

**Arts Awareness at the Metropolitan Museum of Art:
Art Museum Education as Artistic and Political Practice**

BY

ALYSSA GREENBERG
B.A., Oberlin College, 2009
M.A., Bard Graduate Center, 2011

THESIS

Submitted as partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Art History
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Chicago, 2017

Chicago, Illinois

Defense Committee:

Therese Quinn, Chair and Advisor
Hannah Higgins
Lisa Yun Lee
Olivia Gude, School of the Art Institute of Chicago
Karyn Sandlos, School of the Art Institute of Chicago

This dissertation is dedicated to the memories of Justine Gottlieb (1917-2004) and Matt O'Connell (1987-2014), whose commitments to art and activism live on.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my dissertation committee – Therese Quinn, Olivia Gude, Hannah Higgins, Lisa Lee, and Karyn Sandlos – for their generous support and mentorship. I am appreciative of Susanne Uslenghi of the Department of Art History and the staff of the UIC Graduate College (in particular Theresa Christenson-Caballero, Marie Khan, and Steven Kragon) for supporting my research. I am grateful to Jennifer Polk of From PhD to Life for her generous questions and perceptive, tailored coaching.

I would also like to thank the Arts Awareness practitioners I interviewed – Philip Yenawine, Rika Burnham, Howard Levy, and Randy Williams – for sharing their time, memories, and insights with me. A special thanks to Michelle Millar Fisher for introducing me to Arts Awareness and for encouraging me to continue this research.

I thank Barbara File, Jim Moske, and Robin Schwalb at the Metropolitan Museum of Art for their gracious assistance in accessing archival materials.

I thank the activist and professional communities of which I am a member – Museum Workers Speak, UIC Graduate Employees Organization, PAGE, Humanities Without Walls, MASS Action, and Art21 Educators – for their solidarity and inspiration.

I thank the yoga teachers of Logan Square – in particular Veronica Marin at Logan Square Fitness and Mara Goldfine at Tula Yoga – for helping me stay calm, strong, and centered while dissertating. Namaste!

Finally, endless thanks to my mother Susan Gottlieb and my partner/reader/editor/chef/caregiver/best friend Simon Nyi for providing me with a lifetime of love, support, unforgettable adventures, comfortable homes, and tasty meals.

AG

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
I. Arts Awareness at the Metropolitan Museum of Art	1
II. Contemporary Art Museum Education	4
Background: from activism to “diversity,” and back	4
Social justice and participatory practice	14
Critique	17
III. The Implications of Examining Arts Awareness for Contemporary Art Museum Education	20
What contemporary art museum educators can learn from Arts Awareness	20
Arts Awareness is an under-researched and under-theorized precedent to contemporary art museum education	21
From Arts Awareness to Visual Thinking Strategies (VTS)	23
Methodology	28
Summary	28
Starting Point	29
Research Problem	37
Parameters	40
Research Question	41
Notes on Case Study Approach	42
Organizing Data	43
Validity	44
Ethics	44
Notes on Archival Research	46
Notes on Oral History	48
Notes on Analysis	49
Language and terminology	51
Note	53
Chapter 1	55
Introduction	55
The origins of Harlem on My Mind	56
Arts Awareness as an institutional intervention	63
Public curriculum and hidden curriculum	68
Arts Awareness and race	73
Arts Awareness and institutional power	77
Chapter 2: “Let’s construct our own space:” Arts Awareness as Pedagogical Practice	79
Introduction	79
Curriculum theory and social justice pedagogy	82
Social justice pedagogy in Arts Awareness	86
I. Nonverbal learning	87
Yenawine’s definition of nonverbal learning	87

