

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University
Microfilms
International**

300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

8407229

Philip, Frank Stuart

**THE STATUS OF ARTS AND OTHER SPECIALIST DIRECTED PROGRAMS IN
MICHIGAN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, 1982-83**

Michigan State University

PH.D. 1983

**University
Microfilms
International** 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1983

by

Philip, Frank Stuart

All Rights Reserved

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy.
Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark ✓.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ✓
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Other _____

University
Microfilms
International

THE STATUS OF ARTS AND OTHER
SPECIALIST DIRECTED PROGRAMS IN MICHIGAN
PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, 1982-83

By
Frank Stuart Philip

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

1983

Copyright by
Frank Stuart Philip
1983

ABSTRACT

THE STATUS OF ARTS AND OTHER SPECIALIST DIRECTED PROGRAMS IN MICHIGAN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, 1982-83

By

Frank Stuart Philip

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine the present levels of specialist directed programming in Michigan Public Elementary Schools for the areas of Art, Vocal Music, Band, Orchestra, Drama, Dance, Physical Education and Guidance Counseling. The study also: measured the changes in the programming over a five year period; compared the existing levels to data from similar studies in 1974, 1977 and 1979; and gathered information on the reasons for the changes as perceived by elementary principals.

Procedures

With the sponsorship of the Michigan Alliance for Arts Education, the Michigan Department of Education and the endorsement of the Michigan Elementary and Middle Schools Principals Association, a single page (two sided), survey instrument was designed to gather the needed data.

Frank Stuart Philip

The survey was distributed to the 529 public school districts in Michigan having full K-12 programs. Of that total, 514 were mailed to specifically named and randomly selected elementary principals, and 15 were personally delivered to central administrators in the districts having 20 or more elementary buildings.

Special consideration was given to the follow-up of non-respondents to achieve the highest return rate possible. The overall return rate of the survey was 82.6% representing approximately 92.7% of the total Michigan elementary student population. During the course of the telephone follow-up procedure and the personal visits, 115 of the respondents were interviewed.

The survey generated 355 variables which were analyzed to reflect the number and nature of programs, relationships between different variables, and frequencies of response.

Findings

Specialist directed programming was found to have declined from previously reported levels in all categories examined.

The presence of existing programs was significantly related to district size for Art and Vocal Music but not for Instrumental Music, Physical Education and Guidance Counseling; though Physical Education did exhibit the same linear relationship of Art and Music showing that larger districts were more likely to have programs.

Frank Stuart Philip

When the formula state aid factor was compared to programs, significant relationships were established for Art, Vocal Music and Physical Education but not for Instrumental Music, Drama or Guidance Counseling.

Significant relationships were also found when the presence of each program was cross tabulated with the others, with the exception of Instrumental Music and Guidance Counseling.

The losses in programming were attributed to losses in funding for most districts, but the reasons for cutting these programs were also related to poor communication concerning the basic nature of the programs.

A generally pessimistic forecast for the future of these programs was made by the respondents.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study it could be concluded that advocates for the programs in question had generally been ineffective in preventing the loss of programming due to the financial plight of districts and the lack of compelling arguments to reverse the process.

It was also concluded that the incidence of programs and program patterns was sometimes a factor of reasons other than educational ones, i.e. scheduling.

Frank Stuart Philip

Recommendations

Recommendations, based on the conclusions, were made to: the Department of Education concerning the need for its leadership to address the problem; the professional organizations involved in the program areas concerning the need to broaden their responsibilities in the curriculum; the advocacy agencies to provide a clear, well articulated rationale for programs; and to teacher training institutions to enhance the preparation of classroom teachers and specialists in the arts area.

Dedicated with love
to my patient wife
Gloria and my children
Brandy and Bradley.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This task could not have been completed without the support, encouragement and guidance of my doctoral committee -- Chairperson, Dr. Peggy Riethmiller; Dr. William Mehrens; Dr. Benjamin Bohnhorst; and Dr. Charles Steele.

I am also indebted to: Dr. Paul Novak and Dr. Teresa Staten of the Department of Education whose encouragement and expertise contributed enormously to the project; Mr. Jason Flower, principal of Winans Elementary School who provided a sounding board for the study and countless forms of professional, physical and emotional support; and to my typist, Janet Greisinger who did the impossible job of decyphering my right-brained penmanship.

Special thanks is also extended to the organizations who supported and endorsed this study: the Michigan Department of Education, the Michigan Alliance for Arts Education and the Michigan Elementary and Middle Schools Principals Association.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER I: THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	5
Need for the Study	6
Definition of Terms	7
Assumptions	8
Limitations	8
Questions Answered	10
Procedures	11
Overview of the Study	12
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	14
Introduction	14
Recent Status Studies for Specialist Directed Programs	15
Status Survey Impact	18
National and State Studies on the Arts in Education and General Education	21
The Advocacy Movement	25
How the Arts are Advocated: Rhetoric About the Need for Arts Education	29
Summary	34
CHAPTER III: DESIGN OF THE STUDY	37
Introduction	37
Restatement of the Purposes of the Study	37
Population and Sample	38

Development of the Survey Instrument	40
The Survey Instrument	47
Data Collection Procedures	51
Data Processing and Treatment	52
Summary	54
CHAPTER IV: ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	56
Introduction	56
Data Collection	56
Findings	59
Summary	121
CHAPTER V: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	124
Introduction	124
Summary	125
Conclusions	126
Recommendations for the Department of Education	137
Recommendations for Arts Advocacy Groups	140
Recommendations for Professional Organizations	141
Recommendations for Teacher Training Institutions	141
Comments	142
APPENDIX A	143
APPENDIX B	148
LIST OF REFERENCES	159

LIST OF TABLES

2.1	Significant Events in the Arts in Education in Michigan: 1970-1983	20
4.1	Description of Mailed Survey Data Collection	59
4.2	Comparison of Specialist Directed Programs Present in Michigan Public Elementary Schools in 1974, 1977, 1979 and 1983	60
4.3	Art Programs	62
4.4	Vocal Music Programs	64
4.5	Band Programs	66
4.6	Orchestra Programs	68
4.7	Drama Programs	69
4.8	Dance Programs	71
4.9	Physical Education Programs	72
4.10	Guidance Counseling Programs	73
4.11	Summary of State Specialist Totals	75
4.12	Summary of Detroit and Outstate Specialist Totals by Program	76
4.13	Cross Tabulation of the Presence of Programs by District Size	78
	Explanation of 2 x 2 Cross Tabulation Tables	80
4.14	Summary of Significance for District Size and Program .	81
	Cross Tabulations: State Aid By Presence of Program .	83-89
4.15	Art	83
4.16	Vocal Music	84
4.17	Instrumental Music	86
4.18	Drama	87
4.19	Physical Education	88
4.20	Guidance Counseling	89

4.21	Summary of Significance for Cross Tabulation of State Formula Aid and the Presence of Programs	90
4.22	Comparison of District Enrollment Size and Formula Aid Status	91
	Cross Tabulations by Program According to District Count	93-104
4.23	Art by Vocal Music	93
4.24	Art by Instrumental Music	94
4.25	Art by Physical Education	95
4.26	Art by Guidance Counseling	96
4.27	Vocal Music by Instrumental Music	98
4.28	Vocal Music by Physical Education	99
4.29	Vocal Music by Guidance Counseling	100
4.30	Instrumental Music by Physical Education	101
4.31	Instrumental Music by Guidance Counseling	102
4.32	Physical Education by Guidance Counseling	104
4.33	Summary of Significance for Cross Tabulations of Program Offerings	105
4.34	Frequencies of Responses for Question 1 in Section VIII	107
4.35	Frequencies of Responses for Question 2 in Section VIII	110
4.36	Frequencies of Responses for Question 3 in Section VIII	112
4.37	Frequencies of Responses for Question 4 in Section VIII	115
4.38	Frequencies of Responses for Question 5 in Section VIII	117
4.39	Frequencies of Responses for Question 6 in Section VIII	119
5.1	Districts Reporting Programs and Changes Over Last 5 Years	127
5.2	Incidence of Common Programs in Districts	133

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Specialist directed programs in Michigan's public elementary schools appear to have suffered a significant decline over the past ten years due to declining enrollments, the national and state economic crisis and the resultant reordering of educational priorities at the local level.

While the principal reasons for these reductions seem to be economic in nature, other factors are also involved.

No one can deny the impact that the recent recession has made upon the economy of the state. High unemployment has resulted in a decline of dollars coming in to the state treasury while the amount spent in social programs to address the problem has soared. This phenomenon has effectively reduced the amount of dollars available to support education.

In an effort to balance the budget, executive orders rescinding allocations to education have totaled 750 million dollars over the last year and a half. While some of the rescissions were restored and the recent 38% state income tax increase has alleviated some of the pressure, the net effect has been a loss in formula and categorical aid to local districts. Of the 574 school districts in the state which operate schools, 375 are eligible for and receive formula state aid. (529 districts operate K-12 programs). (Michigan Department of Education, 1983) (Manwaring & Fiery, 1983).

The recession and high inflation rate has also produced a reluctance on the part of voters to support local school operating millages or increases to cover the mounting costs of education. When coupled with the declining birth rate, subsequent drop in enrollment and diminishing percentage of voters with children in the public schools (28% according to the 1982 National Gallup Poll on Education)(Gallup, 1982), most local school districts have found it increasingly difficult to provide the range of programs they once had.

Because about 85% to 95% of a district's operating budget goes to pay salaries for school employees, the decrease in dollars has translated directly to a decrease in school personnel. When the number of teacher personnel needs to be reduced, the teachers who do not have a load bearing responsibility (that is, the teachers without a specific grade level class assigned to them as a classroom teacher would) usually are the first to go. At the elementary level, this translates directly as a reduction in the number of specialists in areas such as Art, Music, Physical Education, Library Services and Guidance Counseling.

But underlying the economically based decision to cut specialists, is the issue of educational priorities. The so-called "back to basics" movement of the past decade has raised the question of what is basic to education.

One basic priority of any district in times of diminishing economic resources would seem to be the provision of an educational

program that would meet the basic needs of its students and the community at large. While few would debate the need for a basic education, hardly anyone can agree on just what constitutes a basic program or what the priorities should be within that program.

Unfortunately, most specialist directed programs have not enjoyed the label of "basic" in the mind's of the public. More often than not, they are regarded as frills or extras that are nice to have when budgets are fat, but expendable in lean times.

There are probably many reasons for this attitude which could be traced back to origins woven deeply into the fabric of our culture.

The arts have always been considered a periphery activity in our society, not terribly concerned with the exploration and conquering of a continent or the building of a nation. In Puritan times, they were almost taboo, with the exception of those forms which were used to glorify God. It was considered heretical to use them to celebrate human creativity. In the industrial age and on through our technological age, the arts were accepted by the public as little more than the superficial decoration or adornment of the basic American reason for living: hard work and the pursuit of success. True artists, by their very individualistic nature, were foreign to the American ideal of consistency and the arts were considered an elitist pursuit which was cultivated by the artists and patrons alike. (AEA Panel, 1977).

While Physical Education has enjoyed certain preeminence in our educational system because of its relationship to the American

preoccupation with sports and the development of athletic heroes, a significant portion of the real meaning of the concept has not been fully understood by the public. Sports and recreation are definite parts of any Physical Education program but the ideals of physical development, health education and the qualitative aspects of movement are usually not recognized by the average person or at best receive only cursory attention.

Guidance Counseling at the elementary level is a comparative newcomer to the curriculum. Created to address the growing needs of children to adjust to increasingly complex social changes in their lives, counseling at the elementary grades has yet to break through the barriers of a society that has never readily accepted the notion that professionals should be allowed to meddle in affairs that have long been regarded as the domain of the family, the home, or the church.

Other factors have also detracted from a complete understanding of the role of these specialist programs by the public.

Parents and non-parent voters probably base much of their judgement about present day educational programs on the experiences they had as a student. If the programs they had access to were meaningful to them, they would have a tendency to believe that the programs of a similar nature offered today would have similar meaning for the students of today. If the programs were not available or had a negative impact on them as individuals, their acceptance of or tolerance for the existing programs would be diminished accordingly.

Thus, the seeds sown by both good and bad teaching may be reaped a hundredfold in later years.

Unless the specialist programs of today can articulate a clear rationale for their existence and communicate it effectively to the general public, they will be doomed to remain at the bottom of most districts' priority lists. If the only reason for their inclusion in the elementary curriculum is to provide a contractual break time for the classroom teacher, education may be forfeiting a chance to make the facts and figures of the classroom a meaningful experience for teachers and students alike.

Purpose of the Study

This study attempts to measure the level of specialist directed programming in Michigan's Public Elementary Schools in the following areas:

1. Visual Art
2. Vocal (General) Music
3. Instrumental Music (Band and Orchestra)
4. Drama
5. Dance
6. Physical Education
7. Guidance Counseling

The study will survey all 529 K-12 districts in Michigan to locate specifically where existing programs are. The number of programs identified will be compared to previously collected data from studies done in Michigan in 1974, 1977, and 1979. Questions about the growth, decline, and elimination of programs over the last five years will be asked and perceptions about why changes have occurred will be solicited.

From focused interviews of selected respondents, priority systems will be identified and the rationale for decisions about change will be examined.

Chapter II of the study will contain a review of two surveys of arts programming done in Michigan in 1974 and 1979 by the Joint Legislative Committee on the Arts, chaired by Senator Jack Faxon and one survey of specialist programs completed in 1977 by Donald Kenney. It will also review the role of the arts in the curriculum in current literature and the advocacy efforts for the Arts in Education presently being conducted in the state and nation.

Chapter V contains recommendations for a basic course of action to make the Arts specifically and specialist directed programs in general, a higher priority for education with an emphasis on the elementary curriculum.

Need for the Study

The Michigan Department of Education does not gather data on the number of specialist directed programs in Michigan Schools. While the professional organizations of the Art, Music and Guidance Counselors educators can indicate that a loss of positions is taking place in their field, they cannot with any degree of certainty, say what the exact dimensions of that loss are. Without a survey of this nature, it is impossible to know.

Many educators feel that the programs being surveyed in this study are of great importance in providing a complete education for elementary students. The need for definitive data as a base for decisions about these programs is obvious. Interest in the findings has been voiced by virtually all of the professional organizations involved as well as the Michigan Department of Education and advocacy groups from local state and national levels.

Definition of Terms

This study will employ the following definitions for the following terms:

Specialist Directed Programs: those programs in the elementary curriculum which are conducted or taught by a specialist with certification in a particular field. For the purposes of this study, the fields include: Visual Art, Vocal (General) Music, Band, Orchestra, Drama, Dance, Physical Education and Guidance Counseling.

Arts: including the areas of Visual Art Music (General and Instrumental) Drama and Dance.

Elementary: the basic term applied to school configurations which include grades K-5 or K-6. Most districts use a K-6 configuration for elementary, but many (including Detroit) have a K-5 grouping. The total elementary enrollment for the state of Michigan used in this study is based on the fourth Friday count from the 1982-83 school year and is the average between the total K-5 enrollment (694,005) and the total K-6 enrollment (825,496). The average is 759,750.

Formal Elementary (Art, Music, etc.) Program: a program having a specific time and curriculum which is directed by a specialist in the given area.

Formula State Aid: non-categorical financial aid to districts from the state based on a formula which includes the per pupil expenditure of a district, the state equalized property value of the district and the voted millage. Districts which are "out of formula" receive no financial aid from the state beyond the categorical funding for transportation, etc.

Advocacy: the act of supporting a concept or program through specific measures to assure a beneficial outcome for it.
The process of defending or maintaining a cause.

Assumptions

As with any study based on a voluntary survey, one of the first assumptions is that the survey was clear in its intentions and understood by the respondents.

The second assumption is that the respondents provided the time and care to make the data as accurate as possible thereby assuring a true picture of what the status of these programs really is.

A third assumption is that the field of respondents - elementary principals - have the data close at hand or have quick and easy access to it.

The fourth assumption that affects the outcome of the survey is that the data keying of the information was accurate and the resultant findings truly reflect the actual responses on the returned surveys.

This study also assumes that the perceptions of the respondents in the final section of the survey are accurate with respect to the reasons for changes in programming and that they are reliable observers and participants of that process.

Limitations

This study only will deal with specialist directed programs at the elementary level in 529 Michigan public school districts that have Kindergarten through 12th grade programs.

The study is entirely dependent on a high return rate of surveys to develop a picture of what the status of these programs is at the elementary level on a state wide basis. The survey is voluntary on the part of the respondents and relies on some of their opinions and perceptions. Only high return rates and some consistency in the responses can begin to provide the necessary confidence in the findings.

The survey will describe only the quantitative status of the specialist directed programs. It will indicate the number of programs, the number of specialists assigned to them and the nature of the programs in terms of the time devoted to them. It will not measure either the quality of the programs or their effectiveness. It will not gauge the amount of integration between the programs and the general curriculum or the acceptance of the programs by the staff, administration or community.

The focus on specialist-directed programs in these areas does not deny the fact that many schools have programs which are directed and delivered by the classroom teacher, by specialists in other areas or parent volunteers. Some examples of this are the dance and creative movement curricula found in many Physical Education programs and "Picture Lady" presentations being conducted by parent volunteers. This study will not deal with this type of program beyond their mention in the "Comments from the Survey" section.

While additional comparisons such as the existence of programs and the district's socio-economic status could be derived from this study and data currently available from the Department of Education, they will not be attempted in this work.

Questions Answered

Responses to the survey will provide data for the following questions:

1. How many specialist programs exist in Michigan's public elementary schools in the areas in question?
2. How many specialists are employed to conduct these programs?
3. What is the ratio of specialists to students for each area?
4. What is the nature of each program in terms of its time allotment in the curriculum?
5. What changes have taken place in these programs over the last five years?
6. Why have these changes occurred?
7. What would it take to have these programs included or maintained as a regular part of the elementary curriculum?
8. Based on the present funding structure for public education, what are the chances of supporting these programs in the future?

The focused interviews of district personnel will provide data for the following questions:

1. What are the priority systems operating in local districts with respect to decisions about specialist-directed programs?
2. How are these programs seen by the teachers' administrators and general public in the community?

The review of the literature will address the following questions:

1. What surveys of specialist programs have been conducted in Michigan over the last ten years?
2. How were the surveys used to effect change?
3. What do recent national and state surveys and studies of education in general tell us about the Arts in Education?
4. What is the nature and scope of advocacy movements for the Arts in Education at the local, state and national levels?
5. How are the Arts advocated as basic to the curriculum?

Procedures

This study is based on a survey that was developed by this researcher based on former surveys and expressed needs. It was co-sponsored by the Michigan Department of Education, the Michigan Alliance for Arts Education and endorsed by the Michigan Elementary and Middle Schools Principal's Association. One elementary principal in each of Michigan's 529 K-12 school districts was chosen at random to receive the survey with the exception of the fifteen largest districts (see chapter III).

The surveys were sent to the respondents and returned to the researcher via mail. Two follow-up procedures were utilized to enhance the return rate: phone calls were made to the first one hundred non-responding districts ranked according to enrollment, and a letter was sent to the second one hundred non-respondents.

The returned surveys were visually checked for completeness and clarity, hand edited, and data-keyed into the Department of Education's computers.

The researcher worked closely with staff from the Department's Evaluation and Technical Assistance Unit and the Fine Arts Specialist office.

Overview of the Study

The major thrust of this study is to ascertain the number of specialist-directed programs in Michigan's Public Elementary Schools and the nature of those programs in terms of staffing and time devoted to them. The survey designed to accomplish this task would also measure any changes that have taken place over the last five years and indicate some of the reasons for those changes.

437 districts returned completed survey forms from a field of 529. This represents a return rate of 82.6%. The total of elementary students accounted for in the survey was 704,312 or 92.7% of the average total K-5 and K-6 enrollment for the state.

As part of the follow-up process for non-respondents and in an effort to engage the larger districts, 115 individuals from a like amount of districts were interviewed in person or by phone. The interviews resulted in a better in-depth view of the present situation with regards to the priority systems used to make decisions about changes in programming in those districts. The results of those interviews will be found in Chapter IV of the study.

The review of the literature in Chapter II focuses on three issues. The examination of similar studies conducted in Michigan over the past ten years, the role of arts in the elementary curriculum, and the role that advocacy plays in heightening the public's awareness about the Arts in Education.

Chapter III contains the methodology used to construct and conduct the survey and the procedures for collecting the data for analysis.

The data are analyzed in Chapter IV and presented in the appropriate tables, charts and descriptions necessary to clearly illustrate the findings of the study.

Chapter V contains a summary of the findings and presents the researcher's conclusions and recommendations based on those findings.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter contains a review of the literature for the following topics:

1. The history of the status of specialist directed programs in Michigan's public elementary schools over the last 10 years as evidenced by surveys taken during this period.
2. The changes brought about because of the surveys.
3. The status of the arts in education and other specialist directed programs as evidenced by recent state and national studies of education in general.
4. The nature and scope of advocacy movements for the Arts in Education at the state and national level.
5. The arguments for including the arts as a basic component of public education.

While the focus of this research is on the existing status of specialist directed programs in elementary schools, it is also concerned with the question of how and why programming has apparently declined in these areas. In this sense the study of how programs are advocated and who conducts the advocacy becomes a basic issue. Unfortunately, while much of the research and many of the articles and monographs written on the subject of these programs in the schools are advocative in nature, few are produced with this objective clearly stated. Searches of databases such as E.R.I.C., E.C.E.R. the Magazine Index or the Comprehensive Dissertation Index produced very little in the way of information or research on the subject.

The need to address advocacy as a specific issue for these programs appears to be a fairly recent phenomenon brought on by the changes in the social and economic climate for education.

Recent Status Studies for Specialist Directed Programs

In the past ten years, three major surveys of specialist directed programming have been conducted in Michigan's public elementary schools. Two surveys, one in January of 1974 and one in 1979, were produced for the Joint Legislative Committee on the Arts chaired by State Senator Jack Faxon. The third survey was done by Donald D. Kenney in May of 1977. (Faxon et al., 1974, 1979; Kenney, 1977).

Faxon's 1974 survey collected data from all levels of public school (grades 1-12) and was the most comprehensive of the three. The survey was a part of a larger effort to assess the status of the Arts in Michigan in the areas of: Community Arts Organizations, Public Radio and Television, the Michigan Council for the Arts, Public Schools and Colleges and Universities.

Two forms of the survey instrument were used; one for grades 1 through 9, and one for grades 7 through 12. The overlap was necessary to account for the different grade structures at the building level in the various districts. Though the same questionnaire was used for the intermediate and elementary levels, the analysis of the data was considered separately. Because this present study

is only concerned with the elementary data, the description of Faxon's surveys will be limited to those findings.

The elementary sample for the 1974 survey amounted to approximately 20% of the total of Michigan elementary schools or 469. The sample included a proportional allocation according to three criteria: district size, grade classification and geographic location. The district size was broken down according to three classifications: small--under 3000 students (N = 165), medium--3000 to 9,999 students (N = 165), and large--10,000 students and above (N = 139). Of the 469 schools sent surveys, 310 or 66% returned the completed questionnaire.

In 1974, Faxon found that 61% of the schools responding had Art programs with a specialist, 75% had General Music programs, 90% had Instrumental Music Programs, none had Drama, and only 3% reported Dance programs.

In May of 1977, Donald D. Kenney, then the Superintendent of Ovid-Elsie Schools, approached the Michigan Association of Elementary School Principals (later to become the Michigan Elementary and Middle Schools Principals Association) about doing a study of "Special Services in Michigan Elementary Schools". With the cooperation of MAESP, Kenney surveyed one elementary school principal in each of the (then) 534 districts in Michigan. His decision was based on the knowledge that the principals' organization has had a history of a high return rate for surveys sent to its membership.

