 2001; Warren & Karner, 2010). My field notes consisted of documentation of everything I could remember from my observations at each site during my visits. I took note of what I noticed about each site including what the lesson was, the tone of voice used by the educator, the attitude of the youth, and anything that would help

me to gain a comprehensive picture of the setting and community I was observing (Simons, 2000). After each observation day, I reread my field notes and transferred them to a document on my computer so they were readily available for the next time I needed to read over them (Gillham, 2000).

Interviewing was the second form of data gathering I employed for this research. The types of interview format range on a spectrum from unstructured to structured (Gillham, 2000). On the "unstructured" end of the spectrum, interviews can be defined as listening to others' conversations, natural conversation with an interviewee, and "open-ended" interviews that present a few less structured questions to the interviewee (Gillham, 2000). The "structured" interviews include questionnaires, semi-structured questionnaires with multiple choice and open questions, and verbally administered and recorded questionnaires (Gillham, 2000). At the facility of this spectrum of interviews is the semi-structured interview–open and closed questions for the interviewee (Gillham, 2000). Semi-structured interviews use a few questions to guide the interview while still maintaining a conversational approach to answer key questions in my investigation (Gillham, 2000).

The semi-structured interview was the most effective choice for the purposes of my study because of its flexibility and "naturalness" yet still providing some structure (Gillham, 2000). The semi-structured interviews were based on a set of pre-determined questions that I was able to expand on during the interviews (see Appendix B) (Merriam, 2001; Simons, 2009). I wanted to use a more conversational approach with the interviewing in order to illuminate the interviewees' position on the subject. The conversational, semi-structured approach enabled a more organic interview to take place.

The interviews took place throughout the course of research and data gathering (see Appendix C). The majority of the interviews were done in person unless time or

location was a problem. In order to have accurate accounts of the interviews I used an audio recorder while speaking with the interviewees. All participants signed a consent form granting permission for the interview as well as the audio recording (see Appendix D).

Transcribing is also part of the process of information gathering through interviews. As suggested by Gillham (2000), I transcribed the interviews onto my computer as soon as possible after the interview. Gillham (2000) suggests this because the interview will be at the front of my memory so I can incorporate the tone and physical response in the transcription. The transcripts of the interviews gave me the opportunity to identify the key statements that aid in the analysis portion of my research (Gillham, 2000).

Documentation was the third tool used for evidence gathering. Although not as time consuming and intensive as observation and interviews, the documents gathered add depth and enrich the context of the data (Simons, 2009). Documents included any published or unpublished written literature on the program, any documents the museum education department has in its possession, and all written information I could find describing the outreach partnership programs including websites (Gillham, 2000). I applied Simons's (2009) flexible definition of a "document" in the search for relevant documentation by including not only formal policy documents or records, but also "anything written or produced about the context or site" (p. 63). Communication was essential in document gathering (Gillham, 2000). Not all documentation is straightforward and readily available so it was important that I speak with individuals involved with the programs and the institution in order to gain access to documents not accessible to the general public (Gillham, 2000).

DATA ANALYSIS

All evidence must be analyzed and interpreted once it has been gathered. Analysis provides opportunity to organize my gathered data in preparation to generate my theories and understandings of the evidence (Simons, 2009). Interpretation provides a more organic and "holistic" approach to looking at the data I gathered (Simons, 2009). My first step in the data analysis and interpretation process was external organization (Gillman, 2000) and laying out all of my gathered data in the form of documents, field notes, and interview transcripts. This gave me a physical understanding of the amount of data I had collected over the course of five months. Also, revisiting information I had collected gave me the opportunity for reflective overview leading to rediscoveries and new discoveries I was not aware of at the point of collection (Gillman, 2000).

Once my data was laid out and revisited, I was able to draw out the general themes from my research. The themes of my research were based on the qualities and characteristics of the SDMA programs that I found through my data collection process. After reading through all of my data collection, I defined the general themes for analysis. I then listed evidence from my field notes, documents, and interviews to support my arguments in order to weave them together meaningfully in Chapter V.

CONCLUSION

While conducting my data collection, I was cognizant of my ethical responsibility as the researcher. My observations blended unstructured and structured methods as a participant observer in order to gain a fuller picture of what the SDMA programs for court-involved youth entail. My semi-structured interview process allowed for a conversational approach to my interviews to add another component of data collection for validity. And lastly, for triangulation purposes, I searched for documentation that would help in answering my central research question.

Chapter IV presents data collected through observations, interviews, and documents. At the end of Chapter IV, I extracted the qualities and characteristics of the programs as seen through the data. Information in Chapter IV help to provide answers to the first part of my central research questions: What are the qualities and characteristics of the San Diego Museum of Art's Community Partnership programs serving court-involved youth?

Chapter IV: Presentation of Data

The following chapter recounts my collected data. The chapter is a detailed description of the Community Partnership programs for court-involved youth at the San Diego Museum of Art. Descriptions of documentation regarding the programs, interviews with educators and museum staff, and observations of the sites themselves provide the information to give the most detailed account of the programs. My data collection enabled me to pinpoint the qualities and characteristics of the SDMA's outreach for court-involved youth. This chapter provides data to answer the first of my central research questions: What are the qualities and characteristics of the San Diego Museum of Art's Community Partnership programs serving court-involved youth?

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The San Diego Museum of Art's Community Partnerships began around 1999 as a Family Festival program that occurred about four times a year at the museum. This program initially brought thousands of visitors to the museum with the intention of expanding and reaching new audiences. This family-focused program branched out in three different ways in order to reach all parts of the community. The branches included the family festival held at the museum, museum outreach going to schools or an event, and thirdly, partaking in community events that were not directly related to the museum realm. Funding for the family festival program came from corporate sponsors including Ford, Target, and Union Bank. Qualcomm Incorporated, a global wireless-technologies firm headquartered in San Diego, has also been a monetary supporter of the San Diego Museum of Art since 2001.

There was a strong interest in working more with at-risk youth so Brian Patterson, SDMA's lead museum educator for court-involved youth, experimented with a pilot

program at one site to see the response. The pilot program began as a three or four week test at the National City Juvenile Court and Community School and received positive feedback from teachers. Qualcomm heard about the program at National City from a teacher who worked at the school, and chose to fund the programs with the expectation of expanding the teen outreach. About six years ago, when these programs were getting underway, the budget was $2,200 from Qualcomm to sustain the Community Partnerships. Qualcomm became the main funder for the SDMA's Community Partnerships. The budget has since doubled as of 2011, once the Kearny Mesa site was added.

The museum educators at the San Diego Museum of Art have been constantly challenged by Qualcomm to expand the audience to as many underserved populations as possible. Although Qualcomm has been supporting the San Diego Museum of Art since 2001, the focus has shifted towards education programs for at-risk youth. In general, the Qualcomm Corporation looks to develop philanthropic opportunities that "strengthen communities worldwide." In doing so they established the Qualcomm Foundation that, as Sarah Osinkosky states, allows Qualcomm "to be transparent with [their] philanthropy and to focus funding on things that are fully philanthropic" without any specific benefit to Qualcomm Incorporated.

The two Community Partnerships, the San Diego Museum of Art Teen Art Program at National City Juvenile Court and Community School and at Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility, are just two of the community partnership programs offered by the San Diego Museum of Art. However, National City and Kearny Mesa are the only two programs at the museum that offer art museum education to court-involved youth. The goals and objectives of the programs were laid out for me while speaking with the two educators from the museum. Brian Patterson was my main resource for information

regarding the programs for court-involved youth. He is the primary educator at both the Kearny Mesa Detention Facility and National City Court School sites. Lucy Eron, a second museum educator at the SDMA, teaches at other sites under the umbrella of Community Partnerships, but not to court-involved students. I also gained insight on the education programs through Ruth Broudy, Manager of Docent Programs. As discussed in Chapter I, the other Community Partnership sites include after-school programs for students with behavioral and attitude problems in school, art classes at children's hospitals, and a program at a high school for homeless teens. Both Brian and Lucy are highlighted here because of their involvement with at-risk youth and alternative learning environments through the SDMA Community Partnerships.

The National City Juvenile Court and Community School and the Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility are two separate alternative schooling systems for youth. The National City Juvenile Court and Community School is part of the San Diego County Office of Education. The Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility is under the jurisdiction of San Diego County. Physically, both sites are removed from the public schools in the community. The goals of the court school and the detention facility are to raise the academic achievement of the students and help students earn credits toward high school graduation.

The National City Court and Community School operates on a much more relaxed schedule than a regular school and the youth are able to come in and out of the classroom throughout the day. There are posters and exemplary work on the walls, computers around the classroom, and individual desks for the youths. The students are placed here due to school expulsion, pregnancy, truancy, and other minor offenses against schools rules. The court school site is more physically similar to a typical school setting. On the other hand, the Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility is exactly that, a detention

facility. It is a prison for minors who have committed major offenses and are awaiting adjudication for their crimes, or they have already been adjudicated. The students, who are all adolescent males, could be in the detention facility for reasons such as stealing, vandalism, and gang involvement, to more serious infractions such as assault and drug related crimes. The physical and psychological environments, as well as rules at the detention facility, are much more stringent than at the court school. The detention facility can be equated to a youth prison while the court school is a daily alternative schooling option for students who must be removed from the general public school system.

In general, the SDMA community partnership program at both sites is meant to provide art education to the court-involved youth that emphasizes self-expression and creativity to "reflect on past decisions"[4] and provide "new visions" for their futures. Brian and Lucy emphasize that art history is the vehicle used to provide different art forms, techniques, and examples of how the students can express themselves. The educator provides a "sense of awareness" of the different artists and their techniques, methods, mediums, and genres so students can use them to create their own artworks. Brian states that art has the potential to engage students who have different learning abilities, strengths, and weaknesses and who have not succeeded in the regular school atmosphere.

The youths' ages range from fourteen to eighteen years old and they come from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds. The National City students have been transferred to the alternative school system for varied amounts of time from a few months to an entire school year. They live at home and go to the school each day. The teens at the Kearny Mesa detention facility have been placed at the site under court order for the

---

[4] Quotes in Chapter IV come from interviews and personal communication with Brian Patterson, Lucy Eron, and Angela Gigliotti, a classroom teacher and the National City Juvenile Court and Community School.

offenses mentioned above. The students in the detention facility may be detained for up to 60 days. The students are in individual cells and are gathered in a common area for the art lessons. The SDMA program is a reward for those detainees who have displayed good behavior during their sentence at the detention facility. It is common for students at both sites to have learning or behavioral problems in general school settings and to have reached a point where they are "turned off by everything, all kind of structure and all kinds of teachers."

For this reason, Brian makes an effort to establish a relationship that is unlike a teacher-student relationship, but instead rather like an artist-to-artist level that keeps roles in equilibrium in the classroom. Brian introduces himself to the students as an artist rather than an art teacher in hopes of removing the boundaries and rules that the students may associate with the word "teacher." His approach to teaching also frames the students' identity as artists. Although sometimes his methods are indirect or done so unconsciously, identifying the students as artists gives the youth a new way to look at themselves and the things they are capable of doing.

According to Brian, the museum educator is the most important part of the program. He believes that it takes a particular style of teacher to work with court-involved youth. He also asserts the importance of the educator being "sensitive to the needs of the students" without doing any emotional harm. Brian's methodology and teaching theories stem from his background as a fine artist in a typical education system. He has a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree from San Diego State University, but was kicked out three times because of disagreements with the teachers. After petitioning his way back into the program and graduating with his degree, he focused on a career of freelance work as an educator and artist before becoming part of the San Diego Museum of Art education staff. He views himself in the field equally as an educator and as an artist

melding his two passions into one. His interests in education lie in how the student learns, how the brain most effectively acquires and retains information, and how teachers modify their teaching to mesh with different learning styles. Knowing Brian's background information highlights possible reasons for how and why he has implemented programs for court-involved youth among the SDMA's Community Partnerships.