II. Embodied learning and space.....	92
Embodied learning	92
Embodied learning and <i>an</i> experience	94
Influences on Arts Awareness	96
Institutional space.....	99
Cultivating agency and ownership	101
Hidden curriculum.....	103
Social justice implications.....	104
III. Affective learning, aesthetic experience, and historical knowledge	107
Criticisms of Arts Awareness	107
Lived experience as historical knowledge.....	111
Affective learning as a way to bridge lived experiences to art-historical knowledge.....	113
Activating affective knowledge and art-historical knowledge towards critique of the institution.....	115
Affective learning with art: framing individuals' lived experience as historical knowledge	118
Affective knowledge and art-historical knowledge in dialogue.....	120
Affective learning and challenging hidden curriculum.....	121
Decentralized connoisseurship	122
Learning outside museums	123
Museum as a social laboratory	124
Leveraging the unique potential of art-historical knowledge.....	125
Challenging power dynamics	126
IV. Outside the institution.....	127
Conclusion	130
Chapter 3	132
Arts Awareness' outsiders: use of artists as educators	132
A New Kind of Art Museum Education: Art Museum Education as Participatory Practice	135
Outsiders in contemporary participatory practice.....	137
Nina Simon and <i>The Art of Relevance</i>	137
Museum Hack.....	151
<i>This Progress</i> (2010) by Tino Sehgal.....	153
Conclusion	155
Conclusion	156
Summary	156
Questions for contemporary practitioners	157
Recommendations for contemporary practitioners.....	159
Embedding institutional critique into museum work	160
Responding to current events	162
Cultivating agency of visitors of color	164
Attending to working conditions in museums.....	165
Attending to power dynamics in community engagement.....	167
Listening to artists and activists	168
Conclusion	170
Appendix I: Curriculum Vitae	172
Appendix II: Archival Sources	181
Oral History	181

Metropolitan Museum of Art Archives	181
Smithsonian Archives of American Art.....	181
Bibliography.....	183

Introduction

I. Arts Awareness at the Metropolitan Museum of Art

This section briefly introduces Arts Awareness and my overall project.

This is Arts Awareness: In the early 1970s, teens played bongo drums among the mummies at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Encouraged by their rumpled, denim-clad artist instructors, they burned incense, shot video, and performed interpretive dance in the museum's European Sculpture Court – often to the chagrin of the Met's administrators, curators, and security guards. Arts Awareness was a museum education program comprised of a series of experiences in art forms such as movement, music, photography, and video through which high school students learned the language of art and created direct responses to artworks in the museum. Philip Yenawine, a museum educator who initiated and supervised Arts Awareness, felt that young people should have the opportunity to embody elements of art such as line, texture, tension, focal point, spatial relationships, color, and mood. He believed that by engaging with these elements through artworks in the museum, and interacting with them through art making, participants would likely recognize and respond to the elements upon their next encounters with art and museums.

Through repeated museum visits and sustained contact with artist-educators, Yenawine designed Arts Awareness to both drive home these lessons about art and to help the students feel comfortable with their personal responses to art and to the museum. As one student reflected, "It taught us to really get the taste of art – the feel and smell of

it. At the beginning it sounded funny but now it's something to think about.”¹ Many of the lessons combined art experiences with inquiry-based tactics such as open-ended questioning, storytelling, and group dialogue. For Yenawine, Arts Awareness curriculum emphasized cultivating a way of “seeing” over typical training in art-historical knowledge. This pedagogy replaced traditional, didactic museum tours led by authoritative docents that emphasized factual expertise, which practitioners of Arts Awareness viewed as a monologic, hierarchical and passive experience.

Arts Awareness was part of an institutional effort to be socially inclusive in response to public criticism against the museum's elitism. The museum's director, Thomas Hoving, wrote: “Speaking for this Museum, we have by and large been unresponsive to social and political events. Perhaps, given our own struggle to grow, it couldn't have been otherwise. But to continue to do so would be irresponsible.”² Hoving published this statement in 1969 in a special issue of the *Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* on Black artists in conjunction with the exhibition *Harlem on My Mind: Cultural Capital of Black America, 1900-1968*. This exhibition was one of the most controversial exhibitions in American history due to the museum's decision to omit artwork by Harlem's flourishing artist community, resulting in public protest against the museum led by Black artists.³ This was the Met's first attempt at representing African-Americans through exhibition, and it did so clumsily through an ethnographic display of oversized photomurals of life in Harlem that omitted Black input and artwork. *Harlem on My Mind* failed due to the Met's unwillingness to listen to Black Harlem residents as advisers, to

¹ Bernard Friedberg, *Arts Awareness II* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1973), 4.