Of the 534 surveys sent out, 421 or 78.8% were returned. Kenney found that the percentage of schools reporting Art programs had declined to 53.2%, Vocal Music was reported in 83% of the districts, Instrumental Music was found in 74.5%, Physical Education in 81.2%, and Guidance Counseling was included by 19% of the districts responding. (Kenney, 1977).

Also in 1977, the Wisconsin School Music Association conducted a survey based on an opinionaire which was likewise sent to elementary principals in that state to gauge the status of elementary Music programs. The total response rate for the Wisconsin study was 76%, lending additional support for using the elementary principal as a reliable population for the return of surveys (Borowicz, 1977).

The Joint Legislative Committee on the Arts conducted a second survey of Arts programs in Michigan schools in 1979 with the cooperation of the Michigan Department of Education.

Again the sample was based on enrollment size and consisted of 169 districts broken down into three categories. Districts with enrollments of 3,999 or less ($N = 92$) were included in the "small" classification and comprised half of the districts in Michigan. Ones with student enrollments from 4000 to 11,999 were considered in the "medium" category ($N = 59$), and districts with enrollments of 12,000 or more were put in the "large" category ($N = 18$). The latter category was found to serve 80% of the total students in Michigan.

The 1979 study, like the earlier one, surveyed all levels and was broken down to reflect the data from two classifications: elementary and secondary.

The findings for the elementary level indicated that 57% of the schools in the "small category, 68.3% of the school labeled "medium", and 61% of the "large" districts reported having Art programs. Music programs were found in 84% of the small districts, 95% of the "medium" ones, and 83.5% of the large school districts. When the data are examined in terms of programs which are directed by specialists, the percentages are 57% for Art, 87.5% for Music, 2% for Drama and 13% for Dance with the size classifications aggregated. (Faxon, et al., 1979).

The relatively small sample size (when compared to the other studies) and the researchers inability to find information on this study beyond the brief report supplied by the Department of Education, provoke some questions about the accuracy of these data and the methods used to collect it. They are reported here as the only data available for the study.

Status Survey Impact

Only one of the three surveys completed in Michigan had a measurable impact on the course of specialist directed programs.

Faxon's 1974 survey and accompanying comprehensive status report on the condition of the Arts across the broad spectrum of involvement in the state, was the impetus for many changes. The

hiring of an Arts specialist for Art and Music by the Department of Education two years prior to the survey report, and the report itself, set the stage for increased activity based on the information supplied in the study.

Table 2.1 is a time-line of significant events in the Arts in Education that have transpired since 1970. (Ad-Hoc Advisory Committee on the Arts, 1975; MDE, 1980; MAAE, 1983).

The 1974 study generated the formation of the Ad-Hoc Advisory Committee on the Arts in Education. Composed of representatives of the state's major education and fine arts education associations, the committee met with Mr. Gene Wenner of the John D. Rockefeller III Fund to produce the "Plan of Action for the Arts in Michigan Education". This plan proposed the state-wide conference on the Role of the Arts in Michigan Education in April of 1975, the drafting of legislation by Faxon's Committee which was eventually vetoed by the Governor, and the commitment of Dr. John Porter, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and others to make the Arts in Education a more viable part of schooling in Michigan (Ad-Hoc Committee on the Arts in Education, 1975).

Spinoffs from this activity were: seminars in comprehensive arts planning supported by U.S.D.E. grants in 1977, 1978 and 1979; the development and implementation of the Institute for Comprehensive Arts Planning held in 1980, 1981 and 1982; and the growth of the Michigan Alliance for Arts Education.

Table 2.1
Significant Events in the Arts in Education in Michigan
1970-1983

1970	- Arts included in Goal Five in "Common Goals of Michigan Education".
1972	- Michigan Department of Education hires first full-time staff member for curriculum development in Art and Music.
1973	- Formation of the Joint Legislative Committee on the Arts. - "Status of the Arts in Michigan" study begun.
1974	- Report on "The Status of the Arts" published. \$25,000 for a state wide conference for the Arts in Education appropriated by Legislature. - Ad-Hoc Advisory Committee on the Arts formed - Plan of Action for the Arts in Michigan Education completed.
1975	- Michigan Alliance for Arts Education is organized. - Conference on the role of Arts in Michigan Education presented at Michigan State University. - Bill to support a new Fine Arts Unit at M.D.E. is passed by Legislature and vetoed by the Governor. - State Superintendent pledges to elevate the priority of the Arts in Michigan Education. - 5 recommendations submitted to the State Board of Education for: formulation of an advisory council on the arts in education for the board, inclusion of the arts in state wide assessment programs, consultation with Mr. Gene Wenner of the J.D.R. 3rd Fund, establishment of a task force to assist Mr. Wenner, and recommendations of support for a similar Legislative Bill to establish a Fine Arts Unit.
1976	- The Legislature established the Arts in Education Advisory Council which acts as an advocate of and sounding board for Department of Education and State Board of Education policies on the arts. - The Michigan Council for the Arts established an Arts in Education grant category and an Education Panel to review school proposals and policies affecting the Council and schools.
1977	- Two E.S.E.A. Title IVc projects in elementary integrated arts programs funded in Michigan - Kenney study 1977 - The Department of Education organizes Task Force on the arts in education.
1978	- Art included as a pilot test in Michigan Education Assessment Program. - Compensatory Education developed a publication describing the role of the arts in aiding students to gain basic skills in reading and math, and workshops to introduce the idea to Title I and Article 3 directors.
1979	- Very Special Arts Festivals started in Michigan. - The State Board of Education passed a statement in support of comprehensive arts planning in all educational institutions in Michigan. - Three additional ESEA Title IVc arts programs are funded bringing the total to five. - Faxon study, 1979.
1980	- Joint planning of the Michigan Alliance for Arts Education, representing all the arts education associations in the state, and the Michigan Association of Community Arts Agencies, representing community arts councils, established the first Institute for Comprehensive Arts Planning, in cooperation with the Michigan Department of Education, the Michigan Council for the Arts, and a coalition of institutions of higher education centered at Eastern Michigan University. - V.S.A.F held across state.
1981	- 2nd Institute for Comprehensive Arts Planning. - V.S.A.F. held across state.
1982	- 3rd and final Institute for Comprehensive Arts Planning held at Eastern Michigan University. - Center for Comprehensive Arts Planning established at E.M.U. - V.S.A.F. held - Master Planning Retreat for Michigan Alliance for Arts Education. - M.D.E. Arts Specialist position vacated.
1983	- ICAP Regional Network established - M.D.E. Arts Specialist position filled - Advocacy Directory published by ICAP and MAAE - 20 sites hold V.S.A.F.

While the survey of Kenney (1977) and the 1979 survey of the Joint Legislative Committee added information to this process, they did not produce the groundswell of activity that was initiated by the 1974 study and the addition of a Fine Arts Specialist at the state level.

National and State Studies on the
Arts in Education and General Education

In 1976 at a conference in Aspen, Colorado, Elliot Eisner called for "a bi-annual national survey of the arts in American schools that would provide the field with dependable status data on the educational health of the arts". His status survey would include: "statistical descriptions of important dimensions of the field such as, but not limited to, the number of arts teachers working full time in their fields in elementary and secondary schools and the trends over time regarding their employment" (Eisner, 1976).

Eisner's call, for the most part, has gone unheeded and unanswered. The national status of arts education is a patchwork of sketchy or missing pieces from both the state perspective as well as from specific areas of Arts education.

Generally, more studies of the status of elementary Music Education are to be found in the literature than studies on the other specialist areas such as Art, Physical Education, Dance or Drama. This review of the literature will concern itself with only those studies which examine two or more of the areas in the present research.

In 1963, the National Education Association conducted a national survey of programs in Art and Music in the schools. (NEA, 1963) The elementary findings showed that 97% of the schools provided time for formal or informal instruction in Music, while 94% provided time for Art. When specialist directed programs were considered, it was found that approximately 55 to 60% of the schools employed specialists in Music and 30% had Art teachers. The study also showed that larger schools were more likely to employ specialists than the smaller ones.

In another study completed that year on 1,489 elementary schools, Bozarth (1962) found that 40% of the schools had no specialists in any area, but of those 60% remaining, 57% had Music teachers, 28% had Physical Education specialists, and only 15% employed Art specialists. Bozarth did not find significant differences in the size of the school when compared to the presence of specialists.

Nine years later, the National Education Association again collected data regarding special subject teachers at the elementary level. (NEA 1972). The 1972 study indicated that 84% of the schools now had music specialists, 55% of them employed Art specialists and 74% had a regular specialist in Physical Education. Again the size of the school was a factor with the larger schools reporting higher percentages than the smaller schools in this study.

In 1978, the Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Individualized Schooling undertook a study of the role of specialist teachers in Art, Music and Physical Education at 200 schools from 15 states identified as having Individually Guided Education (I.G.E.). The findings of this survey indicated that 80% of the schools had Music specialists solely responsible for the instruction in Music, 72% had Physical Education specialists and 54% had specialists in Art. (Petzold, 1978)

The Wisconsin study also found that:

"There was little evidence to indicate that specialists and classroom teachers were working cooperatively to plan and implement special area instructional programs. Few classroom teachers were present during the classes taught by specialists, planning sessions between these two groups occur only once a semester, and the majority of the classroom teachers indicated that specialists did not encourage them to be present during the special classes or to teach in the special area. Further, many specialists did not believe that classroom teachers were sufficiently competent to continue a sequence of instruction that had been initiated by the specialist, and recommended substantial inservice work."

This information, which is corroborated by evidence from the interviews of respondents in this survey, is the basis for the speculation that specialist programs: (1) Do not communicate well with other areas in the curriculum and therefore, classroom teachers and administrators are not aware or knowledgeable about the goals and objectives of the programs, and (2) In spite of all of the important educational reasons for these programs, one of the prime reasons for their inclusion in the elementary curriculum is their ability to provide break-time for the classroom teacher.

The elitist attitudes of the specialists and the lack of understanding on the part of the rest of the school may have combined to make the specialist program an easy target during times of economic crisis.

In a study based on data from school law publications from all fifty states, Ogletree (1979) examined the types of curricula legislated by the states. While the study did not differentiate between elementary and secondary programs, it did provide a perspective on how our educational systems mandate certain areas and neglect others.

The study showed that while 66% of the states had some legislative requirement for Physical Education, less than 6% mandated any fine or practical Arts programs.

Studies have also been undertaken to find out what students know about the Arts.

The National Assessment of Educational Progress has recently released two reports on studies done in the 70's. Entitled "Art and Young Americans 1974-79" and "Music 1971-79" (NAEP, 1981). Studies in Art were conducted during the 1974-75 school year using a sample drawn from 32,000 students aged 9, 13 and 17 and again in 1978-79 using the same format. The studies in Music were done in 1971-72 and 1978-79 on a like amount of students.

The survey's findings were mixed concerning the different levels of knowledge, understanding and appreciation evidenced over

the years studied, but indicated a general trend downward in most categories for both Art and Music.

A recent public opinion survey for the Michigan Board of Education shed some light on what Michigan Citizens think about the appropriateness of today's school curriculum (Hubbell, Kazen, 1983). When asked to suggest ways to change the present curriculum, 31.9% indicated a need to stress the basics more, 3.1% suggested "more of the arts".

Respondents were also asked in an "open", free response fashion to state their priorities of the skills needed to "meet the needs of living in today's world". Basic skills again topped the list. The Arts were not mentioned in the findings.

As John Morris of the Michigan Association of School Boards stated in a recent article about this study:

"The public, generally, has some definite ideas about how and what schools should be. Sometimes, without an information base from which to think otherwise, people resist change. If there are compelling reasons for change--and these reports stress that there are--then an enormous communications task is before us. We have found again and again that without public understanding, the support base for change is not there." (Morris, 1983)

The Advocacy Movement

Many people who are interested in supporting specialist programs in the Arts are deeply concerned about the way the Arts are understood by the public. Changes in the status and priority of these programs cannot, and will not come without the "enormous communications task" mentioned by Morris. Where once specialists could be fairly

complacent and secure in their roles, they must now be effective advocates for their programs. This phenomenon has given rise to a growing advocacy movement for the Arts in education.

For the most part, the leadership for this movement has not come from the professional organizations in the fields of Arts education.

At the national level, two groups have shared the leadership role; the Arts, Education and the Americans, an outgrowth of the National Panel on the Arts Education and Americans, authors of the publication Coming To Our Senses (AEA, 1977) and supported by the John D. Rockefeller 3rd Fund; and the National Alliance for Arts Education, located at the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington and funded by the U.S. Department of Education.

The Arts, Education and Americans group traces its beginnings back to 1968; "a watershed year" for the Arts in education according to Hoffa (1976). Kathryn Bloom, who was the head of the Arts and Humanities Program of the U.S. Office of Education, resigned that post to become the director of the J.D.R. 3rd Fund's Arts in General Education Program. Bloom built the program and steered it in the direction of advocacy for the Arts in education. The culmination of that phase was the highly controversial but comprehensive report Coming To Our Senses which underscored "the significance of the Arts for American Education". Produced by a panel of eminent artists, educators and other well known leaders chaired by David Rockefeller, Jr.,

the report outlined the strengths and weaknesses of the Arts in the American Educational system and made recommendations for improving it.

The present day organization took its name from the panel. Still chaired by David Rockefeller, Jr., the group has been active in researching exemplary Arts in education programs and has published a series of 10 monographs on advocacy techniques as well as a slide-tape presentation and audio public service announcements.

A recent development has been the group's affiliation with the Kennedy Center. On April 1, 1983, the AEA's National Information Center was moved to Washington and housed in the Kennedy Center's Education Office. (AEA, 1983).

The other major leader in the field of Arts Education Advocacy is also located in the Kennedy Center. Established with the support of the U.S. Department of Education, the Alliance for Arts Education was formed in 1973 as the center of a network of AAE Committees from all 50 states. As a program of the education office of Kennedy Center, the Alliance has fostered many projects such as the National Committee, Arts for the Handicapped and Programs for Children and Youth (AAE, 1982).

The Michigan Alliance for Arts Education, is part of the national network. The MAAE has provided leadership in our state in advocating the Arts through the sponsorship of two significant projects.

The Institute for Comprehensive Arts Planning was a three year project, funded in part by the C.S. Mott Foundation and the

Michigan Council for the Arts. Sponsored by the MAAE, the Michigan Department of Education and the Michigan Association of Community Arts Agencies and located at Eastern Michigan University, ICAP has been successful in training 56 school/community teams to plan for better comprehensive Arts programs in their areas. A regional network of these teams has been established and a center for information has been created at E.M.U. (MAAE, 1983).

The Very Special Arts Festivals in Michigan have served as an Arts experience for handicapped students in our state for the last 5 years. Twenty sites, usually found at the intermediate district level, were coordinated by the MAAE and the Department of Education in 1983.

Though the A.A.E. and the A.E.A. have provided the leadership for advocacy of all the Arts, Professional organizations and others have also made a contribution.

In 1978, the Alliance coordinated meetings of national level professional organizations for elementary and secondary principals (NAESP and NASSP), school administrators (AASA), school boards (NSBA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) with representation at each meeting from the Art educators (NAEA), the music educators (MENC), and Theatre and Dance educators (ATA and NDA). The challenge presented in each of the meetings was to determine how best to create effective advocates for arts education. The outcome of the meetings was a report with recommendations on how this could be best accomplished (AAE, 1978).

Most of the professional Arts in education organizations produce advocacy materials for the use of their members, but very little has been evidenced in the way of concerned efforts for national advocacy programs.

One exception has been the National Art Education Association which has promoted and used the theme of "Art in the Mainstream" during the last two years, selling the idea of experiences in Art as a form of work, a language system and way of sharpening our ability to form value systems (Feldman, 1982). But the gulf between the rhetoric and action based plans is wide and traversed by few.

Some states have published exemplary booklets on how to advocate the Arts. New Jersey, through their Education Improvement Center in Princeton, provides the field with Speaking Up About the Arts and Support for School Arts Programs (Sterling/Bolin 1981, 82). These "how to do it" books suggest: "What to say about arts education in your community . . . and how to say it effectively". The answers to these questions provide the meat of most advocacy menus.

How the Arts Are Advocated: Rhetoric About the Need for Arts in Education

The basic assumption behind all Arts advocacy is that the Arts provide something that other forms of knowledge and experience cannot offer. This assumption also includes the notion that the Arts are fundamental to the growth and development of any complete human being and should be basic experiences in public education. These

assumptions are manifested in various forms in the literature. The following represents a small sampling of this field of information.

With the exception of a handful of religious fundamentalists who object to "humanism" of any kind, few people are really against the Arts in education or anywhere else. The problem lies in the degree of support and the priority of the Arts when compared to other experiences.

The report of the National Commission of Excellence in Education A Nation at Risk: the Imperative for Educational Reform, is a good example of this positive, yet low priority, attitude. (NCEE, 1983). The 65 page report paints a somber toned picture of the state of education and presents recommendations for addressing the problems. Though the report recommends: "subjects that advance student's personal, educational and occupational goals such as the fine and performing arts and vocational education", they see them as a "complement (to) the New Basics". At the elementary level they recommend "providing a sound base" for further study at the secondary level" couched in language that indicates a predisposition to achievement rather than experience as proposed by Dewey. (Dewey, 1934, 1938).

The College Board's report on Academic Preparation for College offers a bit more forceful suggestion saying: "College entrants will also profit from . . . intensive preparation in at least one of the four areas of the arts: visual arts, theater, music and dance",

but do not list them by name in the "Basic Academic Competencies" (College Board, 1983).

In a survey at the 1977 National School Board's Association, respondents were asked which subjects they regard as basic for every child. Only 24% of the school board members polled included Art as a basic. 38% of the superintendents indicated Art on their list. (NSBA, 1978)

An important point to again underscore at this time is that no real debate is taking place about whether or not the arts are a basic part of education. The literature demonstrates a uniform tendency to be positive about the subject, but varies in degrees from positions which indicate neglect to the most evangelical.

For the purposes of this study it would be unproductive and perhaps impossible to list all of the reasons why individuals think the Arts should be a basic in education. That task would seem to be an appropriate study for the future. However, it would seem important to note some of the primary positions taken in the field by some of the better known scholars.

John Goodlad proposes a three pronged argument for the support of comprehensive programs in Arts education:

"First, the Arts are recognized and established in the existing socio-political goals of education and schooling in the United States. Second, we have sufficient insight into human beings to know that the Arts have a central, not a peripheral role to play in their full development. Third, the Arts as a domain of human experience and activity have so much to offer that their neglect in general education is a form of societal and individual deprivation." (Goodlad, 1980)

Goodlad punctuates that statement with a simple: "The Arts are not an educational option; they are a basic". (Goodlad, 1980)

Stanley Madeja, talking about why we have Arts education, says:

"The goal in Arts education is to provide instruction that allows students to become discriminating about and sensitive to the visual, aural, and kinetic data gathered or received from the Arts object/event/environment and to encourage to analyse this data using aesthetic criteria." (Madeja, 1978)

In stating the position of the Council for Basic Education, Clifton Fadiman explained that basic education:

"concerns itself with those matters which, once learned, enable the student to learn all other matters." (Fadiman, 1959)

Yet another member of the same organization puts the Arts in that category:

"The Council for Basic Education believes that the Arts, properly defined and well taught, have generative powers, and that the arts should be included among the basic subjects all students take in school". (Down, 1979)

Martin Engel indicates some of those "generative powers" in developing four points about language and meaning:

1. "We have many languages, and most of them (such as drawing and body language) are not verbal.
2. We language what we think and know; that is, our cognitive functioning manifests itself through myriad languages.
3. Though we can intellectually separate cognition from verbal and non-verbal languages, emphasizing verbal discourse and trivializing all the non-verbal codes, it is most likely that they are inextricably intertwined.
4. Basic skills, as presently understood, address only one half of one half of the issue: They stress only the form,

rather than the content or meanings inherent in the language, and they include only verbal and mathematical forms of symbolic codes, and none of the others. The fallacy lies in the presumption that the verbal and mathematical include all meanings necessary for adult functioning." (Engel, 1979)

Rudolf Arnheim suggests that:

"the arts are the most powerful means of strengthening the perceptual component without which productive thinking is impossible in any field of endeavor." (Arnheim, 1969)

In an article that proposes that "RT" should be considered the fourth "R" in the curriculum, Harry Broudy says:

"Aesthetic experience is basic because it is a primary form of experience on which all cognition, judgment, and action depend. It is the fundamental and distinctive power or image making by the imagination. It furnishes the raw material for concepts and ideas for creating a world of possibility. Theologically it may be true that in the beginning was the word, but historically it was probably the image or a word-image that came first." (Broudy, 1977)

But the realities in education today tell us that the arts are not basic to most student's education in spite of all the evidence and philosophical rationale. If this study included all of the good reasons why the Arts are important or necessary, it would not change the present situation or alter the public's opinion one bit.

Jerome Hausman puts the problem in perspective:

"It is all well and good to talk or write about the value of the arts. It is another order of business to figure out what is to be done in schools. It is one thing to assert general propositions about the arts in relation to human experience; it is still another to develop clear 'translations' as to what is to be done with the lives of people." (Hausman, 1980)

Summary

This review of the current literature was addressed to topics related to:

1. The history of status studies of elementary specialist programs in Michigan.
2. The impact of those studies in Michigan.
3. National and state studies on the Arts in Education and General Education.
4. The national and state advocacy movement.
5. How the Arts are advocated.

Three major surveys of specialist directed programming at the elementary level in Michigan were examined. Studies of Arts programs were conducted by the Joint Legislative Committee on the Arts in 1974 and 1979. A study of specialist services in Art, Music, Physical Education and Guidance Counseling was done by Donald Kenney in 1977. The findings of the studies demonstrated a gradual decline in the programs over the years.

Of the three surveys, Faxon's 1974 study had the greatest impact on Michigan education. This was due to the emphasis placed on the Arts by the legislative committee at that time; the effect of a new position in the Department of Education assigned to Art; and the emergence of committees and organizations to address the problems identified by the data. Though the impact did not alter the course of declining programs, many of the activities generated were beneficial to the Arts in education for Michigan. The remaining surveys had little effect on education.

Few national level surveys have been taken on specialist programs. Two surveys by the NEA, one in 1962 and the second in 1972 constituted most of the knowledge and information found about specialist programs. Music was found to have conducted more data gathering about its programs than either Art or Physical Education. Data on Dance and Drama at the elementary level was not found.

Information from a survey of 200 I.G.E. schools indicated that the classroom teachers were usually not present during the specialist periods and that the specialist preferred their being out of the room. There was also evidence of a pattern of programming that had more to do with a teacher's break time than other educational reasons.

Other studies included NAEP testing in Art and Music in the early and late seventies and current opinion polls conducted by the Michigan Department of Education.

The Arts advocacy movement was appraised from the national and state perspective. The literature indicated that much of the leadership for these movements came from sources outside of the professional organizations representing specialists. Though the professional organizations did have advocacy materials available, much of the vision for unified efforts was supplied by the John D. Rockefeller the 3rd Fund through the Arts, Education and Americans group and the Alliance for Arts Education in Washington.

The review also found little substantial opposition to Arts programs but that much apathy and neglect has led to a low priority for most.

The literature revealed an overwhelming array of reasons for Arts programs in education. The review made it clear that there was nothing approaching a consistent and clear rationale for these programs and that further study in this area is needed in order to provide significant and compelling reasons that could be communicated directly and effectively. Chapter II was closed on the note that what was needed was a bridge between the rhetoric and action and that changes affecting individuals would be slow and difficult.

Chapter III explains the methodology used to conduct a survey of specialist directed programs in Michigan.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This study is based on a survey of 529 K-12 public school districts in the State of Michigan. Because neither the State Department of Education nor the professional organizations involved keep a record of the level of programming in the areas in question, the study was necessary to provide the basic information.