Brian and the lead teachers from both sites schedule his visits throughout the year. The grants from Qualcomm, Inc. require the SDMA to fulfill 75 hours at the National City site over the course of a year and 40 hours at the Kearny Mesa detention facility. Since these are not the only outreach or in-reach programs the museum schedules during the year, dates and times must be spaced out carefully. Brian contacts the teachers at both sites and offers seven possible dates for visits. Once they are confirmed, he can begin outreach. The site visits run throughout the year at both locations. The National City lessons happen twice in one week, one hour per each class group, and the Kearny Mesa lesson occurs one day for two hours with one group of students. However, since each student has a different sentence, Brian may encounter different students every time he visits. At the National City school, there were two groups of students each of whom had one hour with Brian and both groups experienced the same lesson each day. The Kearny Mesa site was for one group of students in one classroom for two hours. Brian prepared two projects for each hour he was with the youth.

Since the students often change due to length of sentencing, especially in the case of the Kearny Mesa site, the curriculum or lessons can be repeated. However, Brian does mention that "each of the art projects should be different and they should not have any boundaries or rules." I understood this to mean each art project that he presents to the classes must be different in content; however, since the students are often different each time, the projects can be presented more than once at each site.

The general curriculum for the programs for court-involved youth corresponds with the museum collection. The connection could be a painting, an artist, a technique, or a period of art that is represented in the galleries at the SDMA. Brian explains that he teaches how artists in the past have worked and how the lives of these artists can relate to the students' lives. The art lessons are chosen because of their high success rate among the youth. A lesson is considered "high success" when the majority of the youth are encouraged by the art as evidenced by a willingness to experiment with the artistic process, rather than being intimidated by the art and not trying to create anything at all. It does not necessarily mean that there is one way a work of art should look at the end of the lesson. Brian gives the students a general product (a landscape, a self-portrait, marbled paper) and different tools with which the students can reach their own version of that product. The students have the freedom and creativity to get to their own end. The educator is simply offering students tools and techniques to get to an individualized result using a process with which the students feel most comfortable.

OBSERVATIONS

The following observations occurred over a four-month period. I flew to San Diego two separate times for the site visits. As previously mentioned in Chapter III, my field notes were taken after the observation and are as accurate and detailed as possible.

Observation 1: November 15, 2011 National City Juvenile Court and Community School

The observation of the outreach for National City Juvenile Court and Community School began at the museum. I planned to meet with Brian at the San Diego Museum of Art's education department thirty minutes prior to the start of the lesson at National City. Brian gave me the option of meeting him at the site or at the museum and driving to the

school with him. I decided to arrive early to the museum and take the drive down to the site with Brian so I could see the process of the day from start to finish.

Brian asked me to be at the museum by 8:30 A.M. so we could gather materials and drive to National City in time to start the class at 9:00 A.M. I parked my car and walked over to the education department, which is actually in a separate building from the museum itself. There is a small sign next to a door and a doorbell tucked away in a corner next to a restaurant. I rang the bell, heard the door click, and walked down a stairwell to be greeted at the office door by Brian. The department includes an office space for the educators and two large classroom spaces for in-reach classes, camps, and workshops. The space exudes creativity with colorful walls, art supplies everywhere, and artwork on the walls. Hurriedly, we walked through the classroom space to a closet with all the art supplies the education department uses on a daily basis for all programs. It was quite hectic getting everything together. I wondered how much planning Brian had done for this site visit before that morning.

Brian explained to me we would be doing a Georgia O'Keeffe inspired project with the youth at the National City site that day. It was a simple project that did not require many materials. All of the materials fit in one box that was easily carried by one person. The ease of transport could be another reason for the simplicity of the projects since all materials must be brought from the museum.

The materials needed for the day were:
- Chalk pastels

- 16" x 24" sheets of paper

- 8.5" x 11" sheets of paper

- Large boards for a drawing surface

- Printed examples of O'Keeffe works

- Printed images of nature as inspiration for the students

The Georgia O'Keeffe project was a lesson in color blending, organic lines, using the entire sheet of paper, and seeing the abstract in everyday objects. Brian did not bring any images of the O'Keeffe works on display at the museum, but he did bring similar works as inspiration. Brian also chose chalk pastel as the medium for its ease of blending and since it might be a medium that the youth have not worked with frequently. The lesson seemed to have elements that were typical to any museum program and not entirely tailored to this specific audience.

Once in the car we had about a twenty-minute drive south to National City. During the car ride, Brian gave me a debriefing of the process. This included how he would introduce me, the timeline of the project, what the youth were like, how they might respond to me, and issues between students. I was warned that the students probably would not pay any attention to me. This was understandable since I had no relationship with these youth and I was a stranger in their world. I had the choice of how much or how little I wanted to participate in the lesson or if I wanted to do the project with the youth. He instructed me to use positive and specific feedback, if I felt that I wanted to comment on a students work; I was not to use any generalized commentary. For example, instead of saying, "That's really good" and "I like that," I was to use comments that point directly to something in their work such as use of organic lines or blending technique.

We arrived at the site about five minutes early. The National City Court and Community School is located in a small office building with no sign to indicate where or what it is. I waited outside while Brian walked in to let the teacher know that he was there. Brian told me to leave anything valuable in the car and not bring anything with me

49

into the classroom. The doors were open and students and visitors could walk in and out simply by showing any type of identification or credentials. The "school" was two rooms with freshmen and sophomores in one and juniors and seniors in the next. We first walked into the smaller room with the younger students to do the lesson. The only word I could use to describe the scene was chaotic. The students were talking over the teacher, using their cell phones, standing up and moving around the classroom without permission, and walking outside at will. I got the sense that each student was on his or her own individual academic track. There was little regard for the teachers or the rest of the students. I was surprised at the relaxed nature of the school classrooms considering this is a county court school. The lead teacher, Angela Gigliotti, was wrapping up a lesson so Brian could get started with his. While she was doing this, Brian set up the materials and prepared to begin his lesson. This downtime gave me an opportunity to observe the physical surroundings.

The small classroom held about fourteen Hispanic students and three teachers. There were two female teachers and one male teacher. From my observations, one woman was the head classroom teacher, another was an assistant, and I felt that the male teacher was there as more of a disciplinarian and overseer of the students' progress in school. There were small individual desks mixed with tables that could accomodate two students. The desks were in no particular order and looked like they had been moved by the students to face each other. There were two teachers' desks in the back. Older computers were around the edges of the classroom and there were a few students working on them. The room seemed chaotic with everyone working on something different or students not paying attention to the teachers.

When Brian was ready, Angela told the students to get their desks back in order and introduced Brian as the art teacher from the San Diego Museum of Art. I sat in the

back of the classroom with the supplies ready to hand them out when it was time. Brian reintroduced himself and said he was an artist and then introduced me, with a disinterested tone, as a college student working on my thesis. From the first moment of the class Brian works to remove the stigma that the word "teacher" may have, which is meant to bring he and the students to a more even level. His manner of dismissing all other adult figures in the room denotes his role as a peer rather than an authority to the students. Furthermore, introducing himself as an artist and equalizing the relationship between himself and the students, Brian indirectly casts them as artists. This equalization sets a tone in the classroom for the hour-long session.

Brian began the lesson on Georgia O'Keeffe and showed the class examples of her work. He emphasized O'Keefe's use of organic lines, vibrant colors, and finding beauty in simple landscapes. He walked around with pictures so all the students could see. This O'Keeffe project was used as a means of introducing new techniques to the students. The artist's story may not be relatable to the youth at the National City school, but the techniques she used could be applied to the youths' artwork. The art project gave the students another tool to use in their art and be creative without a fear of failure. After giving a short lecture for about ten minutes, Brian sat down, had the youth get close enough so everyone could see, and demonstrated the techniques he had just discussed. He gave examples of starting off on a small piece of paper to practice shading and blending using chalk pastel while emphasizing the students' role in choosing for themselves what colors to use and how to approach their work. As Brian gave the demonstration he was very thorough with his description of exactly what he was doing so the students would first of all, pay attention, and second, understand the project in its entirety. For instance, Brian explained that it was important to use a different finger when blending different colors so they would not smudge. After a small practice paper, he moved to a larger piece

of paper and started to recreate a photograph of a flower he brought with him. Brian went through each step of the art making process step by step so students could see and hear what is going on. He emphasized while he was working that *he* was seeing areas to blend color he felt were right for *his own* work. Brian made the decisions as the artists and the students were expected to do the same. His lectures, demonstrations, and visual example served the different learning styles that could have been present in the classroom. He was aware that not all students would listen to a lecture, or watch a demonstration, or look at the final example. But approaching the lesson from all three directions maximized the chance of all students learning at least one portion of the lesson. The students were very attentive during the majority of the lecture and demonstration. They were most focused when Brian asked them to watch his demo closely. Some of the teens voiced their enthusiasm and how impressed they were with Brian's artistic abilities. I did hear a few discouraging comments from students regarding their own lack of ability to do something similar to Brian's work. After the example was finished, the students were set to work on their own artwork.

There were few restrictions on what could be made and what process the students used, although they were encouraged to practice blending colors. Brian encouraged the students to "draw big" and use the entire paper when working. As I walked around, I noticed a fair number of students using the photographs Brian brought for inspiration. However, they were trying to copy the photograph instead of using it as an inspiration. At this point of the lesson I began to question the relevance of this project to self-expression and creativity. Was Georgia O'Keeffe the best choice for stimulating the creative and self-expressive thought processes intended by the program? Is there a different means of using Georgia O'Keeffe to incorporate the students' personal expressions into the work?

It was not surprising to me that very few of the students acknowledged my presence. However, Brian was very engaging when walking around and working with the students. He encouraged without criticism and suggested trying new techniques with which the students may not be comfortable. A group of girls in the back of the classroom had moved their desks to face each other. They were talking together and on their cell phones, even walking outside occasionally to use their phone. They had their papers in front of them, but were not engaging in the activity. Brian walked past them and asked if they had tried to make anything. The girls were not particularly enthused about the project. Brian simply gave them some pictures that they could use and gently encouraged them to try it out when they felt ready. Eventually they started drawing red flowers on the larger pieces of paper. Brian would not force the girls to work, but he did try to give them options to get them started with the project. Lucy Eron discussed in her interview that this behavior is common in the programs for court-involved youth. She said the lack of enthusiasm or unwillingness to do the project most likely stems from a problem in the student's own life rather than from the art itself. However, the majority of students were actively participating in the project and trying new techniques, which would make this project highly successful according to the SDMA educators' definition of success. In other words, the students were willing to experiment with the art making process as opposed to thinking it was too difficult to even attempt.

The students were asked to clean up after working for about twenty minutes. They wrote their names on their work and the teachers collected the papers. The students were responsible for putting back all the supplies in the box they came in and for making sure all the boxes had the right amount of chalk pastels in them. The youth wiped down the tables and moved the desks back in order. Once the room was cleaned up and the students back in their seats, Angela came back to the front of the classroom and had the students

say "Thank you" to Brian. Both he and I then walked through the door connecting the classrooms to where the older students were working.

The second hour was spent in the larger classroom next-door teaching the same lesson on Georgia O'Keeffe. This classroom was for the junior and senior aged students. The room was larger than the previous one with long tables as desks plus one circle table in the back. The reception area for the school was also in this classroom. Students were either expected to be involved in the classroom lesson or do individual work at a computer. The administrator would sometimes call students to her desk during Brian's hour with the students. I noticed the attention of the students was never completely focused on Brian due to the distracting factors of the environment.