² Thomas Hoving, “Introduction,” *Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 27, no. 5 (January 1969): 244.

³ Bridget R. Cooks, “Black Artists and Activism: Harlem on My Mind (1969),” *American Studies* 48, no. 1 (2007): 5.

incorporate new voices or narratives onto the walls, or to transform their own museological practices. In making this blunder, the Met demonstrated how efforts to enact social inclusion in museums dominated by white staff members are at an increased risk of failure, and how much further they needed to go. Following the *Harlem on My Mind* controversy, the Met reoriented their social and political responsiveness from curatorial to educational. One year later, Black artists made it to the Met's galleries through an alternative path: as artist-educators in the Arts Awareness program, teaching students of color from upper Manhattan and the Bronx.

Arts Awareness ran in 1972 and 1973 as a series of weekly 90-minute sessions for 15 weeks. The majority of student participants were lower-income Black and Latinx⁴ students who attended alternative programs within New York City public high schools and white students from New York City suburbs.⁵ This program activated the museum's collection in a way that centered the creativity, knowledge and experience that the *students* possessed.

My dissertation claims Arts Awareness as a critical, but previously neglected, historical turning point in the history of art museum education and identifies it as a revolutionary combination of artistic, pedagogical, and political practice. Through Arts

⁴ See Methodology: Language and terminology for information about the critical-race-theory informed choices around racialized language.

⁵ These schools included Junior High School 123 in the Bronx, the Clinton Program of JHS 17 on the West side of Manhattan, Benjamin Franklin High School on the Upper East Side of Manhattan, and Thomas Jefferson High School in Brooklyn as well as Mamaroneck High School in suburban Mamaroneck, New York. The students were enrolled in smaller, mini-schools within the above schools that engaged in alternative education. Though enrollment in such programs was voluntary, many of those students enrolled in the New York City schools were assigned there due to "difficulty in the regular classroom learning situation" including poor attendance, disruptiveness in class, discipline or learning issues, or boredom. Arts Awareness partnered with these schools because the mini-school structure afforded them freedom to schedule extensive time in the museum, an interest in supporting alternative education, and a sense that Arts Awareness could "turn on" students facing the problems listed above and be more effective with such students than with "normal" students. 75 students participated in Arts Awareness in 1972, and 125 students in 1973. Bernard Friedberg, *Arts Awareness, a Project of the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1972), 4.

Awareness, for the first time in the Met’s history, working artists—as opposed to docents trained by the museum—facilitated gallery teaching. For these young artists, gallery teaching became a part of their artistic practices. Yet because they were invited to the museum as *educators* rather than *artists*, their work is absent from the historical record. Thus, I seek to re-insert Arts Awareness into the histories of museum education, socially engaged art, and the politics of museums, and to identify Arts Awareness as a formative influence on today’s ubiquitous strategic employment of artists as educators and participatory education strategies. Ultimately, I argue, Arts Awareness also provides an important lesson for contemporary museum education: true inclusivity means attending not only to the content of museums or to the demographic makeup of visitors and staff, but to the fundamental structures of institutional practice.

II. Contemporary Art Museum Education

In this section, I introduce contemporary context, rationale, and stakes for my project. I describe the increased interest in participation, social justice, and underserved audiences in contemporary art museum education practice and gesture towards the problems and potentials I envision in this trend.

Background: from activism to “diversity,” and back

Although the contemporary movement for social justice in museums – what museum scholar, practitioner, and activist Porchia Moore calls the Inclusive Museum Movement⁶ – represents an important paradigm shift, concern about the broader societal value of museums did not begin either with contemporary practices or with Arts

⁶ Porchia Moore, “The Inclusive Museum Movement: Creating a More Inclusive, Equitable, and Culturally Responsible Museum Field,” *Museum Magazine*, December 2016, 18.