Support for the study has come from virtually all of the organizations and institutions having interest in the data. Principal among these has been the Instructional Specialist Program and the Research, Evaluation and Assessment Services of the Michigan Department of Education, and the Michigan Alliance for Arts Education. The Michigan Alliance for Arts Education is an umbrella organization of professional groups and individuals with broad interests in the Arts in Education and is affiliated with the National Alliance for Arts Education which is funded by the United States Department of Education and located in the John F. Kennedy Center for Performing Arts in Washington D.C.

Restatement of the Purposes of the Study

The purpose of this study was to update the information on the presence and suspected decline of specialist directed programs at the elementary level in Michigan public schools. The study

includes questions concerning programs in Visual Art, Vocal (General) Music, Instrumental Music (Band and Orchestra), Drama, Dance, Physical Education and Guidance Counseling. It also includes questions concerning the growth, decline or elimination of these programs over the last five years, the perceived reasons for change, and additional perceptions about the future of the programs. It was expected that the latter concerns would shed some light on the effect of advocacy programs for these areas.

A second purpose of the study was to provide specific information on programming according to specific district location. In this sense, the study might provide a more precise definition of the relationship of programs to factors such as state formula funding, specialist-student ratios, and geographical patterns.

Population and Sample

The population selected for the survey was elementary principals in the State of Michigan. The sample included one elementary principal, randomly selected from each of the 529 districts in the state having educational programs spanning Kindergarten through the 12th grade. An exception to this procedure was made to deal with the 15 districts having more than 20 elementary schools.

The population was identified through the use of the 1983 Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide. This commercial publication lists all schools in the state of Michigan along with the addresses, phone numbers and principal of each school.

Because there are actually 574 districts listed providing education between the grades of K-12, the population was further defined to include only the 529 districts offering full K-12 programs. For identification purposes, each of the 529 districts were assigned a number from 1 through 529, listed according to the alphabetical order of their postal address.

Within each district's listing of elementary schools, each school was assigned a consecutive number from 1 through the total number of schools. Using a random number table found in Runyon and Haber's Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics (1980 table Q page 411), one elementary school and its principal in each district was selected for the sample.

An exception to this procedure was made for the 15 largest districts in the state, having more than 20 elementary schools listed. Because of the size of these districts, a decision was made to personally contact the central administrators having the responsibility for elementary specialist directed programs. In some cases this was the director of elementary programs and in others the specific coordinator for these programs were identified.

A list of the 529 names included in the sample was prepared in xerox label format with each district's 3 digit identification number appearing in the upper left corner of the label. The labels were used to mail the survey packets and were also placed on the survey as a return address as one means to positively identify the source of data.

Development of the Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was roughly designed along the lines of Kenney's survey in 1977. This was done to allow specific comparisons of data from each source to measure any change over time.

The instrument was designed to gather both the hard data such as numbers of programs, specialists, etc. and the perceptions of the respondents with respect to their opinions and knowledge of the inner workings of the district. While the latter was not a feature of the Kenney survey, it was included to elicit a focus for advocacy efforts and also to identify possible sites of effective advocacy.

Special considerations were made to insure a high return rate for the survey. The decision to reject a statistically derived sampling of the 529 districts in favor of using the entire field of districts placed a high priority on a credible return rate to produce reliable results. In order to have both an accurate reflection of the status of these programs state wide, as well as the specific information from individual locations, consideration of the following nine factors was imperative:

1. Sponsorship
2. Input from professionals in the field
3. Graphic design and format
4. Ease of completing and mailing
5. Selection of elementary principals as recipients of the survey

6. Effective follow-up of non-respondents
7. Special handling of large districts
8. Data keying capability
9. Incentive for return

The sponsorship of the survey was important to establish the initial or first contact validity of the project.

On October 27, 1982, the Michigan Alliance for Arts Education was approached at its general membership meeting with a proposal to sponsor part of the survey in return for the data on the status of elementary arts programs in Michigan. The MAAE agreed to take part in the venture as a co-sponsor and have its name used in the process.

In November 1982, preliminary discussions with the Michigan Department of Education were begun concerning the feasibility of the department playing a role in the survey. Because the data gained would seem to be most useful to the Instructional Specialists Program, Dr. Teressa Staten, then the acting supervisor of that unit, was contacted and presented with the idea. A favorable initial response was followed by discussions with Dr. Paul Novak of the Department's Research, Evaluation and Assessment Program concerning any possible conflicts with ongoing work in the department and specific areas where the M.D.E. might be helpful. These preliminary discussions preceded the formal request for co-sponsorship on January 25, 1983, to Dr. Staten which resulted in the necessary clearances from Dr. David Donovan, Head of the Technical Assistance and Evaluation Services section and the final commitment of the Department to co-sponsor the survey.

Also in November of 1982, Mr. William Mays, Jr., Executive Secretary of the Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association was contacted to secure the endorsement of MEMSPA for the survey. Mr. Mays agreed to make the proposal an agenda item at the Association's Board of Directors meeting in January where it was sanctioned by the group.

The co-sponsorship and endorsement campaign allowed the survey to be sent out with a cover letter signed by Dr. Phillip Runkel for the Department of Education, Mr. William Mays for MEMSPA and Frank Philip for the Alliance. All correspondence bore the names of the three organizations and their letterhead/logo providing the recognition needed to assure a good response.

The second consideration was for critical advice and input from professionals in the field of the Arts in Education, the other special areas to be surveyed, and assessment and evaluation personnel with skills in instrument design and implementation.

One of the first individuals to be contacted was Dr. Donald Kenney, now Superintendent of Southgate Schools. Kenney's research in 1977 provided the prototype for this research and demonstrated the reliably high return rate of surveys sent to elementary principals. Dr. Kenney also provided manuscripts of his report and copies of the instrument used as well as some insight about the process of selecting the principals in the districts and methods for the follow-up of non-respondents.

Consultation with Dr. Eric Gordon of Instructional Development Evaluation Associates regarding the formulation of the questions and the appropriate design to achieve the needed data resulted in the basic format of the survey instrument.

Discussions with professionals in the fields to be surveyed brought about further refinement of the basic design and identified the need to key in on the programs that are specialist directed rather than those which are delivered by classroom teachers.

The need to look at specialist-student ratios was a new feature of the survey not found in previous ones. In the earlier studies, the mere presence of specialists and programs could not indicate the true impact of the curriculum. In former studies districts could report having a program with specialists when only three specialists are employed to cover more than 40 elementary buildings. The impact of those programs would be considerably less than those districts reporting a lower specialist-student ratio.

In the early stages of developing the format, valuable advice was provided by the members of the supervising doctoral committee with regards to the precise and concise wording of the instrument. The clarity of the questions asked is largely attributable to the fine honing of the language by this group in early committee meetings.

Throughout the developmental process, elementary principals in the Waverly School District were consulted concerning the appropriateness of the questions asked and whether or not it was a reasonable assumption to expect principals to have, or be privy to the information requested.

Finally, Dr. Paul Novak of the Department of Education was extremely helpful in asking thought provoking questions and providing immense guidance throughout the process.

The third consideration was for a clear and orderly presentation of the survey; one that would increase the return rate by making the process as simple and palatable for the respondents as possible. While the range and scope of the data being sought was great, the format used to present the questions needed to be brief enough to fit on one sheet. It was felt that the single page design would not intimidate the respondent and enhance the likelihood that it would be dealt with immediately rather than put aside by the principal to do at a later date.

The survey was typeset to achieve the greatest economy of space in terms of the layout. The typesetting allowed a greater range of type size and provided a professional and finished appearance to the instrument.

Another element of the instrument design was the self mailing feature to aid in the handling and processing. The survey was printed on card stock to permit the respondent to simply fold and

staple it, apply postage and mail it without the bother of and expense of an envelope. The return address for the survey was printed on one panel and a duplicate of the xerox address label of the principal was affixed to the corner.

Elementary principals were the intended recipients of the survey because of their grasp of the necessary significant data and their position in most districts which locates them between the central administration and the immediate delivery of the educational services. In most cases, their long tenure in the district, their closer ties with specialists, teachers, parents and the community and their broad perceptions of the context of the educational community within the community at large, gives them a unique vantage point from which the questions in the survey would be addressed.

To assure a high return rate, a system of following up the non-respondents was devised. Because one of the intentions of the survey was to account for as high a percentage of the state's elementary population as possible, the follow-up system would concentrate on the larger districts that did not respond.

After the April 27th due date for the return of the survey, a list of the first 100 non-responding districts based on district enrollment size would be assembled. Each principal or the recipient of the survey for that district would then be contacted by telephone to encourage them to return the data.

A second list of the next 100 districts not responding would also be compiled and contacted by follow-up letter. Again the list was based on data from the Department of Education that ranked the districts according to the size of enrollment.

Fifteen of the largest districts or all districts which listed more than twenty elementary buildings in the state would be contacted personally. Because of the concern that a single principal might not be comfortable in reporting data from such a large field, individuals such as the director of elementary instruction or specialist coordinators for the individual areas would be visited on an appointment basis. This would assure the inclusion of the highest enrollment districts in the survey.

The survey was designed to facilitate the conversion of the reported data to a form that could be computerized. With the assistance of Steven Peter of the Michigan Department of Education's Data Processing Unit, data keying numbers were added to the survey forms.

The last consideration in the design process was some form of incentive to the respondents who completed and returned the survey. Each respondent was given the opportunity to check off a section on the survey form to receive a copy of the summary of the findings. While this is only a small token of appreciation, it is some compensation for the expenditure of time and any inconvenience the survey may have caused.

The final step in the instrument design process was a last clearance and proofing by the sponsoring agents and a piloting of the galley proof by principals in the Waverly School District.

The Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was typeset and printed commercially on a single 8½ x 17 sheet of 67 lb. tan card stock (see pages 143 and 144). Both sides of the sheet were used. The survey was folded with one outside panel used for the pre-printed address of this researcher and space for xerox return address label of the respondent which was affixed to the form before mailing from Lansing.

The instrument was mailed in a 6 x 9 sealed envelope with a cover letter stating the purpose of the survey and explaining the process. The cover letter was co-signed by this researcher as the representative of the Michigan Alliance, by Dr. Phillip Runkel, State Superintendent of Public Instruction for the M.D.E., and by William Mays, Jr., Executive Secretary of MEMSPA. (See Appendix A for letter example).

The survey form provided space at the top for identification of the respondent and district which included blanks for:

1. The total district, 4th Friday elementary enrollment
2. The five digit M.D.E. district identification number (provided by the researcher)
3. The school district's name and address

4. The respondent's name, position and school
5. An indication of whether the district receives formula state aid or not
6. An indication of whether the respondent wishes to receive a summary of the findings

The instrument was divided into eight sections. The six sections on the front ask questions about programming in Visual Art, Vocal (General) Music, Band, Orchestra, Drama, Dance and Physical Education. The same questions were asked about each program and included:

1. Does your district have a formal elementary (Art, Music, etc.) program?
2. Does your district employ elementary (Art, Music, etc.) specialists?
3. If so, how many (specialists)?
4. Assuming that your building is a typical example of what the district offers in terms of program, please report the following data for the appropriate levels. (The respondent was asked to report whether or not a specialist was available in the building full time or part time at the specific levels (K-6) and how much time was devoted to that subject in a typical schedule. The question of time was broken down to include three factors: Minutes per session, Sessions per week, Weeks per year. Again the respondent was asked to provide this data according to specific grade level.)

The back page of the survey contained the sections devoted to Guidance Counseling and general questions concerning changes in programming over the last five years, the reasons for those changes and predictions about the probability of programming in the future.

The section on Guidance Counseling asked four questions:

1. Does your district have a formal elementary Guidance Counseling program?
2. How many elementary Guidance Counselors does your district employ?
3. If so, what is their minimum certification?
4. Approximately how many students does each counselor serve?

The general information section included six questions:

1. The respondent was asked to indicate the changes over the last five years in the seven areas of programming with respect to growth, cut-backs in programs and the elimination of programs.
2. The respondent was asked to rank order 7 possible explanations for the growth of programs which included:
 - A. Good communication between the program staff, parents and the community.
 - B. Program is integrated with other subject matter and staff.
 - C. Strong parent advocacy
 - D. Program is seen as part of the basic curriculum.
 - E. Strong program staff.
 - F. District is financially sound.
 - G. Administrative leadership.

The respondent was given two blank spaces to write in additional reasons for growth.

3. The respondent was asked to rank order the reasons for the decline in programming. Six explanations were listed and two blanks were provided for additional reasons.

- A. Area not essential to basic curriculum.
 - B. Lack of district commitment to program.
 - C. Budget cuts.
 - D. Lack of community commitment to program.
 - E. Program did not communicate its reasons for existing.
 - F. Lack of leadership/coordination for the program.
4. The respondent was asked to indicate if any of the program advocates for each of the seven areas had made any attempt to present a defense for saving programs in jeopardy.
5. The respondent was asked to state their opinions concerning what it would take to include these programs as a part of the elementary curriculum in their district. Five choices were provided to be rank ordered and two additional blanks were made available for other reasons. The five choices were:
- A. Better understanding or awareness for the need for these programs.
 - B. Better integration of specialist programs into the general curriculum.
 - C. State mandate.
 - D. More comprehensive pre-service and inservice training for the classroom teacher to assume the delivery responsibility for these programs.
 - E. More money.
6. The respondent was asked to indicate the likelihood for programming in each of the seven areas based on the present funding structure for public education. The choices for this probability were: Likely within 10 years, Likely within 20 years, or not likely.

The bottom of the survey form provided space for additional comments or explanations and the three digit district identification number which was filled in by the researcher before mailing.

Data Collection Procedures

514 survey packets containing the instrument and cover letter were mailed out on April 14, 1983. The remaining 15 packets were hand delivered to the largest districts during the appointments for the data gathering visits.

The 15 largest districts were visited by the researcher during the preceding two weeks, (April 11-29) where appointments had been made with the heads of elementary instruction or the supervisors of the content areas on the survey. In some cases the data was reported via phone according to a prearranged schedule after the initial visit.

A list of the first 100 districts (ranked according to district enrollment) which failed to respond was compiled. This list included districts whose enrollment was 2374 students or greater. Using the M.D.E.'s WATS line, each principal was contacted via phone and in some cases sent a new survey form to be completed.

A second list of the next 100 districts who failed to respond was also compiled. The second list was made up of districts with enrollments ranging from 506 students to 2344

students. Each district on this list received a second survey form and a letter signed by Dr. David Donovan (see Appendix A) of the M.D.E. urging them to complete and return the survey.

DATA Processing and Treatment

Upon receipt of the survey forms, the following processing procedure was implemented:

1. The names and district of the respondents were checked off the master list and any corrections or changes for names or addresses were made.
2. The elementary enrollment figure was checked against the Department of Education's master list of the 1982-83, fourth Friday count. In cases where the figure was not present, it was added.
3. The five digit district code identifying each district was added to the boilerplate information at the top of the survey.
4. Each response was visually checked and edited if necessary for clarity. In cases where the response was illegible, confusing or in conflict with other responses, a telephone call was made to the respondent for clarification.
5. Additional responses in items 2, 3, and 5 of Section VIII were coded for data keying.
6. Data from certain responses (i.e. district name, enrollment, number of specialists and growth or decline indicators) were tallied by hand to establish a separate record to validate the computerized information.
7. The responding district's names were removed from a master list of districts ranked by enrollment size.
8. The finished survey forms were bundled in packs of ninety and delivered to Mr. Steve Peter of the data processing section of the Michigan Department of Education.

The data was fed onto a computer tape by personnel from the Department of Education using the conventional data keying methods. Eight records (cards) were utilized for each survey; one for each section of the survey. Each card carried the boilerplate information from the top of the survey as well as the specific information from each section. 355 variables were established for each case (survey).

Michigan State University's computer facilities were used to process the data. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program was used for the data analysis.

Condescriptives of the 355 variables were run as well as the following other analysis:

1. Crosstabulation for the presence of programs by formula state aid.
2. Crosstabulation of:
 - A. Program by program
 - B. Program by district size
3. Frequencies of responses to questions in Section VIII
4. Listings of program offerings by district
5. Condescriptive of state totals not including data from Detroit
6. Listing of all data by district grouped according to district code.

In addition to the analysis, the computer was used to recode all variables for the number of weeks per year that specialist directed programming was available. This was necessitated by a significant number of responses that listed

more than 36 weeks of instruction (180 days as required by the state). All cases that listed more than 36 weeks were recoded to reflect maximum of 36 weeks.

Handwritten remarks and comments from the surveys were transcribed to the lists found in Appendix B. These comments were especially helpful in the verbal reinforcement of the frustration evidenced in responses to questions in Section VIII and add a decidedly human dimension to these other data.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to assess the status of specialist directed programs in Michigan's public elementary schools. All 529 K-12 school districts in the state were surveyed via the selection of one elementary principal to report the data from his or her district and building. Exception to this procedure was made to assure the inclusion of the 15 largest districts in the state. The data was gathered from these districts by this researcher during personal visits to the districts.

The survey was developed by the researcher using Kenney's 1977 survey as a prototype. It was designed to gather as much information as possible in a one sheet format and at the same time elicit a high response rate. Special follow-up techniques were used to contact non-respondents. They included phone contacts of the first 100 districts ranked by enrollment size and letters and second surveys to the next 100 hundred non-responding districts.

The returned surveys were hand edited and basic information on district enrollment, identification number and formula aid status was checked and added where necessary. The completed forms were transmitted to the Department of Education where the information was fed to the computer for analysis.

Chapter IV contains the data obtained from the survey.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This chapter contains the analyses of the data drawn from the survey and information collected during the telephone and personal contacts with the respondents. The data are presented and discussed from two perspectives. First, they are examined to establish the programming levels for each area in question. These levels are examined for their relationships to each other and to other factors such as district size and state formula aid funding. Comparisons are made to existing data from previous studies. Second, the data are examined to explore possible reasons for program patterns with particular emphasis on why changes have occurred over the years.

Data Collection

The population of the survey was 529 school districts in Michigan offering programming and instruction for Kindergarten through the 12th grade. It was further defined to include 514 elementary principals (one from each district) by name; one from each district and 15 central administrators having responsibility for programming in the areas in question.

Surveys were mailed to the 514 principals on April 14, 1983, and appointments with the remaining individuals at the 15 largest districts were made between the 11th and 29th of April.

During the first full week (April 18-22, 1983) following the initial mailing, 48% of the surveys were returned. As of the published due date of April 27, 1983, 312 survey forms (59%) had been returned.

On April 29, 1983, two lists of non-responding districts were compiled.

The first list was comprised of the first 100 districts that failed to respond ranked according to district size. Each individual principal identified in the sample was contacted via telephone and urged to complete and return the survey. New surveys were sent in 43 cases. In the process of the conversations, additional questions were asked about the status of specialist directed programs in the respondents district. The information and insight gained in these conversations helped to ground the data received in the survey and provided a context for some of the conclusions reached in the last chapter of this study. Of the 100 principals contacted by phone, 75 returned their survey forms.

The second list was made up of the next 100 principals from non-responding districts again ranked according to district enrollment. Each principal on the second list received a second survey via mail with a letter drafted by the researcher and signed by Dr. David Donovan (see Appendix A) of the Michigan Department of Education urging them to complete and return the

survey instrument. The letters and survey forms were mailed in a Department of Education envelope on May 13, 1983. Of the 100 non-responding principals contacted by mail, 44 returned completed survey forms.

A total of 437 surveys were returned by June 17 (82.6%) and delivered to the Department of Education for data keying on that date. Based on a listing of districts ranked by the state's fourth Friday enrollment count and furnished by the Department of Education, the 437 districts included in the survey included: 94 from the first 100 (largest), 80 from the second, 79 from the third, 80 from the fourth, 84 from districts ranked 401 to 500, and 20 of the remaining 29 in the list. The 437 districts were found to account for 704,312 elementary students in the state of Michigan.

While the majority of the districts reported data from K-6 programs, a significant number, including Detroit Public Schools, reported data from a K-5 configuration. Detroit's elementary enrollment (K-5) was 93,844 from the state's fourth Friday count and represented 13.3% of the total enrollment accounted for by the survey. In order to establish a percentage of total Michigan elementary students included in the data, the average of the states total K-5 enrollment (694,005) and the total K-6 enrollment (825,496) was used. The average was 759,750.5 students. Based on that figure, the percentage of elementary students accounted for by the survey was 92.7%.

Table 4.1 is a summary of the data collection procedures.

Table 4.1: Description of Mailed Survey
Data Collection

	<u>Number</u>
Identification of K-12 Districts	529
Surveys mailed	514
Surveys hand delivered	15
Surveys returned by April 27th due date	312
Number of telephone follow-up contacts	100
Number of surveys returned from phone contacts	75
Number of second mailing follow-up contacts	100
Number of surveys returned from mail follow-up	44
Total number of surveys returned by June 17	437
Number of surveys returned after June 17 and not included in Data Analysis	3
Total number of elementary students accounted for by the survey	704,312

Findings

The findings of the survey reflect a significant downward trend for the levels of specialist directed programs in all categories when compared to data from previous surveys. Table 4.2 represents the total percentages of districts having programs directed by specialists from the surveys of 1974 and 1979 done by Faxon, et al., the 1977 survey by Kenney, and this study. With the exception of the Faxon survey which apparently had an insufficient sample and therefore questionable results, the comparison shows a consistent decline in programs over the past nine years.

Table 4.2
Comparison of Specialist Directed
Programs Present in Michigan Public Elementary
Schools in 1974, 1977, 1979 and 1983

Reported in Percentages of Schools Having Programs

	Faxon, et al. 1974	Kenney 1977	Faxon, et al. 1979	Philip 1983
ART	61%	53.2%	57%	40.2%
VOCAL (GENERAL) MUSIC	74% (Vocal)	83%	87.5%	62.5%
INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC	90%	74.5%		61.8% (Band)
				10.5% (Orchestra)
DRAMA	0%	---- *	2%	0.4%
DANCE	3%	---- *	13%	0%
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	---- *	81.2%	---- *	65.4%
GUIDANCE COUNSELING	---- *	19%	---- *	13%
ORIGIN OF SAMPLE	469 elementary schools surveyed. 66% return rate. Sample based on: District size Grade structure Geographic location	534 districts surveyed (all) 78.8% return rate.	169 districts in sample from three size classifica- tions.	529 districts surveyed (all) 82.6% return rate. 92.7% enroll- ment coverage.

*no data reported

Because of the similarities in methodology and the timing of the state's economic downturn, Kenney's survey of 1977 would seem to offer the best comparison for the present data. The results demonstrate a 24% reduction in elementary Art programs, a 25% decline in Vocal Music, a 17% decline in Instrumental Music, a 19% decline in Physical Education and a 32% reduction in Guidance Counseling programs over the past six years.

The data presented in Tables 4.3 through 4.10 represent the information from Sections I through VII of the survey instrument.

Table 4.3 shows that 40.2% or 173 districts out of 433 report having a total of 545.2 (F.T.E.) specialists in Art. Specialists who are assigned to cover more than one building outnumber those who are full time in a building by a ratio of about 5 to 1. Time devoted to instruction in the reporting districts averages around 45 minutes and the number of classes per week averages slightly higher than one session. Generally these classes are for a full year (36 weeks) but a significant number of districts reported less than a full years service yielding an average of approximately 32 weeks per year of instruction.

Through the information gained from the telephone interviews and personal visitations, the overwhelming majority of programs in Art, Music and Physical Education were in fact the contractual break time for the classroom teacher. This item will be discussed

Table 4.3: ART PROGRAMS

433 districts reporting.

40.2% or 173 districts have a program.

59.8% or 260 districts do not have a program.