The teacher was very familiar with Brian and how he worked so she gave him the floor as soon as he and I walked in. The lesson was very similar to the previous one and the students were just as receptive to the project and Brian's teaching. I was able to see the flexibility of the curriculum and how it can be relevant to different groups of students. The students spread out on the tables and found their own space in which to work. There were a few students who isolated themselves and worked quietly while others gathered with friends. As Brian mentioned in interviews, these youth come into these school environments with different learning strengths and weaknesses. Brian gives the students freedom to work in a manner most conducive to creativity and self-expression. This includes letting the students choose where they work and who they work with as well as their process in creating a finished product with which they are happy. Brian acted much in the same way during the second hour as he did in the first; he walked around and spoke with students and gave them encouraging words about their work. At the end of the second hour the students were again responsible for cleaning up their messes and getting

all the supplies put back in the box. They said "Thank you" and we picked up our things and headed back to the museum.

Originally, I planned to observe the Kearny Mesa site on the same day. However, on the way to that site, I received an email informing me that the administrative office had not had enough time to clear me to visit. I was unable to do the observation that day and went back to the museum before Brian had to go out to the Kearny Mesa site. I scheduled another site visit and performed that observation on February 9, 2012.

Observation 2: November 17, 2011 National City Juvenile Court and Community School

Two days later on November 17, 2011, Brian and I went back to the National City site. I made my way to Balboa Park and helped gather materials at the museum before we left. This time the project was about Suminagashi–a paper marbling process.

The materials needed for the day were:
- Small rectanglular plastic containers to hold about an inch of water

- About 200 5" x 7" sheets of paper

- 3-5 Suminagashi ink sets (6 colors-red, yellow, blue, green, orange, black)

- 2 packages of paper towels

- Bamboo brushes

- 100 sheets of rice paper

- 20 small cups for water

Brian explained to me that he likes using Japanese tradition in the lessons for the court-involved youth because the art emphasizes a lifelong commitment to an art form and intense concentration from the artist. The art history lessons that he can teach through

55

Japanese tradition and Suminagashi can be transferred to the youths' lives. Brian uses these lessons because of their ability to contribute to forming positive habits in the students. On a technical level, these lessons offer the students the ultimate creative freedom because every product is different and the process can be manipulated in so many different ways. The students have complete control of the process and product.

We drove out to the site and this time we only worked in the large classroom and the students switched at the hour because of the restrictions of the materials. I noticed a few new students, but the rest of them were the same as two days earlier. A few of the students recognized me and acknowledged my presences by asking questions or asking me to participate. We walked in and Brian prepared a rectangular container of water, a water cup, papers, and colors for the demonstration. For this project Brian sat in the middle of the room and asked the students to get out of their seats and gather around him so they could all see the process. He began by explaining that Suminagashi is an ancient Japanese art form meaning "floating ink" (suminagshi.com). He went on to emphasize that the process required "being one with the water" as described by a student who had done this project before, and the artist must be still and calm with the water for the best results because the water is as much a part of the process as the artist's actions. Brian uses the term artist here, which may embed the idea in the students' minds that they are artists. In that small, but powerful use of the word artist in his demonstration, Brian is labeling the students as artists who have control over the outcome of their art. I was instantly aware of the students' attitude shift from being uninterested in the lesson to being captivated by the appeal of the project. The amount of focus required for the project shifted the students' attention towards what Brian was demonstrating. The students were intrigued by the project and the style with which Brian was teaching was keeping their attention. There is a playful aspect to this demonstration in that it requires

all the students to be still and calm so they will not move the table. Brian talks to the water in order to calm it down. This project required high levels of concentration, but allowed for completely different and individualized results.

Brian also gave the students a second project option for when they finished with the Suminagashi papers. The second project was more about brush practice rather than a finished product. He picked up a piece of rice paper, a bamboo brush, and his cup of clean water. He explained how holding a bamboo brush is different from grasping a pencil and demonstrated how to hold it lightly towards the top of the brush and place it straight down towards the paper. He dipped the brush into the clean water and made simple marks on the paper to give the students an idea of what the brush marks look like. But since it is just water on rice paper, the brushstrokes disappear and the paper becomes blank again once the water dries. Brian lets the students know that this is a project for them to practice and explore different styles of painting. The projects were chances for the students to try more artistic methods than what they may see in a typical art class. Some of the students had done the project before with Brian, hence their ability to answer questions about the process. The project is considered "successful" according to the museum educators' standards, but I wondered if a new project that none of the students had experienced would have served the same purposes as Suminagashi? Nevertheless, the students were very intrigued and enthusiastic about the process Brian was demonstrating in front of them.

Similar to the demonstrations on the first day, Brian went through everything step by step and described, in detail, what he was doing. The students were very focused while he was working and enthusiastic when the finished product came out. Brian would ask questions regarding process such as "what is the second sheet of paper for?" to the group knowing that some of the students had previously done the project, and the few students

who were familiar with the process answered "ghost paper" to clean the excess ink off the water. Students were excited that they knew the answers to some of Brian's questions and sounded proud that they already knew what he was talking about.

When Brian finished with his demonstration the students were responsible for getting all of their materials and to find their own space in which to work. It took about ten minutes or so for them to get fully engaged. Just like the previous lesson, some students wanted their own workspace while others decided to work with friends in small groups. Brian walked around and offered small adjustments and when students asked him a question, he would propose that they knew the answer or other students nearby knew the answer. The students were creative with the technique using different colors or blowing on the ink to make designs. All the students made at least five pieces that day. The works they were creating were completely original.

Brian informed the students that once dried the papers could be used to write or draw on or be displayed. During the second hour, the male teacher was walking around talking with the students about their art. He was so impressed with the project that he decided to try it himself. At the end of each hour, the students cleaned up their desks and put away all the supplies. They said "Thank you" and went back to their regular school day.

I was impressed by the amount of initiative the students took when making their artwork. There was almost 100% participation during both hours. Perhaps this project piqued the students' interests enough that they wanted to continue to explore the way they could create. But how far will these students take the lessons learned from the art history aspect of the lesson? Do the students understand how they could apply the lessons of Japanese art to their own lives? The intention is there, but is it made clear enough for the students to internalize the lessons offered by these Japanese art forms?

Observation 3: February 9, 2012, Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility

During the week of February 9, 2012, I engaged in another research trip to San Diego. This time I gave enough advanced warning to the Kearny Mesa site to complete clearance and be able to observe instruction during Brian's lesson. The observation started just as the other sessions had begun at the museum, preparing materials for the day. Since Brian had two hours with the same set of students he prepared two different projects, one for each hour. Both projects were similar to the National City projects but were executed differently because of the restrictions presented by the location. The first project was a René Magritte inspired self-portrait and the second was Suminagashi.

The materials needed for the day:
- Chalk pastels

- 16" x 24" sheets of paper

- Small, plastic fruit

- Same materials as used for Suminagashi at National City site

We gathered the materials and walked out to the car to drive to Kearny Mesa. When we arrived at the site we went to the front office to check in. We handed our IDs to the woman behind the glass and waited for about five minutes before the teacher came out to get us and walk us back to the classroom. We walked through the halls amidst signs that led to cells, holding areas, classrooms, and guard areas. It was quiet and there were not many people in the hallways. We passed by several doors before we reached one we were to enter. The halls of the detention facility felt sterile to a first time visitor like myself. There was a clear difference between the detention facility and the court school. I could sense the inherent rigidity of the environment in the detention facility. It was an institution governed by inflexible rules and regulations to keep order and good

conduct. Brian informed the teacher that he had a PowerPoint presentation so he needed the projector. She went into the next room to get the projector while we set up in the classroom.

We walked into the room and there were four guards and three teachers or teacher assistants. There were windows along the back wall behind a large control station where the guards work. In the center of the room were eight long tables with six chairs at each one. At the opposite end of the room was a half wall that covers the bathroom area. Branching off from the center were short hallways lined with individual cells. The guards loudly called out to the detainees and opened the cells one by one. When the door opened each youth stepped out and faced the wall with his hands crossed in front of him. Once all the cells were opened and the youth were out, they lined up and silently walked to the tables and sat down. The lead teacher introduced Brian to the group and reminded them that their work was not graded and the only rules were to use just last names on their paper and no numbers or letters could be used in their artwork. The numbers and letters could be associated with gang affiliation. This group consisted of 29 boys who were considered "good behavior" detainees so they had the reward of attending Brian's classes.

Similar to the National City site, Brian gave his credentials as an artist from the San Diego Museum of Art. Again this is meant to put him on the same level as the students. However, Brian did not directly classify the students as artists. Was this something he assumed? Did Brian expect the students to automatically think of themselves as artists? Once the students were seated Brian began the half-hour lesson by using the projector. The first lesson was on the artist René Magritte using images of his work to supplement the lecture. Rather than lecture on facts and dates about the artist, Brian used a story to describe Magritte's life and the hardships that shaped his artistic

talent. Brian asked questions such as "What do you see?" or "What makes this picture Surrealist?" to the youth to engage them. Several students answered. Brian continued on to explain Magritte's very troubled and emotional childhood and that he kept much of his life inside and never told anyone. In the process of associating Magritte's life with the students' possible life experiences, Brian is (perhaps, inadvertently) comparing the students to this professional artist. The well known, professional artist (Magritte) is being likened to the court-involved youth. Thus, students become artists themselves in Brian's mind as well as in the students' minds (hopefully) because of the similarities and connections they are seeing. Magritte is being presented on such a manner that the students can conceive commonalities between themselves and the art historical example of Magritte. Brian explained that Magritte used art and Surrealism to deal with his depression. The images that received the strongest reactions from the students were *The False Mirror* (1928), a painting of an eye with the sky as the iris; *The Son of a Man* (1964), a self-portrait with an apple over the face; and *La Lunette d'Approche* (1963), a painting of a partially open window looking out to what should be a blue sky but is empty blacknes. The *Son of a Man* (1964) portrait was the example for the project. Brian's purpose in showing this image was to illustrate how Magritte dealt with his personal problems in his art: he rarely showed his own identity in self-portraits, perhaps because of shame, embarrassment, or a lack of self-identity. I imagine that students could apply similar feelings into their own art. The students commented on these works and asked questions and were trying to connect the story of Magritte to the subject matter of the painting. They were intrigued by Surrealism and the way the artist played with reality in the paintings. Magritte was used as an example for the students because of the potential ability for court-involved youth to identify with the artist and how Magritte dealt with challenges in his own way. The lesson on Magritte illustrates artistic technique to the

students as well as provides a model for self-expression that the youth could use in their own art. Lessons such as this one are meant to invite the student to bring his own experience into the art being displayed in the hopes that he can express his own thoughts, hardships, and problems in a similar manner in his own art. Brian's demeanor and the lesson on Magritte created a safe space for the students to ask themselves how they can express in art what they cannot express in words. The youth may have felt a sense of empowerment in an environment where they had little to no power themselves. They had an opportunity to have complete control of what they created, which could possibly encourage the students to identify themselves as artists. Was freedom of expression and creativity Brian's indirect means of letting the students know they were artists as well?