Awareness. Museum scholar Hilde Hein notes that museums have had an activist agenda since the Enlightenment. Museum scholar Richard Sandell identifies the public institutions of the Progressive Era, including museums, as activist institutions.⁷ In 1917, Progressive Era museum director and librarian John Cotton Dana expressed the hope that “the growing habit of cities to maintain their own museums will surely tend to democratize them” and make them “immediately and definitely useful to their founders and patrons – the public.”⁸ Beginning in 1972 at a convening in Santiago, Chile organized by the International Council of Museums (ICOM), the new museology movement is motivated by a concern for social and cultural change and consists of community-oriented museum practices including cultivating cooperation between visitors and staff, as well as intercultural collaboration.⁹ Adopted in 1984 by an international coalition of museum leaders known as the International Movement for a new Museology (MINOM), convened by ICOM, the *Declaration of Quebec – Basic Principles of a New Museology* states a commitment to museum practice oriented toward “cultural intervention” and “humanitarian principles.”¹⁰ Another example is the U.S.-based community museum movement, beginning in the late 1960s as a proliferation of grassroots, neighborhood institutions that collected and exhibited artwork from artists of color who were excluded from mainstream museums. Prominent examples of community museums in New York City include the Studio Museum in Harlem (founded in 1968) and El Museo del Barrio (founded in 1969.) Some community museums expanded on these

⁷ Elena Gonzales, “Museums Working for Social Justice: Resonance and Wonder” (Doctoral dissertation, Brown University, 2015), 7; Richard Sandell, “On Ethics, Activism and Human Rights,” in *The Routledge Companion to Museum Ethics: Redefining Ethics for the Twenty-First Century Museum*, ed. Janet C. Marstine, 1st ed. (Routledge, 2011), 134.

⁸ John Cotton Dana, *The Gloom of the Museum* (University of Michigan Library, 1917), 9.

⁹ “MINOM-ICOM | About Us,” accessed January 5, 2017, <http://www.minom-icom.net/about-us>.

¹⁰ UNESCO and ICOM, “The Santiago Declaration,” 1972.

traditional museum practices by organizing activities for children, bilingual education, professional training for nurses, services for elderly people to improve their memory, and access to medical tests including mammograms.¹¹ The new museology movement acknowledged a need for museum professionals to share power and authority with museum visitors. The community museum movement recognized that mainstream museums are exclusionary to artists and visitors of color. Arts Awareness was part of this broader push to make museums more responsive.

As *Harlem on My Mind* illustrates, larger, more established institutions like the Met had also begun to recognize the need for the museum field to engage with more diverse audiences and subject matter – even if projects like *Harlem on My Mind* spectacularly failed to do so – in the 1960s. The American Alliance of Museums (AAM) also recognized lack of diversity among museum board and staff as a condition that the museum field needed to address in an 1984 report called *Museums for a New Century*: “The diversity of the community of museums is not fully representative of the diversity of the society it seeks to serve. In their governance and staffing, museums have much to gain by making a commitment to greater diversity.”¹² Since its Board of Directors adopted the report *Excellence and Equity: Education and the Public Dimension of Museums* as policy in 1991, AAM has mandated that every museum’s mission statement must clearly express a commitment to education as central to the museum’s public

¹¹ Gonzales, “Museums Working for Social Justice: Resonance and Wonder,” 10; Fath Davis Ruffins, “Culture Wars Won and Lost: Ethnic Museums on the Mall, Part I: The National Holocaust Museum and the National Museum of the American Indian,” *Radical History Review* 1997, no. 68 (1997): 79–100; Fath Davis Ruffins, “Culture Wars Won and Lost, Part II: The National African-American Museum Project,” *Radical History Review* 1998, no. 70 (1998): 78–101.

¹² Wendy Ng and Syrus Marcus Ware, “Excellence and Equity?,” *Multiculturalism in Art Museums Today*, 2014, 37; American Association of Museums, “Museums for a New Century: A Report of the Commission on Museums for a New Century” (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums, 1984), 29.

service.¹³ *Excellence and Equity* also drew an explicit link between education and diversity, challenging museums to pair “intellectual rigor with the inclusion of a broader spectrum of our diverse society.”¹⁴ Although *Excellence and Equity* frames education as a museum-wide pursuit, education departments are, in practice, the main agents of this purported social good.