545.2 specialists are employed (F.T.E.) Range, .2 to 120

NUMBER OF DISTRICTS REPORTING FULL AND PART-TIME
(SHARED WITH OTHER BUILDINGS) SPECIALISTS IN BUILDINGS AT
GRADE LEVELS

LEVEL	FULL-TIME	PART-TIME
K	16	69
1	28	130
2	28	131
3	28	134
4	28	135
5	26	131
6	21	92

AMOUNT OF SPECIALIST CONTACT TIME AT GRADE LEVEL

Grade Level	N	\bar{X}	Range	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	Average Minutes per Week
K	75	37.59	15-60	77	1.20	80	31.04	45.11
1	152	43.16	20-75	154	1.16	154	32.20	50.07
2	153	43.63	20-75	156	1.16	155	32.13	50.61
3	155	44.36	20-75	157	1.17	156	32.15	51.90
4	156	45.08	20-75	159	1.18	158	32.15	53.19
5	143	45.30	20-75	152	1.19	151	32.01	53.91
6	106	45.33	25-75	106	1.35	109	31.11	61.20

further in this chapter in terms of the patterns of programming and later in Chapter V as an argument for and against specialist programs.

The interviews also revealed that Art was a subject that was more often considered as an area that classroom teachers could provide without a specialist. While questions of the effectiveness, consistency and quality of these programs without competent supervision are immediately raised by this researcher and others in the field, the perception is prevalent throughout the educational system and probably is a partial explanation for the differences in programming levels in Art and Music.

The data for Vocal Music programs are represented in Table 4.4. The term Vocal Music was used in this study to differentiate between these general music programs and the more specific Instrumental Music programs in Band and Orchestra. While many of the so-called Vocal Music programs also include experiences with Orff and other forms of instruments, the label is generally accepted as the generic music program of most school districts.

Vocal Music programs were identified in 273 school districts in Michigan or 62.6% of the 436 districts reporting information in this survey. Specialists employed by districts in Vocal Music programs numbered 722.9 and ranged from .2 of a position to the 126 positions reported in Detroit Public Schools. The ratio of specialists responsible for more than one building again outnumbered those assigned to a single building by a ratio of approximately 4 to 1.

Table 4.4: VOCAL MUSIC PROGRAMS

436 districts reporting
 62.6% or 273 districts have a program
 37.4% or 163 districts do not have a program
 722.9 specialists are employed (F.T.E.) Range, .2 to 126

NUMBER OF DISTRICTS REPORTING FULL AND PART-TIME
 (SHARED WITH OTHER BUILDINGS) SPECIALISTS IN BUILDINGS AT
 GRADE LEVELS

LEVEL	FULL-TIME	PART-TIME
K	37	130
1	51	196
2	52	195
3	53	192
4	53	191
5	47	174
6	25	118

AMOUNT OF SPECIALIST CONTACT TIME AT GRADE LEVEL

Grade level	N	\bar{X}	Range	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	Average Minutes per Week
K	162	28.51	15-60	162	1.54	162	34.64	43.91
1	247	31.64	15-60	248	1.63	240	34.88	51.57
2	248	31.91	15-60	249	1.60	243	34.89	51.06
3	250	32.54	15-60	251	1.61	245	34.75	52.39
4	247	33.22	16-60	249	1.60	242	34.75	53.15
5	223	33.03	16-60	225	1.59	219	34.70	52.52
6	141	33.54	16-60	144	1.73	145	34.04	58.02

Vocal Music sessions were generally shorter than those in Art (roughly 32 to 33 minutes) but averaged more sessions per week. The pattern most often reported was 2 sessions per week and the average was consistently around 1.6.

This pattern and level for programming in Vocal Music and a similar one for Physical Education seemed to validate information gained from the interview process that indicated that the two programs together were a more likely source for the break time for classroom teacher than other patterns. Because they could be conducted in increments of approximately 30 minutes and presented twice a week, together they could account for four fifths of the needed contractual break time for classroom teachers. While this matter is still in the realm of speculation, it is none the less an interesting indicator of a priority system which may need further investigation by arts advocates.

Table 4.5 indicates the data concerning Band programs at the elementary level. Of the 436 districts reporting, 61.9% or 270 have some form of Band instruction. The number of specialists employed (340.7) and the number of districts reporting full and part time coverage indicates that most of these programs are appendages and training grounds for secondary programs. While data on secondary programs is not reported here, it can be assumed that there is a high correlation between the programs at the elementary and secondary level. Information from the interviews

Table 4.5: BAND PROGRAMS

436 districts reporting
 61.9% or 270 districts have a program
 38.1% or 166 districts do not have a program
 340.7 specialists are employed (F.T.E.) Range, .2 to 42

NUMBER OF DISTRICTS REPORTING FULL AND PART-TIME
 (SHARED WITH OTHER BUILDINGS) SPECIALISTS IN BUILDINGS AT
 GRADE LEVELS

LEVEL	FULL-TIME	PART-TIME
K	0	1
1	0	6
2	0	5
3	0	7
4	3	32
5	19	176
6	20	184

AMOUNT OF SPECIALIST CONTACT TIME AT GRADE LEVEL

Grade Level		N Districts Reporting		Range		N Districts Reporting		N Districts Reporting		Average Minutes per Week	
		\bar{N}	\bar{X} Minutes per Session			\bar{N}	\bar{X} Sessions per Week	\bar{N}	\bar{X} Weeks per Year		
K	2	40.00	20-60	1	2.00	2	36.00			80.00	
1	3	51.67	45-60	4	1.00	5	36.00			51.67	
2	3	51.67	45-60	4	2.00	5	36.00			103.34	
3	5	47.00	30-60	6	1.50	7	35.86			70.50	
4	30	40.23	20-90	29	2.03	32	33.34			81.67	
5	179	37.94	-90	182	2.79	180	33.54			105.85	
6	186	40.36	-90	192	3.12	190	34.97			125.92	

indicate that the majority of these programs are conducted by staff from the secondary level who spend a portion of their time in the elementary schools.

Few programs exist at the lower end of the elementary spectrum with the predominance of activity taking place at the 5th and 6th grade level. Class sessions are in the 40 minute range on the average and are conducted approximately 3 times a week for close to, but less than a full year.

Orchestra programs, as Table 4.6 indicates, follow the same basic pattern as the Band instruction but at reduced levels. Only 10.5% of the 437 districts reporting or 46, have an Orchestra program. Most of the 142.9 specialists employed work only part of their time at the elementary level as with the Band programs. Again, it can be assumed from substantiating evidence from the interviews, that the programs reported here are the threshold experiences for secondary programs.

The number of minutes per session and the number of weeks per year are in line with those reported for Band programs but the number of sessions per week is closer to 2 than the 3 indicated by districts with Band programs.

Only two districts reported programming in Drama as Table 4.7 indicates. One district employed a full time person K-6 and one district assigned one person half time. No data on the delivery of services or the levels serviced were reported.

Table 4.6: ORCHESTRA PROGRAMS

437 districts reporting
 10.5% or 46 districts have a program
 89.5% or 391 districts do not have a program
 142.9 specialists are employed (F.T.E.) Range, .2 to 25

NUMBER OF DISTRICTS REPORTING FULL AND PART-TIME
 (SHARED WITH OTHER BUILDINGS) SPECIALISTS IN BUILDINGS AT
 GRADE LEVELS

LEVEL	FULL-TIME	PART-TIME
K	0	1
1	0	0
2	0	1
3	0	2
4	0	20
5	3	46
6	2	31

AMOUNT OF SPECIALIST CONTACT TIME AT GRADE LEVEL

Grade level		N Districts Reporting		Range		N Districts Reporting		N Districts Reporting		Average Minutes per Week	
	\bar{x}	\bar{x}	Minutes per Session		\bar{x}	\bar{x}	Sessions per Week		\bar{x}		
K	1	60.00	60	1	2	1	36.00	120.00			
1	1	60.00	60	1	2	2	36.00	120.00			
2	2	45.00	30-60	2	2	3	36.00	90.00			
3	3	45.00	30-60	3	2	4	36.00	90.00			
4	21	40.71	25-90	23	2.04	21	33.53	83.05			
5	43	39.88	20-90	43	2.07	44	35.32	82.55			
6	29	38.45	20-75	31	2.23	32	35.56	85.74			

Table 4.7: DRAMA PROGRAMS

437 districts reporting
 .4% or 2 districts have a program
 99.6% or 435 districts do not have a program
 1.5 specialists are employed (F.T.E.) Range, .5 to 1

NUMBER OF DISTRICTS REPORTING FULL AND PART-TIME
 (SHARED WITH OTHER BUILDINGS) SPECIALISTS IN BUILDINGS AT
 GRADE LEVELS

LEVEL	FULL-TIME	PART-TIME
K		
1		
2		
3	NO DATA REPORTED	
4		
5		
6		

AMOUNT OF SPECIALIST CONTACT TIME AT GRADE LEVEL

Grade level	Number of Districts Reporting	Number of Minutes per Session	Range	Number of Districts Reporting	Number of Sessions per Week	Number of Districts Reporting	Number of Weeks per Year	Average Minutes per Week
K								
1								
2			NO DATA REPORTED					
3								
4								
5								
6								

No districts reported specialists or programming in Dance as Table 4.8 shows.

While a small number of respondents reported in the comments section of the instrument that services were available from the classroom teacher in Drama and some Physical Education programs had Dance components, these two programs are the areas of most serious neglect in the elementary curriculum in Michigan. As the data in later tables in this chapter indicate, they are also the least likely programs to be included in the future. To say they are a low priority in public education would be a gross understatement.

Physical Education enjoyed the highest number of specialist directed programs in the state. Table 4.9 indicates that 286 districts or 65.4% of the 437 districts responding, had Physical Education programs. 1023.7 specialists were employed to conduct these programs and the ratio of shared teachers to full-time teachers was close to 2:1.

The contact time reported was approximately 32 to 36 minutes per session and the most often reported number of sessions per week was 2 with an average in the 1.7 range. Most districts reported full year programs and the average for weeks per year was slightly higher than 34.

Guidance Counseling programs were reported by 55 districts or 12.8% of the 429 districts responding as indicated by Table 4.10.

Table 4.8: DANCE PROGRAMS

437 districts reporting
 0% or 0 districts have a program
 100% or 437 districts do not have a program
 0 specialists are employed (F.T.E.) Range, 0 to 0

NUMBER OF DISTRICTS REPORTING FULL AND PART-TIME
 (SHARED WITH OTHER BUILDINGS) SPECIALISTS IN BUILDINGS AT
 GRADE LEVELS

LEVEL	FULL-TIME	PART-TIME
K		
1		
2		
3	NO DATA REPORTED	
4		
5		
6		

AMOUNT OF SPECIALIST CONTACT TIME AT GRADE LEVEL

Grade level	N	\bar{X}	Range	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	Average Minutes per Week
K								
1								
2								
3				NO DATA REPORTED				
4								
5								
6								

Table 4.9: PHYSICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

437 districts reporting
 65.4% or 286 districts have a program
 34.6% or 151 districts do not have a program
 1023.7 specialists employed (F.T.E.) Range, .2 to 370

NUMBER OF DISTRICTS REPORTING FULL AND PART-TIME
 (SHARED WITH OTHER BUILDINGS) SPECIALISTS IN BUILDINGS AT
 GRADE LEVELS

LEVEL	FULL-TIME	PART-TIME
K	56	122
1	81	175
2	83	174
3	84	172
4	87	173
5	81	166
6	51	113

AMOUNT OF SPECIALIST CONTACT TIME AT GRADE LEVEL

Grade level	N	\bar{X}	Range	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	Average Minutes per Week
K	182	28.74	15-60	184	1.55	184	34.65	44.55
1	260	32.27	20-60	260	1.70	256	34.38	54.86
2	261	32.50	20-60	261	1.68	259	34.46	54.60
3	263	33.19	20-60	264	1.67	260	34.40	55.43
4	265	34.00	20-60	266	1.68	262	34.37	57.12
5	252	35.01	20-60	252	1.77	249	34.31	61.97
6	173	36.33	20-60	175	1.97	178	34.02	71.57

Table 4.10: GUIDANCE COUNSELING PROGRAMS

429 districts reporting
 12.8% or 55 districts have a program
 87.2% or 374 districts do not have a program
 172 specialists are employed (F.T.E.) Range, 1 to 92

NUMBER OF DISTRICTS REPORTING FULL AND PART-TIME
 (SHARED WITH OTHER BUILDINGS) SPECIALISTS IN BUILDINGS AT
 GRADE LEVELS

LEVEL	FULL-TIME	PART-TIME
K		
1		
2		
3	NO DATA	
4		
5		
6		

AMOUNT OF SPECIALIST CONTACT TIME AT GRADE LEVEL

Grade level	N Districts Reporting	\bar{x} Minutes per Session	Range	N Districts Reporting	\bar{x} Sessions per Week	N Districts Reporting	\bar{x} Weeks per Year	Average Minutes per Week
K								
1								
2								
3			NO DATA					
4								
5								
6								

One hundred seventy-two specialists are employed for Guidance Counseling programs in Michigan elementary schools. Because of the differences in programming in Guidance Counseling and its dissimilarity to the other programs in the survey, no data on the delivery systems were requested or reported.

Table 4.11 is a summary of the numbers of programs and specialists reported in the survey. Percentages for the number of districts reporting out of the 529 total districts in the state as well as the percentages of districts with and without programs are provided in Columns 1, 2 and 3. Column 4 indicates the totals for specialists in each area for the state. Column 5 is the mean for the number of minutes per session at the fifth grade level. Column 6 is the mean for the number of sessions per week at the fifth grade level. Column 7 is the mean for the number of weeks per year at the fifth grade level.

Because the data from Detroit Public Schools, the largest district in the state, tend to skew the results due to the size of the district (93,844 students K-5 or 13.3% of the total reported), Table 4.12 is provided to show the relationship of the programs reported by Detroit to the totals reported.

The table shows the total number of specialists and the total number and percentage for both the Detroit Public Schools and all others outside of Detroit. This effect is only found where specialists are mentioned in the data and should have no bearing on the findings in the remaining tables.

Table 4.11
SUMMARY OF STATE SPECIALIST TOTALS
BY PROGRAM

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Districts reporting out of 529 total	Have a program	Do not have a program	Total number of specialists in state	Minutes per session at 5th grade level	Sessions per week at 5th grade level	Weeks per year at 5th grade level
ART	N						
	433	173	260	545.2	45.30	1.19	32.01
	%						
	81.9%	40.2%	59.8%				
VOCAL MUSIC	N						
	436	273	163	722.9	33.03	1.59	34.70
	%						
	82.4%	62.6%	37.4%				
BAND	N						
	436	270	166	340.7	37.94	2.79	33.54
	%						
	82.4%	61.9%	38.1%				
ORCHESTRA	N						
	437	46	391	142.9	39.88	2.07	35.32
	%						
	82.6%	10.5%	89.5%				
DRAMA	N						
	437	2	435	1.5	----	----	----
	%						
	82.6%	0.4%	99.6%				
DANCE	N						
	437	0	437	0	----	----	----
	%						
	82.6%	0.0%	100%				
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	N						
	437	286	151	1023	35.01	1.77	34.31
	%						
	82.6%	65.4%	34.6%				
GUIDANCE COUNSELING	N						
	429	55	374	172	----	----	----
	%						
	81.1%	12.8%	87.2%				

Table 4.12
SUMMARY OF DETROIT AND OUTSTATE
SPECIALIST TOTALS BY PROGRAM

	TOTAL OF SPECIALISTS IN STATE	SPECIALISTS IN DETROIT		OUTSTATE SPECIALISTS	
		N	% OF TOTAL	N	% OF TOTAL
ART	545.2	120	22.0%	425.2	78.0%
VOCAL MUSIC	722.9	126	17.4%	596.9	82.6%
BAND	340.7	42	12.3%	298.7	87.7%
ORCHESTRA	142.9	25	17.5%	117.9	82.5%
DRAMA	1.5	0	0	1.5	100%
DANCE	0	0	0	0	0
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	1023.7	370	36.1%	653.7	63.9%
GUIDANCE COUNSELING	172	92	53.5%	80	46.5%

Declining enrollments and shrinking revenues seem to affect the districts with the least amount of flexibility in their budgets the hardest. These districts are generally the smallest or ones that are highly dependent on the formula based aid from the state.

To gauge the effect of district size on the presence of programs, a comparison was made of these two factors. The districts reporting data were divided into four categories according to enrollment. The categories were: districts having an elementary enrollment of 33 to 999, N = 253, ones having enrollments of 1000 to 1999, N = 107; ones having enrollment of 2000 to 3999, N = 50; and the largest districts having from 4,000 to 93,844 elementary students, N = 27. A cross tabulation was made yielding the results shown in Table 4.13.

For the three types of programs employing the greatest number of specialists, i.e. Art, Vocal Music and Physical Education, the results were dramatically consistent, showing a perfect linear relationship. Beginning from the smallest district category through the largest in the area of Art, the percentages for districts having art programs were 30.8%, 41.5%, 64.0% and 77.8% respectively. When the two smallest categories (N = 360) and the two largest categories (N = 77) are grouped, the percentages are 33.6% of the districts having enrollments from 33 to 1999, and 68.8% for the districts having from 2000 to 93,844 students respectively. These results clearly show the advantage of enrollment size when it comes to supporting an Art program.

Table 4.13
CROSS TABULATIONS OF THE PRESENCE OF PROGRAMS
BY DISTRICT SIZE

DISTRICT SIZE ACCORDING TO ELEMENTARY ENROLLMENT

			33 to 999 (253)	1000 to 1999 (107)	2000 to 3999 (50)	4000 to 93,844 (27)
ART	Have a program	N	77	44	32	21
		COL. PCT	30.8%	41.5%	64.0%	77.8%
	Do not have a program	N	173	62	18	6
		COL. PCT	69.2%	58.5%	36.0%	22.2%
VOCAL MUSIC	Have a program	N	145	71	34	23
		COL. PCT	57.5%	66.4%	68.0%	85.2%
	Do not have a program	N	107	36	16	4
		COL. PCT.	42.5%	33.6%	32.0%	14.8%
INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC	Have a program	N	158	60	32	20
		COL. PCT.	62.5%	56.1%	64.0%	76.9%
	Do not have a program	N	95	47	18	6
		COL. PCT	37.5%	43.9%	36.0%	23.1%
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	Have a program	N	155	74	36	21
		COL. PCT	61.3%	69.2%	72.0%	77.8%
	Do not have a program	N	98	33	14	6
		COL. PCT	38.7%	30.8%	28.0%	22.2%
GUIDANCE COUNSELING	Have a program	N	33	16	3	3
		COL. PCT	13.3%	15.2%	6.1%	11.5%
	Do not have a program	N	216	89	46	23
		COL. PCT	86.7%	84.8%	93.9%	88.5%

The percentages for districts having Vocal Music programs when ranking the categories from the smaller districts to the large, are 57.5%, 66.4%, 68.0% and 85.2% respectively. These percentages show a flatter distribution and reflect the higher total percentages found in the Vocal Music area. When grouped the two smaller enrollment categories show a 60% margin and the two larger district categories indicate a 74% margin. Again, the larger the district, the more likely it is to find a Vocal Music program.

Physical Education percentages show an increased evenness in the distribution with 61.3%, 69.2%, 72.0% and 77.8% respectively. A grouping of the smaller district categories and the larger ones yields percentages of 63.6% and 74.0% respectively. Larger districts again are more likely to have Physical Education.

For programs in Instrumental Music and Guidance Counseling, the data are not as consistent.

Instrumental Music shows a general trend toward the patterns found in Art, Vocal Music and Physical Education, but reverses the middle two categories. The percentages; 62.5%, 56.1%, 64.0% and 76.9% respectively show a deviation downward in the second category but conform to the pattern when grouped. Grouping yields a 60.6% figure for the two smaller district categories and a 71.4% figure for the districts having elementary enrollments of 2000 and more.

Guidance Counseling does not conform to the pattern producing percentages of 13.3%, 15.2%, 6.1% and 11.5% respectively. The

comparatively low N and the nature of the counseling program probably has some effect on the figures but the existing data do not clearly indicate what that effect may be. Further study of this and perhaps other factors such as district S.E.V., millages and state aid could be explored in this area.

While the numbers of programs in the various district size categories provide some evidence of the location, only Art and Vocal Music provided significant relationship in terms of the alpha level set. Table 4.14 is a summary of the significance levels found in these comparisons.

A comparison between the factor of formula state aid and the presence of the various programs was also made. Tables 4.15 through 4.19 show the results of those cross tabulations.

In an effort to report the complete data for the cross tabulations in this study, the following table was designed.

The example below is an explanation of that design.

EXPLANATION OF 2x2 CROSS TABULATION TABLES

KEY	
Programs Cross tabulated	1
Number of Districts Reporting(N). . .	2
Row Percentages	3
Column Percentages	4
Percent of Total N	5
Row Totals	6
Column Totals	7
Total N	8

		1.		
		Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	TOTALS
1.	Have a Program	2	2	6
	Do not Have a Program	2	2	6
TOTALS		7	7	8

The table includes marginal percentages: Row percentages (40% for 'Have a Program', 60% for 'Do not Have a Program') and Column percentages (50% for both columns). The center cells (5, 5) are circled, representing 62.5% of the total N (8).

Table 4.14

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR DISTRICT SIZE AND PROGRAMS

	N	χ^2 with 3 df	Significance
ART	433	36.91	.0000
VOCAL MUSIC	436	9.91	.0194
INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC	436	4.15	.2452*
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	437	5.37	.1464*
GUIDANCE COUNSELING	429	2.60	.4582*

*not significant at .05 level

All 2 x 2 cross tabulations will also report the PHI coefficient and the observed and expected values for each cell.

Table 4.15 is the cross tabulation of the variable for the presence of an Art program and whether or not a district receives formula state aid. 330 districts receive the aid based on a formula which includes the S.E.V. of the district, the per pupil expenditure and the millage levied in that district. It is designed to alleviate a portion of the discrepancies between the tax bases of school districts. 199 districts are "out of formula" and receive no such aid.

Since both variables are independent of each other, the χ^2 test was used to measure the interrelationships between the two. In all such comparisons in this study, the significance level was set at $\alpha = 0.05$ and shall be assumed throughout the remaining discussion of the findings.

The frequencies and percentages of the cross tabulation yielded a χ^2 value of 27.52 with one degree of freedom, ($N = 429$), and a significance of .0000. The PHI value was .258, indicating the strongest relationship of the six areas. Therefore, it can be assumed that there is a significant relationship between the factors of formula state aid and the presence of Art programs at the elementary level.

When Vocal Music programs were compared to state aid, a similar result was found. Table 4.16 displays the findings

Table 4.15

CROSS TABULATIONS: STATE AID BY PRESENCE OF PROGRAM

1. State Aid by Art	ART		TOTALS
	Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	
Receive Formula State Aid	94 31.6%	203 68.4%	297 69.2%
State Aid	54.7%	47.3%	79.0%
Do not Receive Formula State Aid	78 45.3%	54 21.0%	132 30.8%
TOTALS	172 40.1%	257 59.9%	429 100%

$\chi^2 = 27.52$ with one degree of freedom
Significant at the .05 level

	ART	
	Have	Don't Have
Receive Formula State Aid	N= 94 Observed 21.9% Expected 27.7%	N= 203 Observed 47.3% Expected 41.5%
Do not Receive Formula State Aid	N= 78 Observed 18.2% Expected 12.4%	N= 54 Observed 12.6% Expected 18.4%

Observed and Expected
Values by Cell.