After the lecture Brian did a demonstration of a Magritte-inspired self-portrait so the students knew what they were supposed to do. Since the students could not move from the seats during the demonstration, Brian taped a piece of paper to the whiteboard so everyone could see it. Magritte's self-portraits often included an object covering his face. The example Brian chose was the *Son of a Man*, which is a self-portrait of Magritte with an apple in front of his face. Using one of the small plastic pieces of fruits to draw from, Brian started drawing the apple with chalk pastel. He described the process in detail and emphasized aspects that could possibly frustrate the students. For instance, he made an important note to switch fingers when blending colors on the paper so the wrong colors would not get mixed. He kept drawing as if he was putting himself behind the apple and the students were impressed with his artistic ability. Once finished with the example, I assisted Brian and the other teachers to hand out paper to each student and place chalk pastel boxes on the tables. Brian then would walk around the room and make it clear to the students that their work would not be graded. Brian was reassuring the students that their work was not for a grade value, but he did expect them to utilize self-

expression and creativity in their work. These expectations, which are much less intimidating to the students than grades, were not explicitly mentioned during the class. Rather, these expectations of self-expression, creative thinking, and using art in a manner that works best for the students are implied by Brian's approach to teaching art to the court-involved youth.

The students were very attentive and respectful during the lecture portion of Brian's lesson; however, the guards were continuing on their business as usual. The guards would sit in the back and watch and discipline students if needed, but they would also be talking very loudly on the phone or walkie-talkies. There were three guards and five teachers supervising and disciplining when necessary so Brian did not have to be concerned with any of that responsibility. However, during the art-making portion of the lesson, the teachers and guards were also walking around encouraging and helping the students with their projects rather than disciplining. This was a change from the beginning of the class when the guards were disruptive and inconsiderate of the lesson.

All the students participated in the activity, but most of them were hesitant to begin their artwork. Once they were started, several questions arose regarding technique and quality. I heard questions such as, "Is this good?" and "How does this look?" from the students to the teachers, guards, Brian, and myself. There was some creativity in their works. For instance, I saw a student draw a pineapple on his paper as opposed to the apples, bananas, or oranges that were on the table. I questioned whether the students understood why Magritte was being used as an example. They were getting the technique down, but were they putting their experiences into their art? Was this too much to ask of the students when they were not completely familiar with the educator or their classmates? Were the students applying the therapeutic aspects of the art making process, whether they were aware of it or not?

After about twenty-five minutes, the students were asked to clean up. They wrote their last names on their art and the teachers collected everything. Chalk pastels and the plastic fruit were placed back in the boxes they were brought into the center. The tables were wiped down and Brian set up for his second demonstration. For this lesson Brian sat in the middle of the room at a table to demonstrate the Suminagashi process just as he did at the National City School. Although they asked to move closer, the students had to stay in their seats for the demonstration so Brian was incredibly detailed in his explanation about the process. He emphasized concentration, "being one with the water," and staying calm so he did not disturb the water. Brian made the process very meditative. There was a lot of awed reaction from the students when they saw the finished product come out of the water. While the demonstration was going on, Brian asked me to fill enough water trays for each student. Additionally, I prepared one tray of ink per table. Each table also received six brushes, one for each color, and I was advised to count every supply as I was handing them out and collecting them back. Every student had his own water tray in which to create his own Suminagashi paper. Students were very participatory and even the teachers and the guards wanted to join in the project. Each student made about five pieces of marbled paper. Brian also gave these students the option of using the paper as something to write letters on, poetry, or give as a gift to someone. Some students worked quietly while others were social with each other as well as the teachers and guards while working.

Once the second hour was up, the young artists had to stop their work and the teachers and guards helped clean everything up. While Brian and I were packing up, the lead teacher was making announcements to the group and handing out academic awards to a few students. The students were then lined up and walked to their cellblocks again. We were escorted to the front, handed our ID's, and then returned to the museum.

The observations above offered detailed accounts of the SDMA programs for court-involved youth. Through these on-site observations I was able to gain a more thorough understanding of the process of the outreach program from beginning to end. This data collection was a key element in the research process in that it provides understandings and brings up questions regarding the program itself. The first of my central research questions (What are the qualities and characteristics of the San Diego Museum of Art's Community Partnership programs serving court-involved youth?) was my prompt while I collected data. The following questions stemmed from the central research question as well: What are the critical elements to these programs? What are the constants between both sites that make it successful? What are the main factors seen at each site that keep the programs from failing?

I found through my observations as well as from similar comments from the interviews, that there is a specific teaching philosophy in the SDMA programs. The SDMA educators share a common belief in how educators should approach court-involved youth at these sites. However, this particular teaching style and approach is not the only means of teaching court-involved youth, a topic that will be discussed in Chapter V. Brian has demonstrated his personal approach as an being educator who is conscious of the sensitive nature of the court-involved youth audience and finds a way to relate to the youth. It begins with equalizing the classroom by emphasizing the artist-to-artist relationship, and continues throughout the lessons with the instrumental use of art history as a vehicle towards the therapeutic benefits of art making. The themes that emerged from the above questions and their application to the observations and interviews are further explicated below.

Brian Patterson's Role as Educator

Brian Patterson appears to be the epicenter of the SDMA programs for court-involved youth. The programs have been working under his leadership since their beginning and he has been the primary educator for both sites. What are the qualities and characteristics that Brian possesses and exemplifies in his teaching of court-involved youth? He identifies himself as an artist as well as an educator who focuses on how students learn best. Moreover, his education is in studio art, rather than art history or art education. Another important aspect of his background to keep in mind is the problems he experienced with college professors, which indicate a possible aversion to authority. Furthermore, Brian's personal experiences with the art educators of his past have acted as a catalyst for him to build his own teaching philosophy and connect with teens, and especially court-involved youth. He sees the potential in the youth and gives them confidence, in one respect, by identifying them as artists with control over the art they are making.

Brian's personality and personal experiences are not the only reasons he is able to easily connect with the court-involved youths. His teaching philosophy and pedagogy, as identifiable through the observations and interviews, are also relevant to the relationship he builds with his students. First of all, Brian is very specific regarding the nature of positive reinforcement the students should receive. I became aware of this characteristic of his teaching philosophy when we were in the car and he instructed me to only compliment specific parts of a student's work, rather than dispense generic positive reinforcements. Brian is conscious of the importance of positive reinforcement and encouragement for these youths. The youths respond well to Brian's positive attitude towards them and are confident in their own work because of it. The students answered questions Brian asked and took initiative in trying different techniques during art making.

66

He also encourages students who are not working with positive words. For instance, when a group of girls were on their phones and talking with each other instead of participating in the Georgia O'Keeffe project, Brian did not tell them to stop what they were doing or force them to make a piece of art. Rather, he suggested the students try drawing something from the photographs he brought in a non-forceful and nonthreatening tone so the girls would not feel as if they were doing something they did not want to do. The positive reinforcement specific to each student could make the youths feel as if they are not being generalized into one group of students, but rather are seen as individuals with talent and the ability to succeed.

Additionally, Brian conveyed in his communications with me that his teaching philosophy is based on how "students learn and how teachers teach." Thus, he tries to understand the best strategy for teaching each student and how they retain information in diverse ways. One of the means of maintaining a strong relationship with the sites and the students that Brian finds most effective is being consistent in his visits. He makes the effort to be the regular museum educator from the SDMA so a trusting relationship can be built between students and educator. The qualities and characteristics Brian possesses do effectively serve court-involved youth, as is evident by the continuity of the programs at both sites and the students' willingness to participate in art making. There are specific qualities to Brian as a museum educator that are unique such as his personal history as an art student. However, there are also characteristics he displays that many museum educators could also employ in programs for court-involved youth. What Brian claims he has found in other museums is an inability to train or hire the right people for similar programs. But is lack of training really the problem? Or does he possess biases regarding his role and abilities to teach court-involved youth that prohibit him from believing other museums educators have the capability to work with such students?

67

Curriculum

Angela Gigliotti, the lead teacher for the National City Juvenile Court and Community School, believes that Brian's strengths are his consistency with students, the ease of communication he has with the youth, and the variety of his lessons. Ms. Gigliotti has fifteen years of experience with court-involved youth so she is familiar with the teaching styles of educators who work best with this particular group. She can create a similar relationship with the students since she works with them every day and is sensitive to the learning strengths and weaknesses of all her students. However, she mentions that Brian can offer diversity in the classroom and expose the youth to different artists and artistic methods that perhaps Angela cannot offer the students.

Brian's curriculum is consistent each visit even though he intermittently visits the sites throughout the year. The procedure follows the same formula: opening lecture, demonstration, and art making activity. The project content changes but the youth that have experienced Brian's classes know what to expect when he comes to the site. However, the consistency of him simply showing up to teach each class is important and enough to keep the youth engaged, interested, and trusting of Brian as an adult figure. The teachers at both National City and Kearny Mesa are constants in the students' lives; however, when an outside educator comes into the classroom, students may not respond as well to that adult figure because they do not see him or her everyday. Brian has made it apparent to the youth, teachers, and myself that he is the only educator from the San Diego Museum of Art that teaches the court-involved youth at both sites. It seems he understands the importance of not only being a positive adult figure to the youth, but also being an adult figure the students have faith in and can trust that Brian will be the one educator to show up. The students were very comfortable with Brian and their

willingness to partake in the curriculum each day is a sign that they trust and respect Brian as an adult figure in their lives.

All this does beg certain questions when it comes to the Kearny Mesa site where students are constantly coming in and out of detainment: Does consistency still play a role with the Kearny Mesa students? It could be a possibility in the case of a detainee who finished his term at the detention facility and then entered the court school system at the National City site. Angela provided an example of this and Brian mentioned that this does happen (or the opposite situation with a National City student going to the detention facility), but does it happen often enough for consistency to be primary factor in the success of a museum outreach program for court-involved youth? If the classes happened more frequently would consistency play a larger role in the program at the Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility?

Instrumental Use of Art History

Art history is at the core of the SDMA educator's teaching philosophy. The art historical facts are not as important to the lessons as is the instrumental use of art history to introduce self-expression and freedom of creativity to the students. Additionally, art history is presented in such a way that the students can easily identify themselves with the examples, in turn, thinking of themselves as artists. In the René Magritte lesson, Brian does not go through the art historical theory behind Magritte's work. Instead, he finds the aspects of Magritte's life that may parallel the lives of the students and uses that as a means of bringing in art history while also encouraging the students to utilize similar tools as Magritte in creating their own art. The online descriptions of the programs for court-involved youth discuss bringing arts to audiences and using art history and art techniques as a means of inspiring self-expression. Brian Patterson and Lucy Eron, the

two museum educators I spoke with about Community Partnership programs at SDMA, both mention in their interviews the central role that art history takes in any lesson for court-involved youth. Art history is used during lessons for inspiration and example. They have found art history to be very adaptable to different audiences. Brian is not using art history in the sense of theory and criticism, but instead using it for the artists' personal stories or techniques that would interest court-involved youth. For instance, in the above observations, Brian used René Magritte to introduce Surrealism through Magritte's life story and why Magritte used art to create a dream world for himself. The Suminagashi and Georgia O'Keefe lessons focused more on new techniques for the students to try and with which they could experiment. Whether the students are connecting to the art and art-making processes through an artist's story or enjoying a new method of creating art, Brian explains that the program's heavy art history background gives the youth the opportunity to see how artists have been through comparable life situations to the students' lives, thus helping to identify the students as artists themselves. As an artist Brian is offering the students the artistic freedom in self-expression that he presented to them in the lessons on Magritte or Suminagashi. Art history serves as a catalyst for the youth to gain an introspective look at themselves as artists and use art to outwardly express themselves.

Art Therapy Elements

Although both programs are very rooted in art history based lessons and teaching philosophy, art therapy has been recognized as an important element of the programs by all three educators with whom I spoke. Brian and the other educators involved in the Community Partnership programs are aware of the fine line separating art education and art therapy. Brian is aware that one or two hours with the students will not solve the

youths' problems, but he does believe that his classes instill confidence in the students. Lucy Eron also said she believes that "art is therapeutic for us all" in one-way or another, so it is inevitable that art therapy is part of the program since art making is occurring. However, therapy is not the main focus of the Community Partnership program for court-involved youth.