So, although field-wide interest in diversity in museums is not a phenomenon new to the 21st century, the prevailing approach to the question has historically been characterized mainly by a concern with audience demographics. And much of the contemporary conversation around diversity and equity in museums still centers on an interest in changing the demographic makeup of museum audiences from an overwhelming majority of white visitors to a balance that represents the demographics of the nation overall. According to a survey conducted by the National Endowment for the Arts, between 2008 and 2012, the percentage of U.S. adults who attended an art museum or gallery dropped by 8%. In particular, museum-going rates declined significantly for adult between the ages of 18 and 24 and between the ages of 35 and 44.¹⁵ Currently, only 9% of core museum visitors are people of color. In *Demographic Transformation and the Future of Museums*, Farrell and Medvedeva wring their hands over how museums will fare in a “majority-minority future”¹⁶ in which people of color outnumber white people.

¹³ “Excellence and Equity: Education and the Public Dimension of Museums” (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums, 1992), 4–5.

¹⁴ Ibid., 6; Wendy Ng and Syrus Marcus Ware, “Excellence and Equity?,” in *Multiculturalism in Art Museums Today*, ed. Joni Boyd Acuff and Laura Evans (Rowman & Littlefield, 2014), 37.

¹⁵ Sunil Iyengar, “How a Nation Engages with Art: Highlights from the 2012 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts” (Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts, September 2013), <https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/highlights-from-2012-sppa-revised-oct-2015.pdf>.

¹⁶ Betty Farrell and Maria Medvedeva, “Demographic Transformation and the Future of Museums” (American Alliance of Museums Press, 2010), 6.

It is important to distinguish between these models, in which diversity of audience and personnel are ends in themselves, and a more explicitly *activist* understanding of museum practice, in which challenges to entrenched power structures become programmatic. For Sandell, an activist museum “does not simply reflect and reinforce dominant moralities and widely supported positions on rights issues, but is increasingly concerned to actively challenge and reconfigure them.”¹⁷ According to Janet Marstine, “to be the compassionate and equitable institutions that the new museum ethics imagines, institutions must be willing to accept the responsibility of activism.”¹⁸ Although MINOM and the community museums of the 1960s are important historical precedents for this way of thinking, it remained largely outside the mainstream discourse for most of the 20th century.

In recent years, however, museums have begun to articulate their commitment to diversity using the vocabulary of activism and social justice. Two of the core professional organizations in this field embody this trend. The Journal of Museum Education, published by the Museum Education Roundtable, perfectly illustrates this trend: they are devoting a special issue to “the ways in which museum educators are actively seeking to identify and dismantle racist practices in museums” to be published in Summer 2017.¹⁹ This issue follows up issues titled *Museum Education in Times of Radical Social Change* (Fall 2012) and *Shared Authority: The Key to Museum Education as Social Change* (Summer 2013). The theme for the National Art Education Association’s 2017

¹⁷ Gonzales, “Museums Working for Social Justice: Resonance and Wonder,” 7; Sandell, “On Ethics, Activism and Human Rights,” 136.

¹⁸ Gonzales, “Museums Working for Social Justice: Resonance and Wonder,” 7; Janet C. Marstine, ed., *The Routledge Companion to Museum Ethics: Redefining Ethics for the Twenty-First Century Museum*, 1st ed. (Routledge, 2011), 13.

¹⁹ Keonna Hendrick and Marit Dewhurst, “Journal of Museum Education Special Edition on Racism in Museum Education,” December 8, 2015.

preconference for museum educators was “Diversity & Inclusion: Art Museum Educators as Levers of Change.” These resources share a commitment to participatory practice.

These efforts underscore a concern across the museum field for attracting more diverse audiences, and in particular underscore how this responsibility often falls to museum educators. Today, one of the most pressing questions in the museum field is: How can museums create social value and cultivate social change? Dr. Johnnetta Cole’s keynote at the 2015 American Alliance of Museums (AAM) conference, titled “Museums, Diversity, and Social Value” was a call to action:

“What I have chosen to do in this keynote address is to make the case that our museums can and must be of social value by not only inspiring but creating change around one of the most critical issues of our time – the issue of diversity. For us in the world of museums that means inspiring and creating far greater diversity in our work forces, our exhibitions, our educational programs, and among our visitors.”²⁰