PHI = .258

Table 4.16

CROSS TABULATIONS: STATE AID BY PRESENCE OF PROGRAM

2. State Aid by Vocal Music	Vocal Music		TOTALS
	Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	
Receive Formula State Aid	170 57.0%	128 43.0%	298 69.0%
State Aid	62.7%	29.6%	79.5%
Do not Receive Formula State Aid	101 37.3%	33 7.6%	134 31.0%
	75.4%	24.6%	
TOTALS	271 62.7%	161 37.3%	432 100%

$\chi^2 = 12.50$ with one degree of freedom
Significant at the .05 level

	Vocal Music	
	Have	Don't Have
Receive Formula State Aid	N= 170 Observed 39.4% Expected 43.3%	N= 128 Observed 29.6% Expected 25.7%
State Aid Do not Receive Formula State Aid	N= 101 Observed 23.4% Expected 19.4%	N= 33 Observed 7.6% Expected 11.6%

Observed and Expected
Values by Cell.

PHI = .175

which indicate a χ^2 value of 12.50 with one degree of freedom, (N = 432), and a significance value of .0004. The PHI value of .175 shows a somewhat less robust relationship when compared to Art. Again, the statistical evidence does show a significant relationship between Vocal Music programs and state aid.

Programs in Instrumental Music and their relationship to state aid are reported in Table 4.17. The χ^2 value was 1.68 with one degree of freedom, (N = 432), with a significance of .1953. Based on our α of .05, the relationship was not significant at that level.

The cross tabulation of Drama and state aid is shown in Table 4.18. The relationship was not significant as the figures indicate.

When state aid was compared to Physical Education in Table 4.19, the results showed a significant relationship which closely paralleled the one found for Vocal Music. The χ^2 value was 12.58 with one degree of freedom with a significance of .0004 (N = 433). This similarity between Vocal Music and Physical Education found in these comparisons lends weight to the theory of their relationship in the elementary curriculum put forth earlier in this chapter.

Guidance Counseling and state aid produced a non-significant relationship as Table 4.20 indicates.

Table 4.17

CROSS TABULATIONS: STATE AID BY PRESENCE OF PROGRAM

3. State Aid by Instrumental Music	Instrumental Music		TOTALS
	Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	
Receive Formula State Aid	177 59.6%	120 40.4%	297 68.8%
State Aid	66.3%	27.8%	
Do not Receive Formula State Aid	90 33.7%	45 10.4%	135 31.3%
	66.7%	33.3%	
TOTALS	267 61.8%	165 38.2%	432 100%

$\chi^2 = 1.68$ with one degree of freedom
Not significant at .05 level

	Instrumental Music	
	Have	Don't Have
Receive Formula State Aid	N= 177 Observed 41.0% Expected 42.5%	N= 120 Observed 27.8% Expected 26.3%
Do not Receive Formula State Aid	N= 90 Observed 20.8% Expected 19.3%	N= 45 Observed 10.4% Expected 12.0%

Observed and Expected
Values by Cell.

PHI = .067

Table 4.18

CROSS TABULATIONS: STATE AID BY PRESENCE OF PROGRAM

		Drama		TOTALS
		Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	
4. State Aid by Drama				
		0.7%	99.3%	
Receive Formula State Aid	2		296	298 68.8%
State Aid	100%	.5%	68.4%	
	0.0%	0.0%	31.2%	
Do not Receive Formula State Aid	0		135	135 31.2%
		0.0%	100%	
TOTALS	2 .5		431 99.5%	433 100%

$\chi^2 = .04$ with one degree of freedom
Not significant at the .05 level

	Drama	
	Have	Don't Have
	N= 2	N= 296
Receive Formula State Aid	Observed .5%	Observed 68.4%
	Expected .3%	Expected 68.5%
State Aid	N= 0	N= 135
Do not Receive Formula State Aid	Observed 0.0%	Observed 31.2%
	Expected 0.2%	Expected 31.0%

Observed and Expected
Values by Cell.

PHI = .046

Table 4.19

CROSS TABULATIONS: STATE AID BY PRESENCE OF PROGRAM

5. State Aid by Physical Education	Physical Education		TOTALS
	Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	
Receive Formula State Aid	178 59.7%	120 40.3%	298 68.8%
State Aid	62.9%	27.7%	80.0%
Do not Receive Formula State Aid	105 37.1%	30 6.9%	135 31.2%
	77.8%	22.2%	
TOTALS	283 65.4%	150 34.6%	433 100%

$\chi^2 = 12.58$ with one degree of freedom
Significant at the .05 level

	Physical Education	
	Have	Don't Have
Receive Formula State Aid	N= 178 Observed 41.1% Expected 45.0%	N= 120 Observed 27.7% Expected 23.8%
Do not Receive Formula State Aid	N= 105 Observed 24.2% Expected 20.4%	N= 30 Observed 6.9% Expected 10.8%

Observed and Expected
Values by Cell.

PHI = .176

Table 4.20

CROSS TABULATIONS: STATE AID BY PRESENCE OF PROGRAM

6. State Aid by Guidance Counseling	Guidance Counseling		TOTALS
	Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	
Receive Formula State Aid	33	260	293 68.9%
State Aid	60.0%	70.3%	
Do not Receive Formula State Aid	22	110	132 31.1%
	40.0%	29.7%	
TOTALS	55 12.9%	370 87.1%	425 100%

$\chi^2 = 1.90$ with one degree of freedom
Not significant at the .05 level

	Guidance Counseling	
	Have	Don't Have
Receive Formula State Aid	N= 33 Observed 7.8% Expected 8.9%	N= 260 Observed 61.2% Expected 60.0%
State Aid Do not Receive Formula State Aid	N= 22 Observed 5.2% Expected 4.0%	N= 110 Observed 25.9% Expected 27.1%

Observed and Expected
Values by Cell.

PHI = .075

Table 4.21 is provided as a summary of the significance levels for the 6 cross tabulations of the presence of programming and the factor of formula state aid.

Table 4.21
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR CROSS TABULATION
OF STATE FORMULA AID AND THE PRESENCE OF PROGRAMS

	ART	VOCAL MUSIC	INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC	DRAMA	PHYSICAL EDUCATION	GUIDANCE COUNSELING
State Formula Aid	.0000	.0004	.1953*	.8501*	.0004	.1677*

*Not significant at .05 level

In order to identify where the districts fit in terms of their size and who gets state aid, a cross tabulation was run between these two factors. The results, reported in Table 4.22, indicate a non-significant relationship but provide some clarification in terms of the number of districts reporting state aid in the 4 groupings used in Table 4.13.

In an effort to establish any relationships between the presence of programming patterns in the districts, cross tabulations were run for the variables of Art, Vocal Music, Instrumental Music, Physical Education and Guidance Counseling. Tables 4.23 through 4.33 reflect those findings.

Table 4.22
COMPARISON OF DISTRICT ENROLLMENT
SIZE AND FORMULA AID STATUS

District Size According To Elementary Enrollment

		Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
		33 to 999 N=252	1000 to 1999 N=105	2000 to 3999 N=49	4000 to 93,844 N=27
Districts Receiving Formula State Aid	N	171	75	37	15
	COL %	67.9%	71.4%	75.5%	55.6%
Districts Not Receiving Formula State Aid	N	81	30	12	12
	COL %	32.1%	28.6%	24.5%	44.4%

$\chi^2 = 2.67$ with 3 degrees of freedom
Significance = .2984
Not significant at .05 level

As with the previous 2 x 2 cross tabulation, the format used in the tables is of a special design to include all of the data in a visually intelligible way. The χ^2 values and the observed and expected values for each cell are also provided along with the PHI value to indicate the robustness of the relationship. A summary of the significance levels is found in Table 4.33.

Table 4.23 indicates the relationship of Art programs to Vocal Music Programs. The χ^2 of 108.52 with one degree of freedom, (N = 432) produced an extremely high significance of 0 (beyond .0000). The PHI value of .506 showed a strength of relationship that was exceeded only by Vocal Music and Physical Education.

When the presence of Art programs was compared to the presence of Instrumental Music programs in Table 4.24, the relationship was again significant though lacking the strength of the previous comparison. The χ^2 value was 20.82 with one degree of freedom (N = 432) and yielded a significance of .0000. A PHI of .224 showed a fairly strong relationship between these two factors.

Art was also significantly related to the presence of Physical Education programs as shown in Table 4.25. The χ^2 value was 96.87 with one degree of freedom, (N = 433), and the significance was .0000. The PHI value was the third highest of the 10 comparisons at .478.

Guidance Counseling and Art programs are reported in Table 4.26. The χ^2 value was 4.21 with one degree of freedom, (N = 425),

Table 4.23
CROSS TABULATION BY PROGRAM
ACCORDING TO DISTRICT COUNT

1. Art by Vocal Music		Vocal Music		TOTALS
		Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	
ART		92.5%	7.5%	
	Have a Program	161	13	174 (40.3%)
		37.3%	3.0%	
	Do not Have a Program	110	148	258 (59.7%)
TOTALS		271 (62.7%)	161 (37.3%)	432 (100%)

$\chi^2 = 108.52$ with 1 degree of freedom
Significant at the .05 level

		Vocal Music	
		Have	Don't Have
ART	Have	N= 161 Observed 37.3% Expected 25.3%	N= 13 Observed 3.0% Expected 15.0%
	Don't Have	N= 110 Observed 25.5% Expected 37.4%	N= 148 Observed 34.3% Expected 22.3%

Observed and Expected
Values by Cell.

PHI = .506

Table 4.24
CROSS TABULATION BY PROGRAM
ACCORDING TO DISTRICT COUNT

		Instrumental Music		TOTALS
		Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	
ART	2. Art by Instrumental Music			
		75.1%	24.9%	
	Have a Program	130	43	173 (40.0%)
	Do not Have a Program	137	122	259 (60.0%)
TOTALS		267 (61.8%)	165 (38.2%)	432 (100%)

Observed and Expected Values by Cell:

ART	Instrumental Music	Observed	Expected
Have a Program	Have a Program	30.1%	24.7%
Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	10.0%	15.3%
Do not Have a Program	Have a Program	31.7%	37.1%
Do not Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	28.2%	22.9%

$\chi^2 = 20.82$ with 1 degree of freedom
Significant at the .05 level

		Instrumental Music	
		Have	Don't Have
ART	Have	N= 130 Observed 30.1% Expected 24.7%	N= 43 Observed 10.0% Expected 15.3%
	Don't Have	N= 137 Observed 31.7% Expected 37.1%	N= 122 Observed 28.2% Expected 22.9%

Observed and Expected
Values by Cell.

PHI = .224

Table 4.25
CROSS TABULATION BY PROGRAM
ACCORDING TO DISTRICT COUNT

		Physical Education		TOTALS
		Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	
3. Art by Physical Education		93.1%	6.9%	
	Have a Program	162	12	174 (40.2%)
	ART	57.2%	2.8%	8.0%
	Do not Have a Program	121	138	259 (59.8%)
TOTALS		283 (65.4%)	150 (34.6%)	433 (100%)

$\chi^2 = 96.87$ with 1 degree of freedom
Significant at the .05 level

		Physical Education	
		Have	Don't Have
ART	Have	N= 162 Observed 37.4% Expected 26.3%	N= 12 Observed 2.8% Expected 13.9%
	Don't Have	N= 121 Observed 27.9% Expected 39.1%	N= 138 Observed 31.9% Expected 20.7%

Observed and Expected
Values by Cell.

PHI = .478

Table 4.26
CROSS TABULATION BY PROGRAM
ACCORDING TO DISTRICT COUNT

		Guidance Counseling		TOTALS
		Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	
ART	4. Art by Guidance Counseling			
		17.1%	82.9%	
	Have a Program	29	141	170 (40.0%)
	Do not Have a Program	25	230	255 (60.0%)
TOTALS		54 (12.7%)	371 (87.3%)	425 (100%)

$\chi^2 = 4.21$ with 1 degree of freedom
Significant at the .05 level

		Guidance Counseling	
		Have	Don't Have
ART	Have	N= 29 Observed 6.8% Expected 5.1%	N= 141 Observed 32.2% Expected 34.9%
	Don't Have	N= 25 Observed 5.9% Expected 7.6%	N= 230 Observed 54.1% Expected 52.4%

Observed and Expected
Values by Cell.

PHI = .107

and the relationship was significant with a .0402 level calculated. As might be assumed, the PHI value was lower at .107.

The fifth comparison was made between Vocal Music and Instrumental Music and is provided in Table 4.27. The value for χ^2 was 12.44 with one degree of freedom ($N = 435$), which produced a significance of .0004. A PHI of .174 was produced.

The relationship between Vocal Music and Physical Education, reported in Table 4.28, was the strongest of the 10 recorded. The χ^2 value was 128.59 with one degree of freedom, ($N = 436$), and the significance was 0 (beyond .0000). The PHI value of .548 again adds credence to the speculation concerning the relationship of these programs to a scheduling pattern that is used as a "best fit" for classroom teacher's break time.

The seventh comparison was made between Vocal Music and Guidance Counseling and is reported in Table 4.29. The χ^2 value was 11.36 with one degree of freedom, ($N = 428$), and the significance was .0008. The relationship was significant and the PHI was .170.

Instrumental Music and Physical Education, as shown in Table 4.30, provided yet another significant relationship. The value for χ^2 was 20.81 with one degree of freedom, ($N = 436$), yielding a significance of .0000. PHI was .223.

Instrumental Music and Guidance Counseling was the only non-significant relationship found in this set of comparisons.

Table 4.27
CROSS TABULATION BY PROGRAM
ACCORDING TO DISTRICT COUNT

		Instrumental Music		TOTALS
5. Vocal Music by Instrumental Music		Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	
VOCAL MUSIC		68.4%	31.6%	
	Have a Program	186	86	272 (62.5%)
		42.8%	19.8%	
	Do not Have a Program	83	80	163 (37.5%)
TOTALS		269 (61.8%)	166 (38.2%)	435 (100%)

$\chi^2 = 12.44$ with 1 degree of freedom
Significant at the .05 level

		Instrumental Music	
		Have	Don't Have
VOCAL MUSIC	Have	N= 186 Observed 42.8% Expected 38.6%	N= 86 Observed 19.8% Expected 23.9%
	Don't Have	N= 83 Observed 19.1% Expected 23.2%	N= 80 Observed 18.4% Expected 14.3%

Observed and Expected
Values by Cell.

PHI = .174

Table 4.28
CROSS TABULATION BY PROGRAM
ACCORDING TO DISTRICT COUNT

		Physical Education		TOTALS
		Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	
6. Vocal Music by Physical Education		85.7%	14.3%	
	Have a Program	234	39	273 (62.6%)
	Do not Have a Program	52	111	163 (37.4%)
	TOTALS	286 (65.6%)	150 (34.4%)	436 (100%)

VOCAL MUSIC		53.7%	26.0%
		11.9%	25.5%

VOCAL MUSIC	81.8%		26.0%
	18.2%		74.0%

$\chi^2 = 128.59$ with 1 degree of freedom
Significant at the .05 level

		Physical Education	
		Have	Don't Have
VOCAL MUSIC	Have	N= 234 Observed 53.7% Expected 41.1%	N= 39 Observed 8.9% Expected 21.5%
	Don't Have	N= 52 Observed 11.9% Expected 24.5%	N= 111 Observed 25.5% Expected 12.9%

Observed and Expected
Values by Cell.

PHI = .548

Table 4.29
CROSS TABULATION BY PROGRAM
ACCORDING TO DISTRICT COUNT

		Guidance Counseling		TOTALS
		Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	
7. Vocal Music by Guidance Counseling		17.3%	82.7%	
	Have a Program	46	220	266 (62.1%)
		83.6%	59.0%	
	Do not Have a Program	9	153	162 (37.9%)
		5.6%	94.4%	
	TOTALS	55 (12.9%)	373 (87.1%)	428 (100%)

$\chi^2 = 11.36$ with 1 degree of freedom
Significant at the .05 level

		Guidance Counseling	
		Have	Don't Have
VOCAL MUSIC	Have	N= 46 Observed 10.7% Expected 8.0%	N= 220 Observed 51.4% Expected 54.1%
	Don't Have	N= 9 Observed 2.1% Expected 4.9%	N= 153 Observed 35.7% Expected 33.0%

Observed and Expected
Values by Cell.

PHI = .170

Table 4.30
CROSS TABULATION BY PROGRAM
ACCORDING TO DISTRICT COUNT

		Physical Education		TOTALS
8. Instrumental Music by Physical Education		Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	
		73.7%	26.3%	
Have a Program	199	71	270 (61.9%)	
INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC		45.6%	16.3%	
		19.7%	18.3%	
Do not Have a Program	86	80	166 (38.1%)	
		51.8%	48.2%	
TOTALS	285 (65.4%)	151 (34.6%)	436 (100%)	

$\chi^2 = 20.81$ with 1 degree of freedom
Significant at the .05 level

		Physical Education	
		Have	Don't Have
INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC	Have	N= 199	N= 71
		Observed 45.6%	Observed 16.3%
	Don't Have	Expected 40.5%	Expected 21.4%
		N= 86	N= 80
	Have	Observed 19.7%	Observed 18.3%
	Don't Have	Expected 24.9%	Expected 13.2%

Observed and Expected
Values by Cell.

PHI = .223

Table 4.31
CROSS TABULATION BY PROGRAM
ACCORDING TO DISTRICT COUNT

		Guidance Counseling		TOTALS
9. Instrumental Music by Guidance Counseling		Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	
INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC		15.5%	84.5%	
	Have a Program	41	223	264 (61.7%)
	Do not Have a Program	14	150	164 (38.3%)
	TOTALS	55 (12.9%)	373 (87.1%)	428 (100%)

		Guidance Counseling		
		Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	
INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC		15.5%	84.5%	
	Have a Program	41	223	264 (61.7%)
	Do not Have a Program	14	150	164 (38.3%)
	TOTALS	55 (12.9%)	373 (87.1%)	428 (100%)

		Guidance Counseling		
		Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	
INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC		15.5%	84.5%	
	Have a Program	41	223	264 (61.7%)
	Do not Have a Program	14	150	164 (38.3%)
	TOTALS	55 (12.9%)	373 (87.1%)	428 (100%)

$\chi^2 = 3.82$ with 1 degree of freedom
Not significant at the .05 level

		Guidance Counseling	
		Have	Don't Have
INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC	Have	N= 41 Observed 9.6% Expected 8.0%	N= 223 Observed 52.1% Expected 53.7%
	Don't Have	N= 14 Observed 3.3% Expected 4.9%	N= 150 Observed 35.0% Expected 33.4%

Observed and Expected
Values by Cell.

PHI = .102

The χ^2 value was 3.82 with one degree of freedom, (N = 428), and the significance was only .0008 beyond the α set at .05* or .0508. PHI was calculated at .102.

The final cross tabulation was between Physical Education and Guidance Counseling in Table 4.32. The relationship was significant using the given α level. The χ^2 value was 4.30 with one degree of freedom, (N = 429), and the significance was .0381. The value for PHI was .107.

Table 4.33 is a summary of the significance of the 10 comparisons. Guidance Counseling and Instrumental Music provided the only non significant relationship. Guidance Counseling was also the only program that registered consistent χ^2 values beyond the .0004 range therefore showing a weaker relationship.

From the comparisons made, there is an almost consistently high relationship among specialist directed programs in Michigan's public elementary schools. That is to say that these individual programs are usually found in the presence of other specialist directed programs. Schools with programs tend to have other programs at the given incidence whereas the schools listed in the fourth cell of the cross tabulations are probably the schools with consistently no program offerings at all.

Section VIII of the survey instrument asks general questions about the changes in programming levels over a five year period,

Table 4.32
CROSS TABULATION BY PROGRAM
ACCORDING TO DISTRICT COUNT

		Guidance Counseling		TOTALS
10. Physical Education by Guidance Counseling		Have a Program	Do not Have a Program	
PHYSICAL EDUCATION		15.5%	84.5%	
	Have a Program	43	235	278 (64.8%)
		78.2%	62.8%	
	Do not Have a Program	12	139	151 (35.2%)
		21.8%	37.2%	
TOTALS		55 (12.8%)	374 (87.2%)	429 (100%)
		7.9%	92.1%	

$\chi^2 = 4.30$ with 1 degree of freedom
Significant at the .05 level

		Guidance Counseling	
		Have	Don't Have
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	Have	N= 43	N= 235
		Observed 10.0%	Observed 54.8%
	Don't Have	Expected 8.3%	Expected 56.5%
		N= 12	N= 139
		Observed 2.8%	Observed 32.4%
		Expected 4.5%	Expected 30.7%

Observed and Expected
Values by Cell.

PHI = .107

Table 4.33
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR
CROSS TABULATIONS OF PROGRAM OFFERINGS

	ART	VOCAL MUSIC	INSTRUMEN- TAL MUSIC	PHYSICAL EDUCATION	GUIDANCE COUNSELING
ART	----				
VOCAL MUSIC	.0000	----			
INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC	.0000	.0004	----		
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	.0000	.0000	.0000	----	
GUIDANCE COUNSELING	.0402	.0008	.0508*	.0381	----

*not significant at the .05 level

perceptions about the reasons for change, and some forecasts about the future of the programming. The respondents were asked to provide their knowledge of the history of the changes and their opinions about them. The results are provided in Tables 4.34 through 4.39.

Data for the tables are presented in frequencies of responses and reported in the number and percentage of the response. Table 4.34 also supplies the percentages in terms of the total number of respondents in the survey (437) which is labeled as the relative frequency, and the percent of those actually responding to the question which is labeled as the adjusted frequency. Because there was no specific opportunity provided to indicate a static or no-change condition, it is assumed that the lack of response indicates that condition.

1. Please indicate if any of the following elementary programs have either grown, been cut-back or eliminated in your district over the last 5 years.

Table 4.34 presents the data from Question 1.

According to the responses, 230 (52.7%) do not report changes in programming in Art. Thirty four districts or 7.8% of the total sample report growth, 58 districts (13.3%) report cuts in programs, and 115 (26.3%) report the complete loss of Art from the elementary level.

Table 4.34

Frequencies of Responses for Question 1 in Section VIII

1. Please indicate if any of the following elementary programs have either grown, been cut-back, or eliminated in your district over the last 5 years.

		Growth	Cut Back	Eliminated	Static or no Response	Totals
ART	N	34	58	115	230	437
	REL.FREQ.%	7.8%	13.3%	26.3%	52.7%	(100)%
	ADJ.FREQ.%	16.4%	28.0%	55.6%	----	100%
VOCAL MUSIC	N	40	93	112	192	437
	REL.FREQ.%	9.2%	21.3%	25.6%	43.9%	100%
	ADJ.FREQ.%	16.3%	38.0%	45.7%	----	100%
INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC	N	26	69	65	277	437
	REL.FREQ.%	5.9%	15.8%	14.9%	63.4%	100%
	ADJ.FREQ.%	16.2%	43.1%	40.6%	----	(100)%
DRAMA	N	5	2	9	421	437
	REL.FREQ.%	1.1%	.5%	2.1%	96.3%	100%
	ADJ.FREQ.%	31.3%	12.5%	56.3%	----	(100)%
DANCE	N	1	1	9	426	437
	REL.FREQ.%	.2%	.2%	2.1%	97.5%	100%
	ADJ.FREQ.%	9.1%	9.1%	81.8%	----	100%
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	N	37	98	100	202	437
	REL.FREQ.%	8.5%	22.4%	22.9%	46.3%	(100)%
	ADJ.FREQ.%	15.7%	41.7%	42.5%	----	(100)%
GUIDANCE COUNSELING	N	18	24	52	343	437
	REL.FREQ.%	4.1%	5.5%	11.9%	78.5%	100%
	ADJ.FREQ.%	19.1%	25.5%	55.3%	----	(100)%

REL.FREQ% = % of total N

ADJ.FREQ.% = % of (N minus static or no response), or respondents only.

Vocal Music saw a 9.2% or 40 district growth in programs over the past five years, but also suffered a 21.3% (93 districts) cut-back in programs and saw 112 programs (25.6%) eliminated in Michigan.

Instrumental Music programs grew in 26 districts (5.9%), but were cut-back in 69 (15.8%) and eliminated in 65 (14.9%).

Drama programs were increased in 5 districts (1.1%), cut-back in 2 (.5%) and vanished in 9 (2.1%).