For the educators at the San Diego Museum of Art, confidence building is a key element in the programs for court-involved youth. All three educators I spoke with–Lucy, Brian, and Angela at the National City site–call attention to the use of art as a means of building self-confidence in the students. Angela explained to me that the students gain more confidence when they see themselves as artists and are more comfortable discussing art after they have a class with Brian. She continues by stating that students feel more confident walking into a museum and can hold a conversation regarding the art in the galleries. Angela informed me that she will take her students from the National City school on field trips to the San Diego Museum of Art and other local museums so they have the opportunity to come in contact with art in other ways than just Brian's visits. Angela continues the confidence building by displaying the art the students make in the classroom. In regard to the Kearny Mesa detention facility, the youth are supported and encouraged by all the authority figures around them in addition to Brian.

As the youth gain confidence and feel comfortable with Brian, the hope is that they will be more inclined to express themselves freely. The educators are sensitive to the fact that these students are under heavy restrictions that can inhibit freedom of expression. While using art history in terms of criticism or theory is a teaching approach commonly used with museum audiences, using art history in this instrumental way, to serve a therapeutic function, is important when working with court-involved youth. What

Brian hopes to provide for the youth in his lessons at both sites is the opportunity for these youth to create without expectations or boundaries.

Self Expression

The educators as well as the online descriptions of the programs discuss self-expression as a vital element to the lessons at both sites. Students are meant to feel as if boundaries and rules in the classroom are removed for at least the two hours Brian is working with them. Brian feels that the youth "deal with enough" with school restrictions, academic expectations, or perhaps situations in their personal lives, and he offers them a vehicle to go their own direction and find ways that work best for them when working with art. Brian explained to me that he is looking for a product in the end; however, the students' processes are individualized so the youth express themselves in a way that most benefits them. Angela also adds to the conversation stating, "whether knowing it or not, [the youth] might be bringing things from their lives into their artwork." Again, the manner in which Brian presents the projects to the court-involved youth encourages the students to represent themselves in their work.

Environment

The physical and emotional environments are quite specific to the programs serving court-involved youth. These youth are not situated in typical classrooms and have several restrictions on what they can and cannot do. Brian considers the limitations of the environment when deciding the lessons for each program. At the National City Juvenile Court and Community School the normal environment is chaotic, unorganized, loud, and based on academic expectations. When Brian comes in, he creates a space more conducive to art making by quieting the classroom and inviting the students to be part of the lesson from beginning to end. He tries to keep their attention focused on the art

making process. Psychologically, Brian creates new expectations unrelated to grades for the one hour lesson that are as simple as participation and creating a product that expresses the student's individual creative process.

The Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility is a more restrictive atmosphere with physical elements confining the students, as well as the psychological aspects of the environment that can hinder creative thinking. In this environment Brian tries to capture the students' attention in order to block out the fact that they are in the middle of a detention facility and live in cells. It is a harsh environment that constantly reminds the youth that they are being punished for a crime they committed. The two-hour art lesson is a way for them to mentally escape that reality and put their emotions and thoughts into their artwork. However, there are some things he cannot control such as the distractions caused by the guards or the reception desk. The physical environment is not the most conducive space for creativity, but Brian keeps the students' attention and gives them enough to think about and discuss that they may feel less emotionally confined.

For the one or two hours of the program, Brian tries to minimize the restrictions these youth face every day and give them a space with unlimited creative boundaries. He makes an effort to distract the students from the loud noises of the guards or the chatter of other students or the fact that they are living in cells or from any other aspect of their personal lives they are afraid to express. Brian takes on the responsibility of recreating the environments of both the court school and the detention facility into spaces where the students feel comfortable to express themselves through art.

CONCLUSION

The San Diego Museum of Art's programs for court-involved youth offer examples of one museum's efforts to serve this audience. In observing the sites and

having conversations with stakeholders in the program as well as examining pertinent documents, I was able to generate a detailed understanding of what makes these programs work. The National City Juvenile Court and Community School and the Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility programs have maintained their status because of the qualities mentioned above.

The two outreach sites for court-involved youth are chiefly run by Brian Patterson. He has been the sole educator from the museum to work with these two particular sites and audiences since their inception. He maintains that the success of these programs, or any similar program, is due to the educator and this audience requires a specific approach that not all museum educators may inherently have or have been trained to do. This raises the important question: Is training what other museum educators lack or is Brian's bias regarding personality traits, personal experiences, and qualities of the teaching philosophy of an educator must have to work with court-involved youth be the reason he believes other museums are unable to maintain art museum education programs with these youth? Brian's curriculum is centered on projects that students can easily identify with whether it is an artist's story or a new method of making art, which in turn identifyies the students as artists. His projects are meant to be process based with a product created in a manner that most benefits the students. It is evident that Brian and the curriculum he utilizes help define the San Diego Museum of Art outreach for court-involved youth.

Secondly, art history is a large component of the SDMA programs. The educators utilize the art historical resources provided by the museum to create a relationship

between the youth and the institution. The lessons revolve around an image, artist, medium, or period that is represented in the museum. However, it is not taught in terms of art criticism or theory. Art history is presented in a way that the students can personally relate to the story or the creative process that art history exemplifies so they also see themselves as artists. Art history acts as the catalyst for the students to explore modes of expressing themselves through art making, which can be different from teaching approaches used with more typical museum audiences.

Introducing art history to the youth and regarding them as artists is intended to instill confidence. Brian does equalize himself and the students as artists as well as the students with the historical examples of the chosen artist; however, he does not always overtly say this to the students. Brian encourages the students to identify themselves as artists. The educators build confidence in the students in hopes of encouraging self-expression in the students' art. These intentions regarding confidence and self-expression provide examples of the art therapy involved in the program. However, it is made clear that the programs are not rooted in art therapy, but rather accentuate the natural therapeutic tendencies of art making.

Lastly, Brian transforms a very restrictive environment at both sites. National City Juvenile Court and Community School and Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility are prohibitive and enforce rules as well as posess physical barriers restricting the youth. In the one or two hours that Brian is working with the students, he attempts to build an environment without barriers, rules, grades, and minimal expectations as far as artistic products. There is a responsibility in the teacher to create a comfortable and trusting

space so the youth feel confident enough to express themselves through their art and not worry about judgment or criticism. These observations and found qualities of the SDMA programs help answer the second part of the central research question (What can be drawn from this program that could be utilized within other art museums?) which will be examined in Chapter V.

Chapter V: Data Analysis

The San Diego Museum of Art outreach programs described in Chapter IV are presented in this research in order to identify the qualities and characteristics the programs posses so other museum education staff consider may utilizing them when establishing similar programs at museums across the country. It also opens up the conversation with social work, youth programs, and society about the educational and therapeutic options available for court-involved youth. This chapter looks deeper into what values and characteristics from the SDMA program can support other museums looking to develop similar outreach. Furthermore, it offers insight into where museum education and research in the field can be expanded. Chapter V analyzes the qualities and characteristics of the programs found in Chapter IV to answer the second central research question: What can be drawn from these programs that could be utilized within other art museums? The areas discussed in this chapter are more generalized than those discussed in Chapter IV in order to offer qualities and characteristics to other museums and present these qualities and characteristics in such a way that justifies the necessity of social responsibility in museums. The themes presented here are related to those found from the observations and interviews, but stand on their own as recommendations to the museum education field as a whole.

ROLES OF THE EDUCATOR

My research suggests that court-involved youth are sensitive to the role the educator plays in museum education programs. The educator, Brian Patterson in the case of the SDMA programs, becomes a multifaceted feature affecting to the success of a program for court-involved youth who takes on different roles and displays varied expectations. The educator must utilize his or her unique personal qualities, background

experiences, and pedagogic theory in a manner that is relevant to and empowers the learner (Crooke, 2007; Dodd, 2002). As Thelan (2001) mentioned, the museum staff must identify the traits of the museum and community being served in order to find the commonalities between them in order to create sustainable partnerships that serve the needs of the audience. The museum educator for programs for court-involved youth must utilize those commonalities so the education program is meaningful to students. In using this approach the museum educator manifests the social responsibility required of museums in order to create and implement museum education programs that serve the needs of the audiences.

Primarily, Brian demonstrates an artist-to-artist relationship between educator and students throughout the process of the art lessons at both National City Juvenile Court and Community School and Kearny Mesa Juvenile Detention Facility. Secondly, Brian is consistent from site to site since he is the only educator for court-involved youth and is a steady adult figure in the youths' lives. Brian portrays qualities as an educator that work well with youth in the court system. However, does this mean other museum staffs wanting to create a similar outreach program need the same characteristics, personality traits, values, and personal background Brian possesses? Brian is strongly invested in his particular approach to teaching court-involved youth; however, my research indicates that his teaching style can provide a model (as opposed to being the only one) for other museum educators eager to work with a court-involved youth audience. I do agree with his opinion that it takes particular personality traits, attitudes, and approaches to work with court-involved youth and not every museum educator may be right for the job. However, Brian's belief that art educators lack training for working with this group is a misdirection that could hold back the development of programs in other museums. When I identified the qualities and characteristics of Brian's teaching style, beliefs, and

78

methods, it appeared his concerns that other museums would likely not be successful in implementing such a program appeared to me to be more of a bias towards his own approaches to educating court-involved youth, than a lack of proper training by other educators. Brian provided no data revealing that his background includes such training specific to museum education for court-involved youth. He does, however, possess some personal history, such as his reluctance towards authority figures, which enables him to readily relate to the youth. His individual background and his education in studio art are significant in creating his own teaching approach for court-involved youth. Therefore, I believe it is not training that other museum educators may lack; they in fact may have the same, if not more, artistic skill and possess similar teaching philosophies as Brian. Additionally they may possess other personal and professional abilities that equip them to work effectively with court-involved youth. Other museum educators can utilize the qualities and characteristics of Brian and his teaching philosophy. It is true that not all museum educators have personal experiences similar to that of Brian; however, it is possible for others to believe in teaching to students' strengths and maintaining consistency as the educator. Many museum educators working with court-involved youth can display pedagogical qualities similar to Brian; thus, the aforementioned characteristics of Brian's teaching are not exclusive to him. In fact, a museum educator must find his or her way to readily relate to the youths on a level deeper than content in art history or art making, and find their personality traits and values that relate to the audience.

Artist-to-Artist Relationship

In the SDMA programs for court-involved youth Brian identifies himself and the students as artists. This action helps to mitigate the teacher-to-student relationship and

create a positive artist-to-artist relationship between himself and the students. Brian strives to remove the perceived stigma caused by the label "teacher" and introduces himself as an artist and he indirectly labels the youth as artists. The students have the opportunity to define themselves as artists rather than court-involved youth, at least for the one or two hours a week that Brian is working with them. While there are indirect ways of implying the youths are artists, such as giving them the ability to create anything they want and expecting a product out of them, the students may benefit if they are more directly identified by the art educator as an artist. Transference of value occurs when an artist (Brian) recognizes the students as artists and the youths instill that definition within themselves. As O'Thearling and Bickley-Green (1996) point out, the value of the students' artwork is directly related to the value they put on themselves. Therefore, if they value themselves as artists, such action may directly translate into their artwork with increased quality self-expression and creativity. The relationship and recognition between educator and student is the base from which educators can build confidence in the students; however, it must be made clear to the students that they are artists with as much freedom and creativity as Brian, or examples from art history, or a museum educator implementing such a program would have.