Dance programs were increased in only one district, cut-back in 1 and eliminated in 9.

Physical Education saw increases in 37 districts (8.5%) partial losses in 98 (22.4%) and the elimination of programs in 100 districts (22.9%).

Guidance Counseling programs grew in 18 districts (4.1%) but were cut back in 24 (5.5%) and eliminated in 52 (11.9%).

When compared to Kenney's study in 1977, the figures seem to be in agreement after making adjustments for the growth and decline over the 6 year period that separates the two studies. Minor differences are partially explainable by the fact that the question assumed, though it did not explicitly specify, that the programs reported should be directed by a specialist in the particular areas in question.

The second question asked of the respondents in Section VIII was:

2. If programs have grown in the last 5 years, what can you identify as the major factors in their growth?

The respondents were asked to rank order their answers according to importance. Many chose to rank different responses equally. Table 4.35 represents the results of the findings reported by frequency of response. The median response is also provided.

The question offered 7 possible explanations to choose from and provided 2 blank spaces for additional ones. Explanations added to the survey form are provided at the end of the description of this table.

Administrative leadership received the most responses as well as the greatest number of priority one rankings, 59 and 28 respectively. The second most often marked reason was good communication, to and from the program with numbers of 47 and 20 respectively. A close third reason was that the program is seen as part of the basic curriculum in that district, accumulating 46 total responses with 20 being marked as a first choice.

The next four rankings included: the "district was financially sound" with totals of 41 and 18, "strong program staff" with totals of 37 and 11, "strong parent advocacy", 35 and 14, and "good integration of the program to the system" receiving 25 total responses and 5 first rankings. The table provides the detailed breakdowns.

Table 4.35

Frequencies of Responses for Question 2 in Section VIII

2. If programs have grown in the last 5 years, what can you identify as the major factors in their growth.

Priority Ranking

Possible Responses		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Tot.
Good communication between the program, staff, parents administrators and community. Median, 1.850	N	20	10	8	4	3	2		47
	%	42.6%	21.3%	17.0%	8.5%	6.4%	4.3%		100%
Program is integrated with other subject matter and staff. Median, 5.583	N	5	5	1	1	6	6	1	25
	%	20.0%	20.0%	4.0%	4.0%	24.0%	24.0%	4.0%	100%
Strong parent advocacy. Median, 2.600	N	14	3	5	2	5	4	2	35
	%	40.0%	8.6%	14.3%	5.7%	14.3%	11.4%	5.7%	100%
Program is seen as part of the basic curriculum. Median, 2.1	N	20	5	5	9	4	1	2	46
	%	43.5%	10.9%	10.9%	19.6%	8.7%	2.2%	4.3%	100%
Strong program staff. Median, 2.438	N	11	8	3	6	6	3		37
	%	29.7%	21.6%	8.1%	16.2%	16.2%	8.1%		100%
District is financially sound. Median, 1.917	N	18	6	5	6	2	4		41
	%	43.9%	14.6%	12.2%	14.6%	4.9%	9.8%		100%
Administrative leadership. Median, 1.579	N	28	19	5	2	1	3	1	59
	%	47.5%	32.2%	8.5%	3.4%	1.7%	5.1%	1.7%	100%

Other reasons added to the form in order of priority were:

1. Contractual or Union considerations (5)
2. Provides break time for classroom teachers (4)
3. Personnel available for assignment (1)
4. Strong staff advocacy (1)
5. Chapter I funds (1)
6. Student need (1)
7. Opened new building (1)

This question provided some explanation of why programs have grown. Though all the specific programs were grouped under the general heading of "programs" the reasons for the growth of one would be equally appropriate for any. As with all of the perceptions listed here, the reader is reminded that the source (elementary principals) should be considered when evaluating the responses.

The third question was the antithesis of the second:

3. If programs have either been cut back or eliminated in the last 5 years, which combination of the following might best describe your district's rationale for deciding to cut or eliminate.

Again the respondents were asked to rank order their responses.

Table 4.36 indicates the response patterns for Question 3 of Section VIII.

The overwhelming choice of the principals for this question was the reason of "budget cuts". With a total response rate of 282, 97.9% or 276 of which were marked number one, there can be little cause to suspect any other reason for the decline or elimination of programs according to the elementary principals.

Table 4.36

Frequencies of Responses for Question 3 in Section VIII

3. If programs have either been cut-back or eliminated in the last 5 years, which combination of the following might best describe your district's rationale for deciding to cut or eliminate.

Priority Ranking

Possible Responses		1	2	3	4	5	6	TOT.
Area not essential to basics curriculum. Median, 2.286	N	7	35	13	3	4	7	69
	%	10.1%	50.7%	18.8%	4.3%	5.8%	10.1%	100%
Lack of district commitment to program. Median, 2.452	N	7	31	28	4	3		73
	%	9.6%	42.5%	38.4%	5.5%	4.1%		100%
Budget cuts. Median, 1.011	N	276	4	1	1			282
	%	97.9%	1.4%	.4%	.4%			100%
Lack of community commitment to program. Median, 2.577	N	10	20	13	12	5	2	62
	%	16.1%	32.3%	21.0%	19.4%	8.1%	3.2%	100%
Program did not communicate its reasons for existing. Median, 3.714	N	3	10	5	14	7	3	42
	%	7.1%	23.8%	11.9%	33.3%	16.7%	7.1%	100%
Lack of leadership-coordination for the program. Median, 5.000	N	3		4	5	8	12	32
	%	9.4%		12.5%	15.6%	25.0%	37.5%	100%

But below that reason lies the spector of priorities to be discussed in the final chapter of this study.

The secondary responses begin to identify the problem.

The second most marked reason was "lack of district commitment to program" which garnered 7 first priority responses, 31 second, 28 third and 4 and 3 for fourth and fifth respectively. Close behind was the rationale stating that these programs were "not essential to the basics curriculum" with 69 total responses; 7 first, 35 second, 13 third and 3, 4, and 7 for 4th through 6th place. The fourth most often marked response had a total of 62 and a median of 2.577 and dealt with a "lack of community commitment to the program". The fifth reason of "poor communications" netted 42 responses with a median of 3.714, and the last reason that dealt with a lack of leadership and coordination for the program received 32 responses with a median of 5.0.

Additional responses added to the form were:

1. Loss of enrollment (7)
2. Scheduling problems (2)
3. Less than a full or part time assignment to warrant maintaining the program (2)
4. Poor teacher training (1)

The fourth question in Section VIII asked about advocacy efforts in the face of possible cuts:

4. Assuming that the cuts were made on a curriculum priority basis according to some rational plan, was there an attempt by program advocates to present significant, compelling reasons for not cutting or eliminating these programs?

Table 4.37 indicates the response frequencies.

The ability to articulate a rationale clearly and forcefully to muster the necessary force to maintain programs in a state of budget cut-backs, is an essential skill for a specialist. The data in this table show an interesting pattern. The ordering of the percentages of programs that put forth an effort to protest cuts or elimination, produces a program list which approximates the list for the number of programs in schools.

Physical Education which has the highest number of programs in the state, also seems to be the most active when it comes to defending itself with a 67.3% figure for advocacy efforts. Instrumental and Vocal Music are second and third with 65.5% and 62.2% respectively, followed by Guidance Counseling and Art with figures of 59.4% and 57.7% respectively. Drama and Dance follow the leaders with 12.5% and 8.7% respectively.

All of the programs produced positive advocacy efforts of 57% or better with the exception of Drama and Dance.

The fifth question asked respondents:

5. In your opinion, what would it take to have these programs included as a regular part of the elementary curriculum?

The respondents were asked to rank order their responses which are provided in Table 4.38.

Again the principal ingredient missing in most districts is money. A total of 325 principals indicated that "more money"

Table 4.37

Frequencies of Responses for Question 4 in Section VIII

4. Assuming that the cuts were made on a curriculum priority basis according to some rational plan, was there an attempt by program advocates to present significant, compelling reasons for not cutting or eliminating these programs.

		YES	NO	TOTAL OF RESPONSES
ART	N	90	66	156
	%	57.7%	42.3%	100%
VOCAL MUSIC	N	117	71	188
	%	62.2%	37.8%	100%
INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC	N	76	40	116
	%	65.5%	34.5%	100%
DRAMA	N	3	21	24
	%	12.5%	87.5%	100%
DANCE	N	2	21	23
	%	8.7%	91.3%	100%
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	N	115	55	171
	%	67.3%	32.2%	100%
GUIDANCE COUNSELING	N	41	28	69
	%	59.4%	40.5%	100%

was the most important factor with 282 or 86.8% saying it was of the first priority. As a second rating it received 29 responses and gained 10 as a third priority.

The second most marked category favored a "state mandate" with 148 total responses broken down in the following way: first, 42 or 28.4%; second, 55 or 37.2%; third 21 or 14.2%; and 8 (5.4%) and 22 (14.9%) for 4th and 5th respectively.

"Better awareness and understanding of the need for programs" was a close third with 143 responses and a median of 2.263. The fourth position in terms of response, dealt with "better training for the classroom teacher to assume the delivery of programs" with 97 responses and a median of 3.750 followed by the need for "better integration of the programs into the regular curriculum" with a response rate of 95 and a lower median of 2.263.

Additional responses written in by the respondents included:

1. More student demand
2. More equitable funding from the state
3. More students
4. Longer school day
5. Parent advocacy
6. Need more space
7. Union discontinue using the special program time as a release time bargaining ploy.
8. Positive media coverage
9. State level advocacy

Table 4.38

Frequencies of Responses for Question 5 in Section VIII

5. In your opinion, what would it take to have these programs included as a regular part of the curriculum?

Priority Rank

Possible responses		1	2	3	4	5	6	TOT.
Better understanding or awareness of the need for these programs Median, 2.263	N	28	57	39	14	5	-	143
	%	19.6%	39.9%	27.3%	9.8%	3.5%	-	100%
Better integration of specialist programs into the general curriculum. Median, 3.450	N	4	15	30	34	12	-	95
	%	4.2%	15.8%	31.6%	35.8%	12.6%	-	100%
State mandate. Median, 2.082	N	42	55	21	8	22	-	148
	%	28.4%	37.2%	14.2%	5.4%	14.9%	-	100%
More comprehensive pre-service & inservice training for the classroom teacher to assume the delivery responsibility for these programs. Median, 3.750	N	7	20	16	22	31	1	97
	%	7.2%	20.6%	16.5%	22.7%	32%	1%	100%
More money. Median, 1.076	N	282	29	10	3	1	-	325
	%	86.8%	8.9%	3.1%	.9%	.3%	-	100%

Table 4.39 reports data from the sixth question in Section VIII:

6. Based on the present funding structure for public education, is it likely that your district will be able to support the following specialist directed programs in the future?

The responses are speculation and forecasting to be sure, but provide the study with a look into the future from the perspective of a group that is typically knowledgeable about the politics and economics of the districts involved.

For the areas of Dance and Drama, little hope is held in the future for these as separate components of the elementary curriculum. Not likely, was the response for 97.0% of the respondents for Dance and 95.7% for Drama.

Less pessimism is evidenced in other areas, but only in degree. Of the 303 responses for Art 34% or 105 indicated that they would likely have a program in the next ten years, 4.0% or 12 indicated it would take twenty years and 61.4% of those responding said that Art programs weren't likely in their districts in the future.

With 287 principals responding, 45.6% felt that Vocal Music would likely be a part of their school in the next ten years, 4.2% said it might take twenty years, and 50.2% said it wasn't likely that they could support a program in the future.

Instrumental Music was reported as a likely part of the curriculum within 10 years by 38.7% of the 235 respondents. Only 3.0% saw that happening in twenty years and 58.3% felt it wasn't likely to happen at all.

Table 4.39

Frequencies of Responses for Question 6 in Section VIII

6. Based on the present funding structure for public education, is it likely that your district will be able to support the following specialist directed programs in the future?

		Likely within 10 years	Likely within 20 years	Not likely	Total of responses
ART	N	105	12	186	303
	%	34.7%	4.0%	61.4%	100%
VOCAL MUSIC	N	131	12	144	287
	%	45.6%	4.2%	50.2%	100%
INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC	N	91	7	137	235
	%	38.7%	3.0%	58.3%	100%
DRAMA	N	5	5	221	231
	%	2.2%	2.2%	95.7%	100%
DANCE	N	3	4	223	230
	%	1.3%	1.7%	97.0%	100%
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	N	139	11	133	283
	%	49.1%	3.9%	47.0%	100%
GUIDANCE COUNSELING	N	63	16	185	264
	%	23.9%	6.1%	70.1%	100%

Physical Education was the only subject area to put together a percentage over 50% for the first two categories. Of the 283 responses, 49.1% indicated the likelihood of Physical Education within 10 years and 3.9% said 20 years. The number not likely to have programs at all was 47.0%.

Guidance Counseling was thought of as a likely program in 10 years for 23% of the 264 responding; by 6.1% in twenty years; and 70.1% felt they wouldn't have it at all in the future.

The personal comments of the respondents added another dimension to the data found in Table 4.39. A total of 105 respondents added written comments to the survey which are transcribed in the appendices.

The comments were evaluated on the basis of whether they were generally positive and optimistic in tone, negative or pessimistic or neutral with respect to the conditions present in the district and hopes for the future. Of the 105 total comments, 75 or 71.4% were judged to be negative-pessimistic. Positive-optimistic comments accounted for 25.7% of the total or 27. Comments from 3 of the respondents or 2.9% were judged to be neutral.

Reading the comments provides a sense of the morale of building level administrators and their frustration in dealing with the problems of education. Most alluded to the poor economic position that the districts have been placed in due to a variety of factors. Most decry the state of affairs that denies them

the ability to provide the type of education they would like to see. General comments from the interview process also underscore this feeling of helplessness.

Summary

The study was designed as an appraisal of the status of specialist directed programming at the elementary level in Michigan. The existing levels of programs could then be roughly compared to the levels reported in earlier studies and the changes and the reasons for change could then be evaluated.

The sample for the study was defined as all 529 public school districts in Michigan who offer K-12 programming. It was further delineated to include one elementary principal in each of the 514 districts listing less than 20 elementary buildings and one or more central administrators with responsibility for elementary specialist programming from 15 of the largest districts.

A survey was developed to collect data concerning the curricular areas of Art, Vocal Music, Band, Orchestra, Drama, Dance, Physical Education and Guidance Counseling. The survey also asked questions about the changes in programming over the past five years, some of the perceived reasons for the changes, and questions about the potential of the programs for the future.

The study achieved a return rate of 82.6% and accounted for 92.7% of the elementary enrollment for the state.

Specialist directed programming in the areas of concern was found to have declined from previously reported levels in all categories. The percentage for districts reporting programs in Art was found to be 40.2%. Vocal Music was found in 62.6% of the districts; Band programs were found in 61.9% of the schools; Orchestra programs in 10.5%; Drama in only two districts or .4%; Dance was non-existent; Physical Education had the highest total of 65.4%; and Guidance Counseling was reported in 55 cases or 12.8% of the districts.

The relationship between formula state aid and district size as a factor for the presence or lack of programs was examined. The findings showed a significant positive relationship between state aid and Art, Vocal Music, and Physical Education; and a positive, though not significant correlation between programs in Instrumental Music, Drama and Guidance Counseling.

When the factor of district size was compared to the presence of programs, the areas of Art, Vocal Music and Physical Education demonstrated a good linear progression showing smaller districts were less likely to have programs than the larger ones. The relationship was significant for Art and Vocal Music, but not significant for the others.

The five major programs were also cross tabulated by program to test for significant relationship between them. All comparisons showed significance at the .05 level except Guidance Counseling and Instrumental Music.

Section VIII of the survey asked questions about changes in programming over a five year period and reasons why those changes have occurred. Predictions were also asked about the future of the programming. Findings were reported in frequency of response and showed: the growth, decline and elimination of programs over the past five years; major factors that influenced growth (administrative leadership was the prime factor); factors that governed decline (money was first); the percentage of programs with positive advocacy records; the needs for including these programs (again money); and the predictions about future programming.

Comments added to the surveys were discussed in terms of the respondent's feelings about the future of the programs in their districts.

Throughout the chapter, information from the respondents interviewed via telephone and personal visits by the researcher, was used to provide a context and a ground for the data.

Chapter V will draw conclusions from the data and provide recommendations for the use of it in forming policy and direction for the Department of Education, teacher training institutions, and advocates for the programs examined.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Up until the time of this research, the suspected decline in specialist-directed programs in Michigan's public elementary schools was a matter of sheer speculation based on isolated information from a variety of sources. Professionals in the arts in education could only allude to fragmentary evidence from personal experience or hearsay.

This research has enabled the curricular fields affected to put the problem in more definitive terms. Decisions about how to deal with the problem can now be based on information developed from the reliably high return rate of the survey.

While the completion of this research marks the end of this task, it is hoped that the results will be the beginning point for the next; the task of using it to make these specialist programs a higher priority for Michigan public education.

This chapter will summarize the findings of the study, draw conclusions from it and recommend a course of action to deal with the problems presented. Recommendations will be directed to the Department of Education, Arts advocacy groups, the professional organizations involved, and the teacher education institutions of the state.

Summary

The intended purpose of this study was to: establish the levels of specialist directed programs in Michigan public elementary schools; measure changes in those levels over time; and seek information regarding the reasons for those changes.

A single page (two sided) survey instrument was developed that ask questions in the following categories:

1. Basic district data including enrollment and formula aid status.
2. Levels of programming in Art.
3. Levels of programming in Vocal Music.
4. Levels of programming in Band.
5. Levels of programming in Orchestra.
6. Levels of programming in Drama.
7. Levels of programming in Dance.
8. Levels of programming in Physical Education.
9. Levels of programming in Guidance Counseling.
10. Changes in programming, reasons for change, and the potential for programs in the future.

The survey was distributed to the 529 public school districts in Michigan having full K-12 programs. Of that total, 514 were mailed to specifically named and randomly selected elementary principals, and 15 were personally delivered to central administrators in the districts having 20 or more elementary buildings.

Special consideration was given to the follow-up of non-respondents to achieve the highest return rate possible. The overall return rate of the survey was 82.6% representing approximately 92.7% of the total Michigan elementary student population. During the course of the telephone follow-up procedure and the personal visits, 115 of the respondents were interviewed.

The survey generated 355 variables which were analyzed to reflect the number and nature of programs, relationships between different variables, and frequencies of response.

Conclusions

Specialist directed programs at the elementary level in all categories have declined significantly from the levels established by previous studies. Financial problems at the district and state level were found to be the principal reason for this decline, but it can be reasonable to conclude that these programs also suffer from a low priority status in relation to other programs such as reading, math and language arts.

Table 5.1 represents the percentage of responding districts having programs and the percentages of changes over the last 5 years.

The data from the present survey correlates closely with the data of Kenney's 1977 study which was based on a similar methodology. Using Art as an example, the indicated percentage of elimination was 26.3% of the 53.2% of the districts reporting programs in 1977

Table 5.1: Districts Reporting Programs
and Changes Over Last 5 Years
Reported in Percentages of Responding Districts
N = 437

	Have Programs	Changes in Programming Over the Last 5 Years		
		Growth	Decline	Elimination
Art	40.2	7.8	13.3	26.3
Vocal Music	65.5	9.2	21.3	25.6
Instrumental Music	Band 61.8	5.9	15.8	14.9
	Orch. 10.5			
Drama	.04	1.1	.5	2.1
Dance	0	.2	.2	2.1
Physical Education	65.4	8.5	22.4	22.9
Guidance Counseling	13.0	4.1	5.5	11.9

or 14%. The difference displayed by the comparison of the total percentages of districts having an Art program in 1977 and 1983 was 13%. Due to the high return rate of both studies, it can be inferred that the data provided in this study are a fairly accurate picture of the programming for the entire state.

Band and Orchestra programs were found to be primarily conducted by specialists at the secondary level reflecting a good articulation of programs between the two levels. In most cases they are the same program, in that they are taught by the same person. While no data was gathered about the number of pupils served, information from the interview process indicated that these programs usually serve a small percentage of the enrollment unlike the programs in Art, Vocal Music and Physical Education which usually serve all the students.

Programs in Drama in the two districts reporting specialists were not defined in the data. The logical assumption is that the specialists are in fact consultants to the elementary level on flexible schedules.

Though Dance was reported as a component of Physical Education programs in many districts, it did not exist as a separate specialist-directed program. The conclusion is that, of the programs surveyed, Drama and Dance programs are of the lowest priority with Dance registering last.

Guidance Counseling Programs did not conform to the patterns established by the other programs. Non significant relationships were found when comparing them to district size, formula aid and Instrumental Music. Though comparisons to the other remaining programs were significant, they were closer to non significant levels than any other comparisons. This phenomenon leads to the speculation that the presence of these programs is a result of individual initiative in the districts rather than the factors explained by this survey.

The big three, Art, Music and Physical Education employed the greatest number of full-time specialists. The presence of the programs was significantly related to state aid and the programs showed consistent positive and significant relationships among them. Art and Vocal Music showed significant relationships to district size, Physical Education did not.

Programming patterns for the three provided some speculation about some of the reasons for their inclusion in the curriculum.

Physical Education and Vocal Music had similar patterns for the number of minutes per session, the number of sessions per week and the number of weeks per year. Programs in both areas were usually about 30 minutes long, twice a week for the whole year. Art, presumably because of the set up and clean up time involved, registered averages of close to 45 minutes per session, met usually once a week and was more often found as a less than full year program. Other studies (Petzold, 1978) confirm this to be a consistent pattern.

When the data for the number of programs for each are examined, Vocal Music and Physical Education are both found in over 60% of the districts (62.6% and 65.4% respectively) while Art is found in only 40%.

According to comments from the survey and the interviews conducted by this researcher, when classroom teachers are given a choice between having either Art or Music programs in their district, the majority will elect to have Music. The reason seems to be that those classroom teachers feel more confident and competent dealing with Art themselves, without a specialist than with Music. The performance aspect of Music and the different symbolic language of Music notation are also deterrents for the classroom teacher. Though this particular study can offer no substantive data to confirm these observations, the indicators seem reliable and reasonable.

Another reason why these programs are more prevalent than Art, is found in the comments from the interviews that indicated that the two programs together, Vocal Music and Physical Education, provided the "best fit" in terms of scheduling the contractual break times for the classroom teacher. The two programs, lasting 30 minutes each for twice a week could account for most of the break time necessary for the classroom teacher. Because of the nature of Art classes and the time required for them, they suffer from a discrimination in the curriculum that has little to do with real educational goals and objectives.

The data concerning district size as a factor for the presence of programs clearly indicates that larger districts are more likely to have programs in Art, Vocal Music, and Physical Education than the smaller ones. The percentages show a direct linear relationship in terms of the number of schools with programs according to the size of the district. The table also shows that for 58% of the reporting districts or those with up to 1000 elementary students, the actual percentages for districts reporting Art programs is 31%, for Vocal Music 58%, and Physical Education 61%. The distribution is more even with the latter two programs which indicates a greater disparity between the presence of programs at that level than the overall percentages indicate. Instrumental Music show a general trend, though not a perfect linear relationship, and Guidance Counseling did not display any particular pattern.

These figures provide a basis for the argument for the consolidation of smaller districts into larger, more economical and efficient ones.

A computer print out was made listing all the data by district, grouped according to district code to establish the geographical distribution of programs. This list will be available to the Fine Arts Specialist Office in the Michigan Department of Education but will not be reported in this document.

When the number of districts not receiving state aid was compared to the number having programs, the data showed that districts which were out of formula aid generally had a higher incidence of programs. Of the districts in the sample, 31% were found to be in that category. These districts generally had a higher state equalized value of tax base to enrollment ratio.

The data for Art showed that 45.3% of the districts having an Art program were non-formula aid schools. Vocal Music registered a 37.3% total and Physical Education programs comprised 37.1% of the total programs found in that category. All three of the above relationships were found to be significant at the .05 level.