In recent decades, the museum education field has shifted its goals towards more community collaborations and education approaches that establish equity of power between community and museum (AAM, 1992; Hirzy, 2002; Jackson, 2002; Kertzner, 2002). Jensen (2002) states in that when museum educators are condescending to museum learners, the learners "confirm their opinion" that the museum is not a place for them (p. 112). This is especially true with teenagers. Thus, in establishing this equity of power specifically with the learner, educators must equalize the room as they make efforts towards positive student empowerment, participation, and creating a comfortable

environment for the youth. Before the art education even begins the educator must define the relationship between himself and the students, and my research indicates that an artist-to-artist relationship has positive psychological effects on court-involved youth. This artist-to-artist relationship may be one of very few positive adult interactions the students have experienced thus far in their lives. These youths see adults as the authority figures who placed them in the court system and isolated them from society (O'Thearling & Bickley-Green, 1996; Wallace-DiGarbo & Hill, 2006) Therefore, it is crucial for the art educator to build the relationship from the beginning and consistently maintain its quality to keep the youths interested during each visit from the educator. However, it must be recognized that the museum institution the educator represents is one of an authority in art history and culture. The museum cannot escape the perception of being an authority figure, thus it could be difficult for a museum educator to escape from this perceived position of authority. Museum educators can do their best to mask their authority by recognizing themselves as artists so students feel they can relate to the educators in ways they cannot with their regular classroom teacher or other adults in positions of authority. Relating on personal levels and removing notions of authority encourages and empowers students in the classroom (Dodd, 2002).

Consistency

Consistency is important in working with court-involved youth when it comes to who teaches the students at each site. Showing up is just as important, if not more important, than the art activity itself. Brian is the only SDMA educator who works with court-involved youth at both sites. The students know him, they are comfortable with him, they are aware of how he runs the class, and they respect him. The students can always rely on Brian to show up. Students do not wonder if a different educator from the

museum will teach his class. This continues the relationship building process with the site as well as with the students. Instilling trust in the community the SDMA educators are working with maintains the relationship between museum and community (Janes, 2007). As Janes (2007) has argued, it is the *quality* of the communication in a museum partnership that instills trust in the community and will enable the museum to fulfill its responsibilities. Court-involved youth may have had past experiences with adults being inconsistent and unsupportive. An educator has the opportunity to provide a positive and consistent adult figure in students' lives by being a consistent and dependable adult figure thereby creating a safe and trusting space for the students to express themselves (O'Thearling & Bickley-Green, 1996).

The SDMA program does include multiple visits throughout the year and is a continuous outreach effort rather than a one-time event. Therefore, Brian can get to know the students if he visits the sites often enough, which gives the students confidence that Brian is going to be a constant figure in their school lives. An outreach program for court-involved youth would be most beneficial if it was consistent throughout the year rather than existing over a period of a few months. Of course, this requires more educators on the museum staff which circles the argument back to considering the traits and characteristics of a museum educator working with youth in court systems. Court-involved youth are vulnerable to disappointment from adults and the museum educator can provide a positive, constant adult figure in the youths' lives (O'Thearling & Bickley-Green, 1996). The educator must understand the psychological importance they are to court-involved youth, being a reliable and a constant adult figure in their lives. The educator must be willing to show up every time and administrators need to designate a single educator to one site, thereby helping to facilitate a consistent and dependable environment for the students.

Learning Styles

Socially responsible museum staffs hoping to build partnerships with community audiences must fulfill the needs of the individuals who make up the audience being served. As Crooke (2007) and Watson (2007) mentioned, museums must create diverse strategies and tailor education to the needs of each audience. The majority of court-involved youth more than likely have learning or behavioral difficulties in the classroom (Nance & Novy, 2011). I could sense this during my observations at the National City site since the students were a bit chaotic while I visited. I also noticed Brian's teaching catered to different learning styles by using lecture, visual examples, and walking around or bringing the youth into the lesson all at once. An educator who notices and teaches to a variety of learning abilities may find that students are more engaged during a lesson and less likely to misbehave if they are interested and engaged in what is being taught. Court-involved youth also have a tendency to display non-conformist attitudes and educators are encouraged to utilize this feature as a tool for creativity (O'Thearling & Bickley-Green, 1996). Students may also feel more connected with the lesson because it is presented in a manner they can understand rather than feeling a sense of failure for not comprehending the information.

Nance and Novy (2011), as previously mentioned in Chapter II, state that delinquent behavior stems partially from the teachers in the general school system having little to no expectations of at-risk youth. This could lead to a life of court-involvement for the student. For instance, if a teacher makes it clear that he or she does not see potential in a student, then that student may find acceptance and expectations from negative sources such as gangs or drugs. If teachers do not expect anything from these youth, how can these young people expect anything from themselves?

Brian is already working with the students after they have been pushed into a criminal lifestyle. He knows how important it is to uplift the students by putting expectations on them so they can make better decisions for a more positive future. However, the expectations are more focused on internal growth and participation in the process as opposed to academic knowledge and grades. Expectations, especially ones that are almost impossible to fail in meeting, offer the teacher numerous opportunities to positively reinforce and praise the students (Nance & Novy, 2011). Thus, in programs for court-involved youth it is good to offer the students an opportunity for success in a classroom setting. These expectations include utilizing demonstrated techniques and creating an artwork that displays self-expression, self-reflection, creativity, and thinking beyond the boundaries that society has created. Art educators must be cognizant of the fact that positive expectations provide the youth with self-worth and a meaningful goal for which to strive. Students then begin to see potential within themselves.

Brian displayed specific qualities that are very important for an educator to have when working with court-involved youth. However, although Brian does have particular qualities specific to him, other art museum educators may also possess qualities beneficial to working with youths in the court system. Drawing insight from my observations and interviews, I believe that individual teachers working with court-involved youth would be specifically effective if they possessed the following characteristics: (a. understanding the needs of the particular community he or she is working with, (b) consistency with visits and curriculum, (c) relating to the students on their own level yet still maintaining control over the classroom, and (d) having a sensitivity towards the youths' psychological needs. Brian makes a solid point in saying that it takes a special personality type in an educator to work with these youth, and I whole-heartedly agree, but it does not have to be exclusively someone of Brian's

personality. The personality type he exemplifies is one that can easily relate to a teen's aversion to authority and can very quickly connect to the youth through language and demeanor. But while some traits are intrinsically present in some individuals, others can be learned over time. It is certain that museum educators in other museums can replicate this position in similar outreach programs and infuse the program with their own traits and characteristics. And perhaps, a different personality type may relate to the students just as well as Brian's. For instance, an educator with a therapeutic, calm, and nurturing personality could be just as appealing and new to students in court schools or detention facilities. In general, this research strongly suggests the necessity for the educator to be able to connect to court-involved youth on their level and make the students aware of their potential no matter what the approach. The artist-to-artist relationship is an important aspect of a program for court involved youth because it instills confidence in the students so they are able to comfortably express themselves through creativity. This perception is connected to the recent movement in museum education towards more socially responsibly museums.

CURRICULUM

The curriculum used at the National City and Kearny Mesa sites are relatively typical to museum education or even regular art classes. However, what sets it apart from other art lessons is the instrumental use of art history as a vehicle for self-expression and creativity.

Art History as a Vehicle

The SDMA has demonstrated for other museums and programs an approach to effectively integrating art history into lessons intended to encourage court-involved youth to creatively express themselves through art. One must also recognize that the court-

involved youth are adolescents and that fact alone requires a specific manner of teaching art history. As Lowenfeld and Britain (1970) explained, teenage students (court-involved or not) must feel empowered in their creativity and have a sense of independence from authority. Jensen (2002) also supports this theory stating that teen learners are developing a sense of self and need opportunities to express themselves and learn creatively. Court-involved youth are not only seeking independence from general authority, but also freedom from their physical and psychological barriers. Art education can be used to fulfill the youths' needs to express themselves and to provide an outlet for creativity to imagine and project the student into a positive future (O'Thearling & Bickley-Green, 1996; Venable, 2005; Wallace-DiGarbo & Hill, 2006). In museum education, art history is meant to be the catalyst for self-expression and creativity. What other educators working with this audience must see is the importance of using this vehicle in the proper way for this specific group of learners. Art history allows for an infinite number of directions to meaning making, and court-involved youth should see art history in relation to how they can communicate their own personal experiences through art. The goal is not what the art is about; it is *how* the art is being presented to these youth.

The outreach program for court-involved youth at the SDMA properly demonstrates how an outreach program incorporates the museum and its resources into lessons for court-involved youth. A key point I discerned during my data gathering was the importance of using art history as a means to the end, rather than being the end itself. The use of art history is an example of how a socially responsible museum *serves* the audience, rather than *represents* the audience (Crooke, 2007). The art in the galleries is not changing. However, reflecting Crooke's (2007) writings how museums can serve audiences, Brian communicated to me that it is in the way the educator teaches the art and changes the pedagogical approach according to the specific learners that the museum

can be relevant to and properly serve court-involved youth. Whatever art historical context the museum collection focuses on, the factual information of the art is not nearly as important as the presentation of the art in a way that clearly relates to court-involved youth.

It is normal that a museum educator would use the resources available at the museum in the projects he or she presents to an audience. A notable quality of the SDMA program is the educators' presentation of art history in a manner apropos to the lives of court-involved youth. For example, René Magritte is taught in terms of his personal life and the psychological troubles he went through and how he used art to express those problems. Many of the youth could have similarly troubled pasts and are able to identify with Magritte when his art is presented to the youth in a manner they understand. Thus, the museum becomes more relevant to the youth. This is meant to empower the youth and give them tools to think creatively and express themselves freely in an environment that limits most, if not all, of their power. The SDMA exemplifies the discussions of Crooke (2007), Dodd (2002), and Thelan (2001) on the importance of confidence building and empowering the communities the museum staff serves in order to maintain partnerships in the community.

Brian, Lucy, and Ruth Broudy (Manager of Docent Programs), the three museum educators I spoke with regarding the SDMA program at the National City and Kearny Mesa sites, mentioned using art history as a means of connecting with court-involved youth in a language and contextual relationship that is most relatable to the students. The educators' comments directly correspond to the theory that general art education creates a comprehensible language for the youth because of the freedoms it provides for the youth (O'Thearling & Bickley-Green, 1996; Venable, 2005; Wallace-DiGarbo & Hill, 2006). Brian, Lucy, and Ruth put this language in the context of art history. Examples of this

include, as stated above, Brian introducing René Magritte in the context of the artist's personal story and how that story was expressed in the art, or in demonstrating Suminagashi as a reflective and meditative practice that requires stillness and concentration from the artist. Both these examples are represented by works in the museum collection and connect outreach to the museum and the museum's mission. However, the Georgia O'Keeffe lesson did not seem tailored to court-involved youth. Presenting Georgia O'Keeffe in regards to her biography as a female artist working in a predominantly male artist circle could possibly provide a lesson in empowerment for the adolescent girls at the National City site. This approach may be more suitable to Brian's teaching approach for court-involved youth than introducing Georgia O'Keeffe in a lesson on organic lines and color blending.

The art historical examples must be carefully selected by the educator with the intention of using art history as the vehicle through which students will understand how past artists used self-expression so the students may utilize it in their own work. Educators must choose artists as examples that bring the students into the art itself so the creation of artwork is based on personal experiences and previously acquired knowledge.

Additionally, art history can serve as an example of using techniques to offer the student new ways of expressing themselves and connecting with the therapeutic process of art making. Brian's demonstration of Suminagashi is less about the artwork and more about the process being introduced to the students. He enjoys using Japanese art tradition because of its emphasis on life-long commitment to an art practice and its meditative qualities that require concentration. Students can transfer the idea of life-long commitment and concentration to their own lives on many different levels. For instance, this can be a lesson in finding a skill, whether artistic or other skills, and committing to the development of the skill to make it a life-long practice and possibly a career.