Values for that cell in the comparisons of Instrumental Music, Drama and Guidance Counseling were 33.7%, 0.0% and 40% respectively and all three relationships were not significant at the .05 level.

From those comparisons it could be concluded that, given the total of out of formula districts in the sample, those districts which do not receive state aid have a higher incidence of programs. This finding supports the argument that the formula aid system is not providing an equal education for all Michigan students.

When the programs were cross tabulated to establish the incidences of commonality, the results provided some interesting contrasts. The data is presented in Table 5.2.

Vocal Music and Physical Education were the most likely combinations examined with an incidence of 53.7% of the districts

Table 5.2
Incidence of Common Programs in Districts

N = 437

reported in percent of districts having both programs

	Art	Vocal Music	Instrumental Music	Physical Education	Guidance Counseling
Art	----				
Vocal Music	37.3%	----			
Instrumental Music	30.1%	42.8%	----		
Physical Education	37.4%	53.7%	45.6%	----	
Guidance Counseling	6.8%	10.7%	9.6%	10.0%	----

having both. Physical Education and Instrumental Music provided the next best match with 45.6% followed by Instrumental Music and Vocal Music with 42.8%. The incidence of Art programs to Vocal Music and Physical Education was virtually the same, 37%, lending further support to the pattern established earlier.

All relationships were significant at the .05 level with the exception of Instrumental Music and Guidance Counseling as Table 4.33 indicates. From the data it would be logical to conclude that there is a relationship between districts having specialist-directed programs and that what we see is a percentage of districts that have multiple programs that will be somewhere between 30% and 54% and approximately 18% of the districts with no programs at all.

Section VIII of the survey asked the respondents to make use of their knowledge of the history and condition of their districts and provide their perceptions about why programming has changed over a five year period. Questions were also asked about the potential for programming in the future. The results were reported as the frequencies of responses for the given choice.

As noted earlier in this chapter the responses for Question One concerning the growth, decline and elimination of programs are highly reliable, given the levels reported in Kenney's 1977 study. The figures dramatically portray the losses in programming over this period and indicate some form of action if we are to insure that all Michigan elementary students receive a comprehensive education in these areas.

When respondents were asked to indicate why programs had grown in the second question, the answer of first choice is administrative leadership. The second choice most often marked had to do with how the program is communicated with the rest of the educational community. The third choice is probably related to the second and implies that the basic nature of the programs was well communicated. The only specific money issue ranked fourth followed by strong parent advocacy, strong program staff, and a concern for the integration of the program with the rest of the school.

The conclusion drawn from these data indicates that the leaders of any programs where growth or stabilization is desired, should work closely with the administrators to help communicate to the community the basic nature of what they do.

The respondents were also asked why programs have been cut back or eliminated. The overwhelming majority answered with a resounding "no money". As the discussion in Chapter One indicated, when money is cut, people are cut, and with those people go the programs. The lack of district and community commitment followed the reason that the area was not deemed as "basic" to the curriculum with poor communication and lack of leadership being marked as the last two choices.

The conclusion drawn here is that the programs were cut or abolished due to financial reasons, but below that response was a priority system operating that made the programs vulnerable because of the program advocates inability to communicate worth to the school

and community. The district simply did not have enough compelling information to make a decision favorable to the program.

When asked about the positive advocacy efforts of the programs in jeopardy in Question Four, the respondents indicated that most programs put up a defense in one form or another. The reported totals were: 57.7% for Art, 62.2% for Vocal Music, 65.5% for Instrumental Music, 12.5% for Drama, 8.7% for Dance, 67.3% for Physical Education, and 59.4% for Guidance Counseling.

When these figures are compared to the total of programs cut or eliminated in Question One, the results are alarming. In spite of the apparent advocacy efforts, the numbers in each category are greater for programs cut or eliminated than the total responses for each program category in Question Four. In other words, with or without advocacy efforts, the programs were reduced or eliminated. Whether this is due to unsurmountable odds or ineffective advocacy is not clear. It is probably a combination of both. But if advocates can't change the odds by becoming better at making their programs more viable, understandable and acceptable in the eyes of the decision makers, the trend will likely continue.

The fifth question asked the respondents what it would take to make the programs a part of their district's curriculum. In a margin approaching 7 to 1 the respondents stated that money was the key factor over the next highest rated answer of "State mandate". A respectable third was the need for better awareness and understanding

about the program. This response actually received more second priority rankings than any other. The fourth and fifth choices were the need for better teacher education and better integration of the programs into the general curriculum.

Unquestionably, money is prime concern when it comes to specialist directed programming. But below that need was an appeal for leadership on the part of the state and for better program information. While it is highly unlikely that the State of Michigan will be able to mandate into existence any program in the curriculum without supporting the district's ability to provide it in some way, the Department of Education does have the responsibility to set the highest possible standards and expectations for education.

The survey of specialist-directed programs in Michigan elementary schools has provided the field with definitive data on the status of these programs and some insight about changes over the past five years.

Recommendations for the Michigan Department of Education

The study clearly shows that programs in specialist directed areas have declined at an alarming rate. It was also possible to conclude that districts are not fulfilling the expectations adopted and provided by the State Board of Education in 1979 which stated:

"Education in the Arts in Michigan's schools is based on The Common Goals of Michigan Education.

The Arts Goals for individual students are contained in these essential components:

All students should be provided with skills to participate in all of the arts at levels of expertise appropriate to their interest and development.

All students should experience arts processes in the learning activities of the entire curriculum.

All students should be familiar with many forms of expression from many cultures.

All students should develop skills in recognizing the thematic and formal relationships among different forms of expression.

All students should acquire skills in developing their own criteria for making aesthetic judgments.

In order to achieve these goals, the Michigan State Board of Education recommends comprehensive programs for arts education in all educational institutions.

To be comprehensive, a program in the arts will include:

- the training of all children in all the arts, and specific training for students with special interests.
- the development of curricula and teaching strategies that integrate arts processes with other learning experiences.
- training for all students in recognition and appreciation of aesthetic characteristics in many art forms.
- the identification and utilization of all community and school resources for the provision of arts experiences.
- the identification of the needs and strengths of individual students in the arts.
- the provision for special arts education for all special populations, including, but not limited to, handicapped, educationally disadvantaged, gifted and talented, and bilingual students.

All components of comprehensive programs for arts education must be non-sexist and non-racist.

It is the basic premise of this statement that the arts are a fundamental part of education. They provide students with means for expression and communication at every age level. They train students to recognize, discriminate and respond to images, sounds, movements and spatial relationships. They assist in the development of personal value systems. They give access to understanding different cultures. They provide career opportunities and skills for lifelong participation in leisure time activities.

All of the components of a comprehensive arts program are interdependent. Each one is essential to the achievement of the goal of the arts that they can utilize in their adult lives for both participation and appreciation."

Based on these conclusions, the following recommendations for the Michigan Department of Education are made:

1. It is recommended that the Department of Education approach the State Board of Education with the results of this survey and recommend that a standing committee be assigned the task of convening a group of educational leaders from the following organizations to address the data and make suggestions to the board for a course of action to alleviate the problem.
The group should include, but not be limited to, representatives from:
 - A. All professional organizations of programs affected by the survey including the art educators (MAEA), the music educators (MMEA), the Michigan Theater Association (MTA), and the Michigan Dance Association (MDA).
 - B. Professional organizations of administrators such as the Michigan Elementary and Middle Schools Principals Association (MEMSPA) and the Michigan Association of School Administrators (MASA).

- C. Organized Arts advocacy groups such as the Michigan Alliance for Arts Education and the Concerned Citizens for the Arts.
 - D. The Joint Legislative Committee on the Arts.
 - E. The Michigan Association of School Boards.
2. It is recommended that the Department of Education provide models of alternative delivery systems for the Arts at the elementary level such as the programs developed in this state under E.S.E.A. Title IVc and provide training to implement them in districts desiring them.
 3. It is recommended that the Department of Education create a system for knowing the status of specialist-directed programs at all levels on a bi-annual basis.

Recommendations for Arts Advocacy Groups

It was possible to conclude that advocates in the field apparently lack a consistent and compelling rationale on why the specialist-directed programs in this survey are a vital and necessary part of education, and the skills and ability to communicate these effectively. Based on that conclusion, the following recommendations are made:

1. The Michigan Alliance for Arts Education or the Concerned Citizens for the Arts should seek funding to underwrite a study designed to produce a clearly stated rationale for Arts programs at the elementary level and a system for its use in school districts.
2. The Michigan Alliance for Arts Education or the Concerned Citizens for the Arts should create a conference for training Arts advocates in effective advocacy measures and political action.

Recommendations for Professional Organizations

It was possible to conclude from this study that the specialists in the areas examined in survey, perhaps perceive their roles in the educational system in a way that may be too narrow or isolated.

Based on this conclusion the following recommendations are made:

1. Professional organizations of the special areas included in the survey should encourage their members to see and make use of their positions in a broader way, involving the total learning of the school in their area and their area throughout the system.
2. Professional organizations should encourage their members to speak out strongly against the practice of making their sessions the break time for the classroom teacher and instead insist that the teacher become an integral part of their teaching process.

Recommendations for Teacher Education Institutions

It was possible to conclude from this study that elementary classroom teachers are ill equipped and uncomfortable in dealing with areas usually assigned to specialists. It was also apparent that specialists were not trained or encouraged to work with classroom teachers.

Based on these conclusions, the following recommendations are made:

1. Teacher Education Institutions should include curricula for the training of elementary classroom teachers that stresses the importance of the Arts as subject matter and as integrated approaches to other educational objectives.
2. Teacher Education Institutions should broaden the experiences of all students seeking specialist degrees and certifications to include experiences in all of the Arts areas as well as courses designed to familiarize them with the tasks and role of the classroom teacher.

Comments

Kenneth Snellson, the noted sculptor, once remarked when confronted about his sculpture being judged as too technically contrived as opposed to aesthetically motivated: "Hardening of the categories brings on Art disease."

Perhaps it is also time in education to have a physical exam to determine if our categories are indeed too calcified to permit flexibility and the free flowing interchange of ideas and learning; to determine if the various tissue of the curricular body is too specialized so as to not relate to other parts or the whole being.

With this survey we have determined the temperature and pulse of specialist programming, noted certain other symptoms and ventured a diagnosis. The patient is ill, undernourished and suffering.


If our diagnosis is correct and the prescription proper, we should see some sign of recovery. If it is a seasonal malady brought on by a cold, harsh climate, we may have to wait until the spring to get relief - if it comes.

Waiting is the hardest part when someone that means something to you is sick, waiting to see if the cure has an effect on the symptoms, or the cause, if we are lucky. But wait we must. And keep busy tending our patient. And hope.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
Survey Form and Sample
Correspondence

Total District ELEMENTARY
student population (4th Friday
evening, 1982)


 7.11
 School District _____ Address _____ City _____ Zip _____
 _____, Principal _____ Elementary School _____
 Person completing report _____
 Does your district receive female state staff? ☐ Yes ☐ No
 Do you wish to receive a summary sheet of these findings? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Please fill in all appropriate spaces. Be sure to indicate the total number of elementary specialists in the district for each of the 7 categories.

SECTION IV – DRAMA

- 1** Does your district have a formal elementary Art program?
- ☐ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No
- 15
- 2** Does your district employ elementary Art Specialists?
- ☐ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No
- If so, how many? _____
- 10-15
- 15
- If your district has a program with specialists, please continue.
If your district does not have a program with specialists, please go to Section II.
- 3** Assuming that your building is a typical example of what the majority of schools in your program, please report the following data for the appropriate lines:
- Please mark the appropriate boxes:
- Spacelines (Building full-time)**
- ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5
- 20 21 22 23 24 30 35
- Spacelines (Building part-time)**
- ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5
- 17 20 30 31 32 33
- Spacelines typical class contract by specialist:**
- Minutes per session
- ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5
- 20 25 30 35 38 40 45
- Spacelines per week**
- ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5
- <1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- Weeks per year**
- ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5
- 40 45 50 51 52 54
- 1/65
- Comments and explanations of variations (special programs, etc.)**

Comments and explanations of variations (special programs, extra-curricular activities)

SECTION V – DANCE

- 1** Does your district have a formal elementary Vocal Music Program?
- ☐ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No
- 14
- 2** Does your district employ elementary Vocal Music Specialists?
- ☐ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No
- If so, how many? _____
- 15 10-10
- If your district has a program with specialists, please continue.
If your district does not have a program with specialists, please go to Section H.
- 3** Assuming that your building is a typical example of what the district offers in formal program, please report the following data for the appropriate result.
- Please mark the appropriate boxes:
- Specialist (including full-time)** **Specialist (including part-time)**
- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 |
- Please indicate typical class size(s) by speaker:
- Minors per section** **Seniors per week**
- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 |
- Weeks per year**
- | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 |
- Y90
- Continued on back and explanations of variations legend programs/extra-curricular activities

Comments and explanations of variations (special programs/extracurricular activities)

SECTION VI – PHYSICAL EDUCATION

1. Does your district have an elementary Instrumental Music Program? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- 14
2. Does your district employ elementary Instrumental Music Specialists? ☐ Yes ☐ No. If so, how many? Band String
- 15 16 17 18 19
- If your district has a program with specialists, please continue.
If your district does not have a program with specialists, please go to Section IV.
3. Assuming that your building is a typical example of what the following district is, in terms of program, please report the following data for the appropriate levels.
- Please mark the appropriate boxes:
- Qualitative (Shading) (circle 1-5)
- Quantitative (Shading) (circle 1-5)
- Qualitative (Shading) (circle 1-5)
- Quantitative (Shading) (circle 1-5)
- Please indicate typical class contact by specialists:
- Minutes per session
- Qualitative (Shading) (circle 1-5)
- Quantitative (Shading) (circle 1-5)
- Minutes per year
- Qualitative (Shading) (circle 1-5)
- Quantitative (Shading) (circle 1-5)
- Comments and explanations of variations (special programs/instr-

Comments and explanations of variations (special programs/extracurricular activities)

- 1** Does your district have a formal elementary Drama program?
- ☐ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No
- 14
- 2** Does your district employ elementary Drama Specialists?
- ☐ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No
- If no, how many? _____ 10-18
- 15
- If your district has a program with specialists, please continue.
- If your district does not have a program with specialists, please go to Section V.
- 3** Assuming that your building is a typical example of what the district represents in terms of program, please report the following data for your respective building:
- Please mark the appropriate boxes:
- Specialist (Building full-time)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 |
- Specialist (Building part-time)**
- | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 |
- Please indicate typical race content by specialist:
- Hispanic per section**
- | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 |
- White per year**
- | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 |
- Hispanic per week**
- | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 61 | 62 | 63 | 64 | 65 | 66 | 67 | 68 |
- 5/90
- Contents and explanations of variations Special programs/activities

Comments and explanations of variations (special programs/extra-curricular activities)

- 1** Does your district have a formal elementary Census program?
- ☐ Yes ☐ No
- 14
- 2** Does your district employ elementary Census Specialist?
- ☐ Yes ☐ No If so, how many? _____
- 15 10-10
- If your district has a program with specialists, please continue.
If your district does not have a program with specialists, please go to Section VI.
- 3** Assuming that your building is a typical example of what the Census differs in terms of program, please report the following data for the appropriate building:
- Please mark the appropriate boxes:
- Specialist (Building full-time)**
- | | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 |
- Specialist (Building part-time)**
- | | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 |
- Please mark the typical class content by number:
- Minutes per session**
- | | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 |
- Sessions per week**
- | | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 |
- Weeks per year**
- | | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 |
- 4/00
- Comments and explanations of variations (special programs/strategies):

Comments and explanations of variations (special programs/extramuscular activities)

1. Does your district have a formal elementary Physical Education program? ☐ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No
- 16
2. Does your district operate elementary Physical Education Recreations? ☐ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No If so, how many? _____
- 18 10-10
- If your district has a program with specialists, please continue.
- If your district does not have a program with specialists, please go to Section VII.
3. Assuming that your building is a typical example of what the district offers in terms of program, please report the following data on your building's program.
- Please mark the appropriate boxes:
- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| <p>Specialist (filling full-time)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td><td>10</td><td>11</td><td>12</td><td>13</td><td>14</td><td>15</td><td>16</td><td>17</td><td>18</td><td>19</td><td>20</td><td>21</td><td>22</td><td>23</td><td>24</td><td>25</td><td>26</td><td>27</td><td>28</td><td>29</td><td>30</td><td>31</td><td>32</td><td>33</td><td>34</td><td>35</td><td>36</td><td>37</td><td>38</td><td>39</td><td>40</td><td>41</td><td>42</td><td>43</td><td>44</td><td>45</td><td>46</td><td>47</td><td>48</td><td>49</td><td>50</td><td>51</td><td>52</td><td>53</td><td>54</td><td>55</td><td>56</td><td>57</td><td>58</td><td>59</td><td>60</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 | <p>Specialist (filling part-time)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td><td>10</td><td>11</td><td>12</td><td>13</td><td>14</td><td>15</td><td>16</td><td>17</td><td>18</td><td>19</td><td>20</td><td>21</td><td>22</td><td>23</td><td>24</td><td>25</td><td>26</td><td>27</td><td>28</td><td>29</td><td>30</td><td>31</td><td>32</td><td>33</td><td>34</td><td>35</td><td>36</td><td>37</td><td>38</td><td>39</td><td>40</td><td>41</td><td>42</td><td>43</td><td>44</td><td>45</td><td>46</td><td>47</td><td>48</td><td>49</td><td>50</td><td>51</td><td>52</td><td>53</td><td>54</td><td>55</td><td>56</td><td>57</td><td>58</td><td>59</td><td>60</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
- Please indicate typical class contact by specialist:
- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| <p>minutes per session</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td><td>10</td><td>11</td><td>12</td><td>13</td><td>14</td><td>15</td><td>16</td><td>17</td><td>18</td><td>19</td><td>20</td><td>21</td><td>22</td><td>23</td><td>24</td><td>25</td><td>26</td><td>27</td><td>28</td><td>29</td><td>30</td><td>31</td><td>32</td><td>33</td><td>34</td><td>35</td><td>36</td><td>37</td><td>38</td><td>39</td><td>40</td><td>41</td><td>42</td><td>43</td><td>44</td><td>45</td><td>46</td><td>47</td><td>48</td><td>49</td><td>50</td><td>51</td><td>52</td><td>53</td><td>54</td><td>55</td><td>56</td><td>57</td><td>58</td><td>59</td><td>60</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 | <p>Sessions per week</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td><td>10</td><td>11</td><td>12</td><td>13</td><td>14</td><td>15</td><td>16</td><td>17</td><td>18</td><td>19</td><td>20</td><td>21</td><td>22</td><td>23</td><td>24</td><td>25</td><td>26</td><td>27</td><td>28</td><td>29</td><td>30</td><td>31</td><td>32</td><td>33</td><td>34</td><td>35</td><td>36</td><td>37</td><td>38</td><td>39</td><td>40</td><td>41</td><td>42</td><td>43</td><td>44</td><td>45</td><td>46</td><td>47</td><td>48</td><td>49</td><td>50</td><td>51</td><td>52</td><td>53</td><td>54</td><td>55</td><td>56</td><td>57</td><td>58</td><td>59</td><td>60</td> </tr> </table> | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
- Weekly per session
- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
- 7/60
- Comments and explanations of variations (special programs/enter-

Comments and explanations of variations (special programs/extra muscular activities)

SECTION VII - GUIDANCE COUNSELING

1 Does your district have a formal elementary Guidance Counseling Program? ☐ 1 Yes ☐ 2 No

14

2 How many elementary Guidance Counselors does your district employ? 15-16

3 If so, what is their minimum certification? _____

4 Approximately how many students does each counselor serve? 17-20

Comments and explanation of variations (special programs/extra-curricular activities)

SECTION VIII - GENERAL

1 Please indicate if any of the following elementary programs have either grown, been cut-back, or eliminated in your district over the last 5 years.

Growth	Cut-back	Eliminated
21 <input type="checkbox"/> Art	<input type="checkbox"/> Art	<input type="checkbox"/> Art
22 <input type="checkbox"/> Vis. Mus.	<input type="checkbox"/> Vis. Mus.	<input type="checkbox"/> Vis. Mus.
23 <input type="checkbox"/> Inst. Mus.	<input type="checkbox"/> Inst. Mus.	<input type="checkbox"/> Inst. Mus.
24 <input type="checkbox"/> Drama	<input type="checkbox"/> Drama	<input type="checkbox"/> Drama
25 <input type="checkbox"/> Dance	<input type="checkbox"/> Dance	<input type="checkbox"/> Dance
26 <input type="checkbox"/> Phys. Ed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Phys. Ed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Phys. Ed.
27 <input type="checkbox"/> Counseling	<input type="checkbox"/> Counseling	<input type="checkbox"/> Counseling

2 If programs have grown in the last 5 years, what can you identify as the major factors in their growth? Good communication between the program, staff, parents, administrators and community.

- 30 ☐ Program is integrated with other subject matter and staff.
- 31 ☐ Strong parent advocacy.
- 32 ☐ Program is seen as part of the basic curriculum.
- 33 ☐ Strong program staff.
- 34 ☐ District is financially sound.
- 35 ☐ Administrative leadership.
- 36 _____
- 37 _____

3 If programs have either been cut-back or eliminated in the last 5 years, which combination of the following might best describe your district's rationale for deciding to cut or eliminate? Area not essential to basic curriculum.

- 38 ☐ Lack of district commitment to program.
- 39 ☐ Budget cuts.
- 40 ☐ Lack of community commitment to program.
- 41 ☐ Program did not communicate its reasons for existing.
- 42 ☐ Lack of leadership/coordination for the program.
- 43 _____
- 44 _____
- 45 _____
- 46 _____
- 47 _____

4 Assuming that the cuts were made on a curriculum priority basis according to some rational plan, was there any attempt by program administrators to present significant, compelling reasons for not cutting or eliminating these programs?

Yes	No
48 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
49 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
50 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
51 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
52 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
53 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
54 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
55 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Art
	Vis. Mus.
	Inst. Mus.
	Drama
	Dance
	Phys. Ed.
	Counseling

5 In your opinion, what would it take to have these programs included as a regular part of the elementary curriculum? Both essential to basic curriculum. Use any or all of the choices below or add your own.

- 56 ☐ Better understanding or awareness of the need for these programs.
- 57 ☐ Better integration of specialist programs into the general curriculum.
- 58 ☐ More money.
- 59 ☐ More comprehensive pre-service and in-service training for the classroom teacher to assume the delivery responsibility for these programs.
- 60 ☐ More money.
- 61 _____
- 62 _____
- 63 _____

6 Based on the present funding structure for public education, is it likely that your district will be able to support the following specialist directed programs in the future?

Likely Within 10 Years	Likely Within 20 Years	Not Likely
66 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
67 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
68 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
69 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
70 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
71 <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Art
		Vis. Mus.
		Inst. Mus.
		Drama
		Dance
		Phys. Ed.
		Counseling

☐ (Office Use) 8/80

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

PLACE
STAMP
HERE



MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

MICHIGAN
ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
ASSOCIATION

MICHIGAN ELEMENTARY SPECIALIST SURVEY
FRANK PHILIP, MAEE SURVEY COORDINATOR
P.O. BOX 23026
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909



P.O. BOX 23026, LANSING, MI 48909

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

MICHIGAN
ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
ASSOCIATION

Dear Colleague,

Michigan Public Education has been dealt some severe economic blows over the last decade. Many specialist directed programs in our schools have been drastically reduced or eliminated. An accompanying problem we face is not knowing exactly the extent of these cuts at the local level on a state-wide basis.