Additionally, the meditative calmness and concentration is something the students can utilize in everyday life. However, the question I present in Chapter IV arises once again: Do the students really understand the purpose of these lessons? The art projects are meant to provide the students with tools of self-expression and emphasize life-life commitment as well as the meditative qualities of art making. These ideas should be repeated at times during the class in order for the students to truly grasp the purpose of the art-making process. It is projects such as this, however, that give students the empowerment to create an individualized artwork while experiencing (whether they are aware of it or not) therapeutic effects of art creation.

ART EDUCATION VERSUS ART THERAPY

Art history is a means through which a museum educator can open a student's mind to his or her limitless options for creating art. The collected data offered an example of the therapeutic nature of art making. The SDMA program blends art therapy and art education practices at both sites, but attention must be called to the distinction between the two practices and what is and is not included in programs for court-involved youth. Museum educators must maintain a careful balance between education and therapy.

In the discussion of art therapy in Chapter II, the definition of art therapy underlined artistic self-expression as a means of healing conflicts and problems in the individual partaking in the creative art-making process ("Art therapy: definition of the profession," 2012). Edwards (1976) juxtaposes the two and explains that art education is primarily about the product while art therapy is about treatment during the process. I found in my observations of the SDMA programs at the court school and the detention facility that the art lessons are grounded in art education with therapy being a positive outcome of the process. In saying this, the programs can be classified under art education

because of the focus on making a product; however, discussions with the SDMA educators and my observations demonstrate that there are clear art therapy attributes to the program as well. Additionally, as Lucy mentioned in her interview and O'Thearling and Bickley-Green (1996) mentioned in their work, art making inevitably contains therapeutic aspects.

Brian gave demonstrations of what possible artworks might look like in reference to his lesson; however he expected students to be creative in the ways they were getting to that end point. Therapy is incorporated into the art lesson with the students in the use of the art process. Unfortunately, some students may not absorb the therapeutic value of the art making process and the educator must be aware (just like Brian is) of this fact. A student, however, could possibly have a positive emotional response to a finished product due to simple gratification in completing the work of art on his or her own, which in turn could be considered healing in itself. Nevertheless, art education is primarily concerned with creating a product while art therapy focuses on the psychological effects happening during its creation, and court-involved youth benefit from a blend of both education and therapy (Anderson, Walch, & Becker, 2003; Edwards, 1976; O'Thearling & Bickley-Greene, 1996; Venable, 2005; Wallace-DiGarbo & Hill, 2006). Therefore, art educators working with court-involved youth must be conscious of creating lessons for the students that integrate artistic techniques and methods while at the same time offering students an emotional outlet for problems they may be containing within themselves because they do not have language to clearly explain their thoughts and emotions.

The descriptions of the programs at the National City Court School and the Kearny Mesa Detention Facility on the San Diego Museum of Art's website mention the integration of self-expression into the art lessons. The program for court-involved youth automatically goes in the vein of art therapy when incorporating expression as a means of

reflection. The art making process is simultaneously using retrospection regarding the youths' past decisions and as a tool for envisioning a future that will enable them to contribute positively to society. Just as the literature in Chapter II mentioned, art education for court involved youth offers students a language with which to express themselves and have freedom in creating their own works of art (Anderson, Walch, & Becker, 2003; Edwards, 1976; O'Thearling & Bickley-Greene, 1996; Venable, 2005; Wallace-DiGarbo & Hill, 2006).

Art educators aspiring to create art education programs for court-involved youth can understand the importance of including self-expression and confidence building as a major component of the program. Encouraging creativity and placing value on all of the students' work supports the process of self-expression. It is an opportunity for the youth to be noticed in a positive light for their non-conformity and tendency to break barriers. Art education outreach programs can use the rebellious nature of court-involved youth as a tool for creativity as O'Thearling and Bickley-Green (1996) identified in their research.

From an ethical point of view, the museum educator needs to understand his or her role as educator rather than therapist. There are therapeutic elements to art education for court-involved youth; however, this does not classify the educator as an art therapist nor should he or she be expected to assume that role. Lucy Eron mentioned in her interview that art making is inherently therapeutic whether that is the intention or not. Therefore, it could be argued that all museum educators, whether working with court-involved youth or not, may be unknowingly crossing boundaries into art therapy when educating an audience. It seems unreasonable for all museum educators to have an art therapy background; however, it may be useful for museum educators teaching court-involved or at-risk youth to share in Lucy's view that art is always therapeutic and the

educator should approach the youth with a sense of art therapy in their lessons. Taking the responsibility to inform themselves on art therapy could be beneficial as well.

The community court school and detention facility environments are not the most conducive for freedom of thought or self-expression. The National City and Kearny Mesa sites, although physically quite different, both construct restrictive psychological environments that corral, it not stifles, freedom of thought. Neither of the spaces inspires self-expression from the students. Juvenile detention facilities and county court schools are meant to rectify the students' delinquent behaviors and they do so partially through the surrounding environment. Therefore, in order for the students to feel comfortable expressing themselves in their artwork without restrictions, the art educator must create an emotional environment that is conducive for creativity and art making. O'Theatling and Bickley-Green (1996) argue that art education as a whole can create a safe space conducive to creativity and self-expression. However, time constraints, teachers, guards, jail cells, walkie-talkies, and other students stand as difficult obstacles in court schools or detention facilities. The challenge for the instructor in this type of environment is capturing the attention of the students in such a way that the physical distractions are diminished as much as possible. This begins with the initial introduction of the educator and the lesson. The artist-to-artist relationship must be developed from the moment the educator begins the class. The environment created by the educator is built by intangible efforts as opposed to anything physical. For instance, when Brian introduces himself as an artist it removes the inequality of the teacher-to-student relationship. Also, he constantly reminds the students nothing is being graded, thereby eliminating the fear of failure. Doing away with the connotations of a typical academic class period and giving the students empowerment over how an artwork is being produced in that small window

of time creates a promising environment. During that one or two-hour art lesson, the youth should feel freedom from the surroundings forced upon them.

IMPORT TO THE FIELD

So why should there be art education programs for court-involved youth? What good can they do for museum education, museums in general, and society as a whole? The San Diego Museum of Art Community Partnership program serving court-involved youth is an example of the benefits of providing outreach to this audience. The purpose of the example is more than simply showing how to run a successful program. It also offers a means of establishing social responsibility in museums serving court-involved youth and other underserved audiences. Museum outreach can become more than just art lessons; it can be a vehicle towards a healthy and responsible life for a child involved in the courts. Understandably, this is a large task for any museum to take on; however, it is about starting from within the museum, figuring out what museum educators can offer the underserved communities, and beginning the partnership and expanding that relationship over time.

Outreach programs for court-involved youth are few and far between. Even finding the program at the San Diego Museum of Art proved difficult because it is not highly marketed. I found very little literature on art museum education programs for court-involved or at-risk youth in my searching for pertinent literature to support my research. The scarcity of these programs is surprising since the SDMA provides a strong example of how to offer and maintain a program to such an underserved audience. The San Diego Museum of Art's Community Partnerships with a county court school and juvenile detention facility are examples of the social responsibility the museum of the 21st must undertake. The programs correspond to Janes's (2007) description of a socially

93

responsible museum in that they not only recognize the problem of underserved audience, but also they actualize solutions to serve those audiences in ways that most benefit the groups.

Art education for court-involved youth has the ability to benefit all partners involved including the students, the court institutions, and the educating institution (in this case, that institution is the museum). The literature mentioned in Chapter II (O'Thearling & Bickley-Green, 1996; Venable, 2005; Wallace-DiGarbo & Hill, 2006) discussed the benefits of art education in general for incarcerated and at-risk youth. This literature along with the data gathered for this research provides evidence of the use of art education with court-involved youth. Art education offers the students a new language as a means of self-expression. The proper educator, curriculum, and environment could not only act as a catalyst for creativity in artwork, but it can also give court-involved youth the therapeutic outlet other activities cannot.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

My research on museum education for court-involved youth points to directions for potential future studies. In my short-term research, it was impossible ascertain longterm outcomes of the National City and Kearny Mesa sites' programs. A longitudinal research study can focus on the outcomes the program in terms of how they might have affected the students' lives. The outcomes of a longitudinal study can provide the field with a stronger definition of a successful outreach program for court-involved youth. A program can then be seen as successful according to established and enduring evidence. Since my case study did not focus on ascertaining program outcomes but on identifying the qualities and characteristics of the court-involved youth program, even short-term

research studies focused on identifying the programs' outcomes would be beneficial especially to any longitudinal studies.

Additionally, another case study could look closely at one particular student and measure his or her progress throughout the school year. Progress can be tracked in several different ways such as degree of participation, an individual student's personal reactions to art, or even tracking the relationship between art lessons and academic expectations. A study based on the progress of one individual student could also examine the effects of the art therapy qualities of the outreach program for court-involved youth.

The programs at the San Diego Museum of Art can also be compared to similar programs in other museums through a cross-case study. In a cross-case study, the researcher would be able to compare and contrast educators, goals of the programs, qualities and characteristics of each program, the curricula utilized at each museum, outcomes for students, and the commitment to social responsibility. Gathering data from more than one institution enables the investigator to define the common qualities of programs for court-involved youth. Such research would also serve as a form of triangulating and validating the characteristics a museum program for court-involved youth may have. In general, further research on the subject of outreach programs for court-involved youth can include several different approaches to gaining a more definitive understanding of what a successful program entails.

CLOSING

The intention of my research was to offer the art and museum education fields a strong example of a museum program that has explored and maintained social responsibility through community partnerships. Art educators and museum staff may use this research as a guide in fulfilling roles of as socially responsible institutions, expanding

audiences, and serving surrounding communities in ways they may not considered prior to this research. Court-involved youth are an underserved audience by the museum and often excluded by the rest of society. As socially responsible institutions, museums must see the need to expand art museum education to court-involved youth and other underserved audiences. Art museum education can serve these groups in unique and tailored ways that can better the lives of the individuals as well as society. The correct educator, curriculum, and environment are all crucial in creating similar programs so the audiences and community needs are being met. Overall, my research is an opportunity for readers to gain an understanding of the social responsibility and awareness that should be involved in today's museum education standards. Art museum education must be expanded to as many audiences as possible with the intention of serving as opposed to representing these audiences, meeting the goals of the museum, and more importantly fulfilling the needs of the community being served in order to advance society as a whole.

Appendix A: San Diego Museum of Art Letter of Consent

BALBOA PARK
THE SAN DIEGO
MUSEUM OF ART
TheSanDiegoMuseumofArt.org
P.O. BOX 122107
San Diego, CA 92112

24 May 2011

Blanton Museum of Art
The University of Texas at Austin
1 University Station Stop D1303
Austin, TX 78712

To whom it may concern,

On behalf of The San Diego Museum of Art, I grant Kristina Goldman permission to conduct
research for her Master's Thesis here at the Museum as well as at our community partnership
programs. These are community partnership programs we have created with the Kearny Mesa
Juvenile Detention Facility and the Juvenile Court Community Schools. Ms. Goldman will be
permitted to look through documentation available about the programs, observe the sites, and
finally, interview those involved in the programs.

Sincerely

Julia Marciari-Alexander, Ph.D.
Deputy Director for Curatorial Affairs and Education

Appendix B: Interview Questions

1) What are the teaching methods and philosophies you use in this program?

2) How do these techniques differ from other audiences you may teach?

3) What are the goals of the program?

4) Why do you feel that this group is defined as "underserved"?

5) Why do you think it is necessary to work with underserved audiences?

6) How can these programs be models for other museums' community partnership programs? Do you think it is necessary for all museums to have programs similar to SDMA's?

7) Do you think there are other audience that are underserved by museums?

Appendix C: Interview Dates

Lucy Eron: November 14, 2011

Ruth Broudy: November 15, 2011

Angela Gigliotti: November 16, 2011

Brian Patterson: February 9, 2012

Appendix D: Consent Form

Title: **Museum to Community: San Diego Museum of Art's Community Partnership Programs Serving Juvenile Delinquents**

Conducted By: **Kristina Goldman**
Of The University of Texas at Austin: **Department of Art/Art History**
Telephone: **(805)432-7529 Faculty Sponsor (Melinda Mayer): (512)471-5319**

You are being asked to participate in a research study. This form provides you with information about the study. The person in charge of this research will also describe this study to you and answer all of your questions. Please read the information below and ask any questions you might have before deciding whether or not to take part. Your participation is entirely voluntary. You can refuse to participate or stop participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You can stop your participation at any time and your refusal will not impact current or future relationships with UT Austin or participating sites. To do so simply tell the researcher you wish to stop participation. The researcher will provide you with a copy of this consent for your records.

The purpose of this study is to define the qualities and characteristics of the San Diego Museum of Art's community partnership programs serving juvenile offenders. This information will be analyzed to obtain what can be drawn from these programs that could be utilized by other art museums.

If you agree to be in this study, we will ask you to do the following things:
- On-site observation
- Semi-structured interview
- You will be audio recorded for accuracy
- Questions will be general questions about your involvement in the program, the goals of the program, the teaching philosophies of the program and the potential for this program to be an example for other museums.

Total estimated time to participate in study is 1-2 site visits over the course of the Fall 2011 semester as well as 1-2 semi-structured interviews during that time.

Risks of being in the study
- The risk associated with this study is no greater than everyday life.

Benefits of being in the study
- This research will bring awareness to the importance of museum outreach programs and the necessity of these programs to reach underserved audiences. It will serve as an example for other museums to create similar programs and inspire museums to take on social responsibility for their surrounding communities.

Compensation:
- **N/A**

Confidentiality and Privacy Protections:

- If you wish to remain anonymous in the data analysis please let the Principle Investigator know. If you do not want any personal information to be written in the report, your name will be changed for your confidentiality.
- The data resulting from your participation may be made available to other researchers in the future for research purposes not detailed within this consent form. In these cases, the data will contain no identifying information that could associate you with it, or with your participation in any study.

The records of this study will be stored securely and kept confidential. Authorized persons from The University of Texas at Austin, members of the Institutional Review Board, and (study sponsors, if any) have the legal right to review your research records and will protect the confidentiality of those records to the extent permitted by law. All publications will exclude any information that will make it possible to identify you as a subject. Throughout the study, the researchers will notify you of new information that may become available and that might affect your decision to remain in the study.

Contacts and Questions:

If you have any questions about the study please ask now. If you have questions later, want additional information, or wish to withdraw your participation call the researchers conducting the study. Their names, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses are at the top of this page.

If you would like to obtain information about the research study, have questions, concerns, complaints or wish to discuss problems about a research study with someone unaffiliated with the study, please contact the IRB Office at (512) 471-8871 or Jody Jensen, Ph.D., Chair, The University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at (512) 232-2685. Anonymity, if desired, will be protected to the extent possible. As an alternative method of contact, an email may be sent to orsc@uts.cc.utexas.edu or a letter sent to IRB Administrator, P.O. Box 7426, Mail Code A 3200, Austin, TX 78713.
> ***You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.***

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information and have sufficient information to make a decision about participating in this study. I consent to participate in the study.

Signature:_____ Date: _____

_____ Date: _____
Signature of Person Obtaining Consent

Signature of Investigator:_____ Date: _____

I have read the above information and I consent to audio recording of myself during the interview.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

References

American Association of Museums. (1992). *Excellence and equity: Education and the public dimension of museums*. Washington, DC: American Association of Museums.

Anderson, S., Walch, N., & Becker, K. (2003). *The power of art: The arts as an effective intervention strategy for at-risk youth*. Retrieved from California Endowment website: http://www.calendow.org/uploadedfiles/publications/by_topic/disparities/general/the%20power%20of%20art.pdf.

Art therapy: definition of the profession. (2012). Retrieved from http://www.americanarttherapyassociation.org/aata-aboutus.html.

Arts and at-risk youth program. (1998). Retrieved from http://www.ojjdp.gov/grants/grantprograms/discr13.html.

Arts programs for at-risk youth: How U.S. communities are using the arts to rescue their youth and deter crime. (2012). Retrieved from http://www.americansforthearts.org/NAPD/files/9209/Arts%20Programs%20for%20Youth%20At-Risk_Pamphlet.pdf.

Burchardt, T., Le Grand, J., & Piachaud, D. (1999). "Social exclusion in Britain 1991—1995." *Social policy & administration, 33* (3), 227-244.

Clements, P. (2004). Rehabilitative role of arts education in prison: Accommodation or enlightenment? *International Journal of Art and Design Education, 23*(2), 169-178.

Community partnerships. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.sdmart.org/education/community-partnerships.

Crooke, E. (2007). *Museums and communities: Ideas, issues and challenges*. [EBL Reader version]. Retrieved from http://www.utxa.eblib.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=332072&userid=ilLUdSerVRU%3d&tstamp=1303785349&id=557B9A07D7350B86458482ADDC5C3C985F509D1B.

Davis, P. (2007). Place exploration: Museums, identity, community. In S. Watson (Ed.) *Museums and their communities* (pp. 53-75). [EBL Reader version]. Retrieved from http://www.utxa.eblib.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=322943&userid=ilLUdSerVRU%3d&tstamp=1303785507&id=3A81750373B8A141E4BB908179976434C0029064.

Dawson, E. (2011, July/August). Whose museum? *Museum, 90*(4). Retrieved from http://www.aam-us.org/pubs/upload/bench.pdf.

Dodd, J. (2002). Whose museum is it anyway? Museum education and the community. In E. Hooper-Greenhill, (Ed.), *The education role of the museum* (pp. 131-133). New York, NY: Routledge.

Duff, P. (2008). *Case study research in applied linguistics* [EBL E-book]. Retrieved from http://www.utxa.eblib.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=311075&echo=1&userid=ilLUdSerVRU%3d&tstamp=1344919292&id=384BB48534C68B58E780C995F513D56F1F5FB785.

Edwards, Michael. (1976). Art therapy and art education: Towards a reconciliation. *Studies in Art Education*, *17*(2), 63-66.

Gerring, J. (2006). *Case study research: Principles and practices* [EBL E-book]. Retrieved from http://www.utxa.eblib.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=288451&echo=1&userid=ilLUdSerVRU%3d&tstamp=1344919408&id=41ACA84E403A0ECF352EE2DDDDDC3B53A5B4505C.

Gillham, B. (2000). *Case study research methods* [EBL E-book]. Retrieved from http://www.utxa.eblib.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=564247&echo=1&userid=ilLUdSerVRU%3d&tstamp=1344919555&id=994D14A855BD809740C29D88714A6648E4B2533D.

Hein, G. E. (1998). *Learning in the museum*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hirzy, E. (2002). Mastering civic engagement: A report from the American Association of Museums. In *Mastering civic engagement: A challenge to museums* (pp. 9-20). Washington, DC: American Association of Museums.

Hooper-Greenhill, E. (2002). Museum learners as active postmodernists: contextualizing constructivism. In E. Hooper-Greenhill, (Ed.), *The educational role of the museum* (pp. 67-72). New York, NY: Routledge.

Jackson, M. R. (2002). Coming to the center of community life. In *Mastering civic engagement: A challenge to museums* (pp. 29-37). Washington, DC: American Association of Museums.

Janes, R. R. (2007). Museums, social responsibility and the future we desire. In S. J. Knell, S. MacLeod, & S. Watson, (Eds.), *Museum revolution: How museums change and are changed* (pp. 134-146). New York, NY: Routledge.

Janes, R. R., & Conaty, G. T. (Eds.). (2005). *Looking reality in the eye: Museums and social responsibility*. Calgary, Alberta, Canada: University of Calgary Press.

Jensen, N. (2002). Children, teenagers and adults in museums: A developmental perspective. In E. Hooper-Greenhil (Ed.), *The educational role of the museum* (pp.110-117). New York, NY: Routledge.

Juvenile Court and Community Schools. (2012). Retrieved from http://www.sdcoe.net/jccs2/?loc=home.

Juvenile halls. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/probation/juvenile_halls.html.

Kadoyama, M. (2007, July). The spot where it flows: Practicing civic engagement. Retrieved from http://www.aam-us.org/pubs/webexclusive/civic.cfm.

Kertzner, D. (2002). The lens of organizational culture. In *Mastering civic engagement: A challenge to museums* (pp. 39-48). Washington, DC: American Association of Museums.

Lessane, P. W. (2003) Making a way outta no way: Lessons I've learned from our diversity project community partners. In J. A. Spitz & M. Thom (Eds.), *Urban network: Museums embracing communities* (pp. 18-21). Chicago, IL: The Field Museum.

Lowenfeld, V., & Brittain, W. L. (1970). *Creative and mental growth*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.

Merriam, S. (2001). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mission and history. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.sdmart.org/about/mission-history.

Nance, D. & Novy, F. A. (2011). The power of education in juvenile justice. In A.R. Roberts & D. W. Springer (Eds.), Juvenile Delinquency and Juvenile Justice: Policies, Programs and Intervention Strategies. Sudbury, MA: Junes and Bartlett Publishers.

Newsom, B., & Silver, A. (1978) *Art museum as educator*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Task Force of Employment and Training for Court-Involved Youth (2000). *Report of the OJJDP Task Force on Employment and Training for Court-Involved Youth*. Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/182787.pdf.

O'Thearling, S., & Bickley-Green, C. A. (1996). Art education and at-risk youth: Enabling factors of visual expression. *Visual Arts Research, 33*(43), 20-22.

Riches, C. (1994). The hidden therapy of a prison art education programme. In M. Liebmann (Ed.), *Art therapy with offenders* (pp. 77-101). Bristol, PA: Jessica Kingsley Publishers Ltd.

Sandell, R. (Ed.). (2002). *Museums, society, inequality*. New York, NY: Routledge.

School in the park: An innovative instructional program. (2009). Retrieved from http://www.schoolinthepark.org.

Simons, H. (2009). *Case study research in practice*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Spitz, J. A., & Thom, M. (2003) Introduction. In J. A. Spitz & M. Thom (Eds.). *Urban networks: Museums embracing communities* (pp. 3-7). Chicago, IL: The Field Museum.

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Tellis, W. (1997, September). The application of case study methodology. *The Qualitative Report 3*(3). Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR3-3/tellis2.html/.

Thelan, D. (2001, May/June). Learning community: Lessons in co-creating the civic museum. *Museum News, 80*(3). Retrieved from http://www.aam-us.org/pubs/mn/MN_MJ01_LearningCommunity.cfm.

Venable, B. (2005, July). At-risk and in-need: Reaching juvenile offenders through art. *Art Education, 58*(4), 48-53.

Wallace-DiGarbo, A., & Hill, D. C. (2006) Art as agency: Exploring empowerment of at-risk youth. *Art Therapy: Journal of the American Art Therapy Association, 23*(3), 119-125.

Warren, C., & Karner, T. (2010). *Discovering qualitative methods: Field research, interviews, and analysis*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.

Watson, S. (2007). Introduction to part one. In S. Watson (Ed.) *Museums and their communities* (pp. 27-31). [EBL Reader version]. Retrieved from http://www.utxa.eblib.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=322 943&userid=ilLUdSerVRU%3d&tstamp=1303785507&id=3A81750373B8A141 E4BB908179976434C0029064.

Woodside, A. (2010). *Case study research: Theory, methods, practice*. UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Yin, R. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Yin, R. (2012). *Applications of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.