The enclosed survey will establish what the current level of programming is for Art, Music, Drama, Dance, Physical Education, and Guidance Counseling at the *elementary level* in Michigan. It is, in part, a replication of a survey done in 1977 by Donald D. Kenney with the cooperation of MEMSPA. The findings of that survey appeared in your journal "*PRINCIPAL*" in December of that year.

This survey is being co-sponsored by the Michigan Department of Education and the Michigan Alliance for Arts Education with the cooperation and endorsement of MEMSPA.

With the exception of some of the larger districts, one elementary principal in each of Michigan's 529 school districts has been sent a copy of this survey to fill out for their district. *You will be the only one contributing data from your district* so it is essential that we have your support. Please take a few minutes to complete the survey, staple and return it by April 27 using the self-mailing feature provided. (Based on a piloting of the instrument in the Lansing area, the average time needed to complete the survey was about 10 minutes).

If you wish to receive a summary of the findings, be sure to check the appropriate box on the survey.

We thank you in advance for your cooperation and appreciate the time you spend to give us all a clearer understanding of the problem.

Sincerely,

Phillip E. Runkel
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Michigan Department of Education

William Mays, Jr.
Executive Secretary
Michigan Elementary and Middle Schools Principal's Association

Frank S. Philip
Secretary, Michigan Alliance for Arts Education
Survey Coordinator

STATE OF MICHIGAN

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Lansing, Michigan 48909



PHILLIP E. RUNKEL
Superintendent
of Public Instruction

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

DR. GUMECINDO SALAS

President

JOHN WATANEN, JR.

Vice President

ANNETTA MILLER

Secretary

DR. EDMUND F. VANDETTE

Treasurer

CARROLL M. HUTTON

NASBE Delegate

BARBARA DUMOUCHELLE

BARBARA ROBERTS MASON

NORMAN OTTO STOCKMEYER, SR.

Governor

JAMES J. BLANCHARD

Ex-Officio

Dear Colleague:

About four weeks ago you received a copy of a survey concerning specialist-directed programs in Art, Music, Dance, Drama, Physical Education and Guidance Counseling at the elementary level. The survey was mailed to one principal in each of the 529 school districts in Michigan. As of this date, our records indicate that your survey form has not been returned.

While the return of the survey is not an official requirement of the Department of Education, the information gained from it will be extremely important for assessing the status of these programs in the state and directing the development of future programs. I urge you to give it your immediate attention.

In the event you did not receive the survey, another copy of the survey is enclosed. Please take the 10 minutes it requires to give us an idea of what program your district offers. The completed survey can be stapled and returned in that form. With your assistance, a complete picture of the current situation will be assured.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

David L. Donovan
Assistant Superintendent
Technical Assistance and
Evaluation Services

DLD:td
enclosure (1)



P.O. BOX 23026, LANSING, MI 48909

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Lansing, MI
Permit # 629

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

MICHIGAN
ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
ASSOCIATION

OR PRESENT PRINCIPAL

IMPORTANT ELEMENTARY SURVEY: PLEASE RESPOND BY APRIL 27, 1983

APPENDIX B
Written Comments From Surveys

District
Code
Source

- 267 Superintendent/Board considers elementary education 2nd class to extra-curricular/sports, etc.
- 272 Next week is our millage election. If this millage fails, all of music in district will be cut. Counseling service will be reduced.
- 40 Annual decreases in state aid have resulted in corresponding cuts in program.
- 283 It is hard for this district to budget yearly when the state does not live up to its promise and says "too bad for you - cut your program".
Until the state puts education in a higher priority, the citizens will not do so either.
- 395 We expect cut backs in Music-Art-P.E. system wide, K-12, if our June 13 millage request fails.
- 364 Our program in Art, PE, Music and Band have been stable for many years.
- 501 It all depends on MONEY for our schools!!
- 114 Our programs are strong.
- 530 Why did you not survey library media specialist.
- 204 We are going to have pressure to increase instruction in science, math, computers, drug abuse, gifted and talented and who knows what else in the next few years. Our nation and people put the arts at a low priority. We get what we are willing to pay for. You cannot go cheap and have quality education.
- 125 Trying to operate on 23.58 mills just isn't going to make it for these types of programs! Help!

District
Code
Source

- 7 Not until the State Board and governing bodies wake up to value of education.
- 206 Vocal Music and instrumental music will probably be reduced slightly starting with the 1983-84 school year.
- 127 We have had art, P.E. and Music for many years. There is a possibility we may have to cut all 3 next year.
- 271 In my opinion, a funding system such as ours that does not provide enough money for these "special experiences" in many districts, while some of the more fortunate children do have these opportunities, is unjust.
- 4 When each of these programs was first cut back, then eliminated, teachers and administrators were faced with the decision of (1) large (43-1) pupil teacher ratios or (2) continuation of special programs.
- 233 Our staff and a parent advisory group are attempting to fill the gap by providing a variety of Fine Arts enrichment experiences for students. Some of our programs have been wonderfully successful. Many students will have the benefit of lives enriched by some training in an area of the arts previously closed to them. We continue to be grateful to the many artists who offer their services to us.
- 277 Section VIII. 3. Our cuts were based on data which suggested that of the 3 areas, Art, Music and Phys. Ed. - music was the area in which teachers felt least competent - it was, therefore, the area of least cut.
- 276 Agricultural community that feels special programs are a frill. Would like the programs if someone else funded them.
- 408 Extremely Poor Survey. We have library time - Why is not that considered important?
How can the State of Michigan afford poorly written useless survey and inturn not make state aid payments?

District
Code
Source

- 187 Unless additional money becomes available, we are in danger of losing these programs within the next three years.
- 65 We have not had counseling or drama.
- 177 Specialists programs were cut in half one year and entirely eliminated the next. Seen as only way to save enough to keep schools open.
We have now saved some money. Some programs may be added in isolated cases. Usually based on board members and their individual "pet" likes no matter how much administrative backup that is provided in a different direction.
- 69 We do not have any of the programs listed. Each teacher is responsible for same.
- 33 In a small school system where teachers are used on both ends of the building, we are dictated by the high schools curriculum demands, and the finances of the district as a whole.
- 72 Art, Counseling, Drama, Dance have never been mentioned as a priority here. We principals have lobbied hard for counseling to no avail.
- 254 Loss of school social worker full time has been extremely detrimental to our building. The letter I wrote to the school board last Spring prevented complete elimination, but the board needs further convincing. Supts. priority is saving funds.
Will try to incorporate S.S.W. in Title I Program next year unless those funds are cut too much.
- 453 Art and phys. Ed. may grow in time and staff. I doubt if any others will grow. I don't see any push for any other areas.
- 141 Inadequate funding has wrecked havoc upon our system. It is sad to realize that children aren't really number 1.

District
Code Source

- 375 We have no money!
- 258 Under present conditions counseling services are imperative, yet lacking. This needs immediate attention.
- 163 We also have an elementary foreign language program - 4 teachers meet students 5 days per week for 20 minutes in grades K-2. This will expand next year.
- 94 A major contributing factor to reduction of (Arts) is the shortened school day - 5 hrs. time does not permit for a loaded curriculum and arts.
Elem. programs have suffered the brunt of reductions with little promise of (arts) implementation unless it becomes mandatory.
- 52 Section VIII - We have not changed in last 5 years.
- 221 Major budget cuts will be made for the 83-84 school year. All of the areas above have been discussed. It appears that most may be saved, but the art program is still subject to reduction.
- 394 If the economy were to improve and tax dollars were more available, the programs could be reinstated quickly.
- 212 Our only growth has been in elementary counseling, but to obtain that growth we have lost counseling in the high school and middle school so that we have not really progressed.
- 96 The elementary schools went to K-4 this year.
The 5th and 6th graders do have exploratory courses in most of the areas surveyed.
- 301 #6 With the current funding we hold on to the program on a yearly basis. They are important to our overall education, but if cuts must be made they will be effected.
- 120 Drama and dance both are experienced by our students in the regular classroom, vocal music and gym, and at times through volunteers.

District
Code
Source

- 367 A definite need for elementary school counseling.
- 485 Due to the fact that our school millages do not pass, coupled with the fact that the state of Michigan has not given our school district the money promised --- we have had to cut the above listed programs.
- 105 My building is K-4 but our elementary goes K-6 so I tried to answer the questions for K-6. We also had a certified librarian 5 days a week. Now cut to 3 days per week.
- 428 The answer to Sec. VII, 6 depends on the philosophy of the superintendent. Our current supt. would preserve these programs and look for other alternatives before cutting.
- 319 Our art-music-phy. ed. has remained the same for the past 5 years. At least approximately the same - Cut backs in years prior to 5 years ago, proved very unpopular. Staff wants breaks provided by specialists - parents want music, art and phy. ed.
- 410 Our district is in very severe financial difficulty. Cuts are also present at higher levels and will continue to be a problem.
- 47 Programs involved in this survey have neither grown or have been eliminated. Could in the future (Music/P.E.)
- 76 By 1990, teenagers are predicted to have cardiac symptoms due to lack of exercise. If supt. of Michigan Dept. of Ed would strongly recommend the need and give reasons, boards might change priorities. (Possibly have grants to support programs). Elementary is always lowest priority; secondary first.
- 334 I have been a school principal for 32 years. During that time politicians have been saying that we need to finance the public schools so that every child will receive a quality education. There still isn't quality or equality. Isn't anyone listening?

District
Code
Source

- 109 It would appear that music is close to going, unless the economy turns around.
- 354 The attitude of our public is very negative toward any increase in taxes, therefore, if we have to depend on state financing for these programs, we will never receive enough because these dollars will have to be used to maintain existing programs since property tax increased millage seems very doubtful at this time.
- 380 If continued millage problems exist - it becomes more difficult to hold these areas at the present level.
- 193 In our small rural location only electronic communications will impact in a major way.
More comprehensive pre-service education for those teachers who will teach in small rural areas (those who must teach (DO) everything) is a must.
- 368 Our elementary teachers do the best they can in these areas.
Need more MONEY.
- 186 As I said in Section VIII. All will be dropped in 1983-84.
It is a terrible shame but without monies, what can districts do? We hope some can be returned.
- 78 Funding for public education is the basic problem which we face in attempting to offer our students any of the items included in this survey. The more we raise locally the less we get from the state. I am sure you are aware of this dilemma.
- 152 Art, vocal, Music, Band, Strings and Phy. Ed. are being eliminated for the 1983-84 school year.
- 381 I anticipate that we will be able to continue supporting elementary music, art and physical education as we are now doing for some time to come.

District
Code
Source

- 391 MORE MONEY!!
- 64 We plan to continue all programs we currently have.
- 281 Budget cuts here are directly related to the state formula for the finance of public schools. An important factor is that school millages are the only "voice" on tax issues that people feel they can control.
- 393 Will have full time art in 1983-84.
- 20 Instrumental works more effectively in an hourly rotational schedule than in a self-contained elem. program; therefore, regardless of budget considerations, we would oppose reinstatement in elem.
- 124 Some enrollment decline has kept art, P.E., music program pretty much as has been except we had Kdgn., music and PE once a week before lightning schedules.
Philosophy has been percentage cuts across the entire school spectrum rather than total elimination of one program as much as possible.
- 32 All should be funded by state govt.
- 159 We are out of formula. Our state is a "poor" advocate of public education! The children suffer for the state's mismanagement.
- 462 If our millage passes on June 13, we will reinstate physical education and institute a program in elementary counseling.
- 490 Folk dancing is a part of our elementary schools physical education program.
- 239 It seems to me the state is reducing its responsibility for funding education. We are getting less and less money.

District
Code
Source

- 137 Survey not clear. For example No. 6 we already have Art, vocal music and P.E. but they have been cut back. They will continue as is if present funding continues. If you want such surveys returned at least don't make us pay for postage.
- 325 We have a proposal before the Board of Ed. to add elementary counseling. It looks like it will go. As you know the community supports our schools well. We are lucky.
- 255 It is truly a tragedy that elementary education always seems to come under scrutiny first when there are cuts to be made. It is time that cuts are made across the board.
- 360 We have had most all programs within the last 10 years. MONEY is the basis for not having some NOW!
- 170 Vocal music and P.E. - ½ hr. sessions - once a week is just "taken" programming but better than nothing. Vocal music was cut last year, but reinstated this year. Both programs considered yearly when cuts are made.
- 384 We voted in June of 1982 for 1.9 mills for secondary extra curricular programs and elem. vocal music, inst. music and physical ed. In 1983-84 we will have a further deterioration of the classroom program due to revenue short fall but the 1.9 will give us music and gym as usual. Survey should have included library/media services - ours are near zero.
- 531 Our elementary arts programs are just barely surviving right now. They may not be around in Sept. 83 depending on financial developments this summer.
- 459 If financial aid for school districts does not improve very soon we likely will have to eliminate vocal music and physical education programs, as there is already some discussion along those lines now.
Besides documenting that there is a problem -- lack of specialists in the arts -- what do you plan to do with these results from your survey?
Will you give Blanchard a copy of the results as further proof that school finance in Michigan is a farce and is in need of drastic change?

District
Code
Source

- 286 I think it is unthinkable that a child's education should be so controlled by their parents decision of where to live, or what can happen to a school district after you have committed yourself to buying in a certain school district. Lower income kids need the advantages of a good education more than upper income kids who are able to benefit from the social experiences money can buy. Educators kids are almost priced out of a college education.
- 525 Library program still there.
- 37 Our school system board seems to be concerned with secondary education and sports only. We have one board member that speaks out for elementary.
- 483 We lost art, music (Inst. and Voc.) and physical education just this past year. We hope to reinstate some or all in the 83-84 school year. (Library was also cut!) I feel counseling is very important. We use to have social workers from the I.S.D. until the law changed (Sp. ed.) to say that \$ support would only be given to Sp. Ed. students. There are so many problems that schools can't deal with - divorce, unemployment, child abuse, parents and students on drugs, etc. We need help! They need help. Community social services can't do it - too many people. The waiting list is for six months.
- 477 Revising programs to produce results that the community will become aware of will help their support. If you are interested in our Fitness for Youth Program, please contact me.
- 454 We are hurting! I can see a time when we may have to close our schools. When is someone going to help - I mean legislatures. Can't they see it's almost impossible to pass millages when everyone is broke.
- 14 An elementary principal in Ann Arbor should also be asked to answer this questionnaire. Our special programs are tremendous and greatly supported by the AA Community.
- 415 Due to the economy and limited experiences of our students in the fine arts outside of school today, our school needs its own special classes more than ever.

District
Code
Source

- 405 Our school district is likely in its last year of being "in formula". If we do not pass an added millage package in June, we will be forced to drop music, art and physical education. No more specials until refinancing.
- 198 Art, music and phy. ed. were dropped 2nd semester of 1980-81 and all year in 1981-82. They were reinstated in Sept. of 1982 from a greater than expected cash balance.
- 158 Our programs have remained intact despite closing a number of buildings and reducing staff. They have remained because the board, staff and community recognize their impact.
- 446 We must alter the present funding structure for public education. We must set forth a state wide program that will fulfill the democratic needs of the people.
- 121 Must have revamping of method of financing public education. Dist. #7 is financially distressed.
- 135 Our music, gym and art in the elementary school has stayed status quo in the 28 years I've been here. Plans are to continue to maintain these in our curriculum. Fortunately these areas are excellent public relations for this small farming community and the citizens are very supportive of the school. Concerts spring/fall, art shows and field day are presented each year. Public crowds the facilities.
- 326 In our district, special programs have been tied to contractual length of day. Days were shortened K-12 3 years ago; contract says classroom teachers will have 25 contact hrs. Specialists were used to lengthen the day. Although classroom teachers now have the responsibility for teaching art, music and p.e., the quality and quantity both vary widely and whatever of these subjects is taught comes at the expense of some other class.
- 427 We are committed to providing quality education for our students; however budget cuts have made it impossible to continue with cultural arts programs which are really needed.

District
Code
Source

- 470 Method of financing is entirely unfair. A district with a power plant is loaded. Another is fighting to survive. Adequate money should be provided by the state equally on a per pupil basis.
- 83 Our school is limited by size or what can be realistically offered.
- 101 My responses reflect a K-4 building. Volunteer parents have contributed in art for K-4.
- 309 Extra curricular added both boys and girls interschool basketball. Added 6 grade Industrial arts. Added more supervised library with certified teachers.
- 184 There have been no cut backs in our school the past 12 years.
- 482 Loss of most of our programs were do to fund loss.
- 190 Hopefully all programs will be reinstated should the economy take an upswing. Our community had always been very supportive of its schools.
- 329 We need \$ \$ \$ \$.
- 166 I don't think this survey is going to tell you anything.
- 180 We think counseling, art and music are important, but because of state aid and declining enrollments and inflation we are operating a bare bones curriculum. High school and Middle school each reduced their daily schedule by 1 class hour.
- 436 Without a change in funding support for education, we are likely to loose all our special programs. Property tax cannot continue to keep up with inflation and increased costs and also pay for special programs.
- 516 VIII - 6. Not likely if present funding structure, related to cuts, would continue as it has over the past few years.

LIST OF REFERENCES

SOURCES CITED

- Ad-Hoc Advisory Committee on the Arts in Michigan Education, Documents of the Arts in Michigan Education Movement, Lansing, 1975.
- Alliance for Arts Education, The Kennedy Center Education Program History, AAE publication, Washington, 1982.
- Alliance for Arts Education, Arts Education Advocacy, AAE, with NAEA, MENC, ATA, NDA, NAESP, NASSP, CCSSO, AASA, NSBA, 1978.
- Arnheim, R. Visual Thinking, Univ. of Calif. Press, Berkley, 1969.
- Arts, Education and the Americans, Inc. AEA Moves to Washington; Becomes Kennedy Center Educational Affiliate. AEA Communique. March, 1983, 1.
- Arts, Education and the Americans Panel. Coming To Our Senses, A.E.A. Inc. David Rockefeller, Jr. Chair, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1977.
- Borowicz, J. Selected Exemplary Music Programs in Wisconsin. Research Report for the Wisconsin School Music Association, Madison, 1977.
- Bozarth, H.C. Elementary School Size Related to Special Programs; Library, Art, Music, and Physical Education, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, 1962.
- Broudy, H.S. How Basic is Aesthetic Education? Educational Leadership, Vol 35, No. 2, November 1977.
- The College Board, Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and be Able to do. Report of the College Board, New York, 1983.
- Dewey, J. Experience and Education, The MacMillan Co., New York, 1938.
- Dewey, J. Art As Experience, Minton, Balch, New York, 1934.
- Down, A.G. Art, Basic Education and the Back to Basics Movement, Arts Education and Back to Basics, S. Dobbs ed. NAEA Reston, 1979, 29.
- Eisner, E.W. Thoughts on an Agenda for Research and Development in Arts Education. Arts and Aesthetics: An Agenda for the Future, CEMREL Inc., St. Louis, 1976, 411-412.

- Engel, M. The Arts as Basic Skills, Arts Education and Back to Basics, S.M. Dobbs ed, NAEA, Reston 1979, 43-44.
- Fadiman, C. The Case for Basic Education, J. Koerner, ed. Atlantic-Little Brown, 1959, 6.
- Faxon, J. et al. The Status of the Arts in Michigan, Report of the Joint Legislative Committee on the Arts. Faxon J. Chair, Lansing, 1974.
- Faxon J. et al. Survey Report: The Arts in Education, Michigan Department of Education and the Joint Legislative Committee on the Arts. Faxon, J. Chair. Lansing, 1979.
- Feldman, E.B. A Sermon on Work, Language, and Values, Art Education, Vol 35, No. 4, NAEA, Washington, July 1982.
- Goodlad, J.I. The Arts and Education, Arts in the Schools, J. Hausman Ed. McGraw-Hill, New York 1980, 3.
- Goodlad, J.I. Beyond the Rhetoric of Promise, Arts in the Schools, J. Hausman ed. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1980, 234.
- Hausman, J.J. The Domain of the Arts in Arts and the Schools, J. Hausman ed., McGraw-Hill, 1980, p 25.
- Hoffa, H. The History of the Idea, Arts and Aesthetics: An Agenda For the Future, Stanley Madeja ed. CEMREL Inc., St. Louis, 1976.
- Hubbell, N.S. and Kazen, D. Opinions of Michigan Citizens About the Public Schools, Project Outreach Report, Michigan Department of Education and Ingham I.S.D., Mason, 1983, 11-12.
- Kenney, D.D. Special Services in Michigan Elementary Schools: Results of a May 1977 Survey. Principal, Dec. 1977.
- Madeja, S.S., The Arts, Cognition and Basic Skills, CEMREL Inc. St. Louis, 1978, 13.
- Manwaring, L. and Fiery C., School District Reorganization, Michigan School Board Journal, June, 1983.
- Morris, J.D. The Public May Need Information Before Buying in on Excellence. Michigan School Board Journal, Vol 30, No 2, June 1983, 30.

- Michigan Alliance for Arts Education, ICAP Final Report MAAE, 1983.
- Michigan Board of Education, Comprehensive Arts Education: A Manual For Planners, Michigan Department of Education, Lansing, 1980.
- Michigan Department of Education, Computer print out of formula aid status of Michigan School Districts, Program number R2743, 4-12-1983.
- National Assessment of Education Progress, Art and Young Americans, 1974-79. Research Report, NAEP, Denver, 1981.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress. Music 1971-79 Research Report, NAEP, Denver, 1981.
- National Education Association, Music and Art in the Public Schools, (Research Monograph 1963-M3) Washington, D.C. 1963.
- National Education Association. Special Subject Teachers in the Elementary School. NEA Research Bulletin, 1972, 50, 44-46.
- The National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk: The Imperitive for Educational Reform, U.S. Department of Education, Washington D.C. 1983.
- National School Boards Association, The Arts in Education Research Report 1978-2, NSBA, Washington D.C. 1978, 1.
- Ogletree, E.J. The Status of State Legislated Curricula in the U.S. Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1979, 133.
- Petzold, R.G. Role of Specialist Teachers and Classroom Teachers in Art, Music, and Physical Education Programs in Selected I.G.E. Schools: Survey of Existing Practices. Working Paper no. 227, Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Individualized Schooling, Madison, 1978. 131.
- Sterling, C. and Bolin, J. Speaking Up About the Arts, Education Improvement Center, Princeton, 1982.
- Sterling, C. and Bolin, J. Support for School Arts Programs, Education Improvement Center, Princeton, 1981.

SOURCES USED, BUT NOT CITED

- Alden, E.F. et al. Austerity vs. Aesthetics in the Elementary School Program. Research Report, Illinois, 1980
- Alexander, R.R., The Ghost of Creativity in Art Education, Art Education, Vol. 34, N4, Jul 1981, 28-30
- American Association of School Administrators and Music Educators National Conference, Joint Statement, AASA/MENC Joint Committee, Washington, 1965.
- Berger, D. Guggenheim Museum Children's Program; Learning to Read Through the Arts, School Year 1974-75. New York City Board of Education, 1975.
- Harris, L. Americans in the Arts: Highlights From a Study of Public Opinion. American Council for the Arts, 1974, 31.
- Lewis, H. P. Position Paper: The Arts in the Elementary School, Arts and the Schools, Hausman, J. ed, McGraw Hill, 1980, 247, 250.
- Logan, F.M. Growth of Art in American Schools. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1955.
- McFee, J.K. and Degge, R.M. Art, Culture and Environment, Wadsworth Publishing Co., Belmont, CA 1977.
- Miller, J.L. A Study of Attitudes of School Board Presidents, Superintendents, and Elementary and Secondary Principals in Missouri School Districts Concerning Visual Arts Education and the Perception of Those Attitudes by Art Teachers. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Kansas, 1980.
- Read, H. Education Through Art, Pantheon, NY
- Wessel, H.M. Equal Education in Art: A Study of Art Supply Expenditures on the Elementary Level. Art Education, Vol. 31, N6, Oct 1978, 24-26.
- Wright, J.E. The Role and Status of Elementary Art Programs. Research Report. California, 1980.