“Colleagues all, I believe that we cannot fully carry out the visions and the missions of our museums, and indeed our museum cannot continue to be of social value if we do not do what is required to have more diversity in who works at our museums, in the audiences we welcome to our museums, and in the philanthropic and board leadership of our museums.”²¹

For Cole, museums create social value by both reflecting society -- what she calls “the histories and herstories, the cultures, art and science ... of the many people who make up our nation and our world”²² -- and influencing society. She identifies the overrepresentation of white people in museum staffs (and particularly in leadership roles) and museum audiences, the underrepresentation of women in director roles and of women artists on gallery walls, wage disparity for women museum workers as key problems facing the museum field. She challenged museum professionals to “boldly,

²⁰ Johnnetta Betsch Cole, “Museums, Diversity, & Social Value” (2015 American Alliance of Museums Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia, April 27, 2015), <https://aamd.org/our-members/from-the-field/johnnetta-cole-museums-diversity-social-value>.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

indeed bodaciously commit to rethinking about what takes place at our museums, to whom our museums belong, and who the colleagues are who have the privilege of telling important stories through the power of science, history, culture, and art.”²³ In other words, Cole’s call to action is for museums to reflect and, in turn, shape society by building equity into exhibitions, education, and programming as well as internal labor practices and working conditions.

Though there has long been an activist strain in museology, activism is now becoming mainstream in the contemporary museum world as narrated by major organizations like AAM. This field is vocal about its commitments to social value. Previously, social value was understood as expanding museums’ meaningfulness to visitors across lines of social difference while maintaining the norms of museum practice. Today, social value is increasingly framed in terms of social justice, and how museums can practice advocacy and solidarity with marginalized identities and urges systemic, transformative change in museum practice. Porchia Moore describes this contemporary movement as the Inclusive Museum Movement, characterized by “a call for transformative and systemic change in museums” to be implemented through inclusive, equitable, culturally responsible, and culturally relevant best practices and built on “the principles of social justice, history-based radical traditions, and anti-oppression frameworks.”²⁴ In an October 2016 press release, Laura Lott, President and CEO of the American Alliance of Museums (AAM) — the organization that oversees the accreditation of American museums, and also the major professional organization for museum directors, curators, and educators – discussed this commitment:

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Moore, “The Inclusive Museum Movement: Creating a More Inclusive, Equitable, and Culturally Responsible Museum Field,” 18.

“I think museums are increasingly embracing their roles in social justice. They’re taking more proactive positions about the things our country (at least) is facing in a pretty lousy election year with a lot of rhetoric and some racial tensions that seem to have gotten a little worse in the last couple of years. Museums are not just sitting back and pretending they’re not part of that – they’re actually embracing their role to help people understand the history, and what’s going on. I’ve seen more museums take what could be perceived as riskier but more deliberate stances in their communities. I think that’s good, but I think AAM has a role in helping museums to do that carefully, responsibly and productively.”²⁵

Lott acknowledges the recent proliferation of work by contemporary museum professionals who are creating exhibitions, community programs, online resources, and other projects that actively confront social injustice by addressing issues of immigration, religious expression, sexual orientation, and gender identity and supporting the work of activists engaged in struggles against racism, discrimination, and oppression.

Museum studies scholarship has long held that, regardless of a museum’s political position, museums produce and maintain ideology. Richard Sandell writes:

“Over the past two decades, the view that museums are socially constitutive and that they construct and communicate realities which function to reshape (not simply reflect) social relations, moral codes and conventions is one which has gained widespread support, not only within museum studies but also in sociology, cultural studies and anthropology.”²⁶

Lott’s description reflects Sandell’s observation that museums are not neutral or apolitical but socially constitutive, and that they have an active role in shaping society. Her description reflects how museums realize the significant social implications of museum practice, which are inextricable from social justice struggles today. In today’s Inclusive Museum Movement, these concerns are a part of mainstream museum discourse.

²⁵ Laura Lott, AAM President, Laura Lott: Museums Are the Classrooms of the Future, October 17, 2016, <http://blooloop.com/feature/aam-president-laura-lott-museums-are-the-classrooms-of-the-future/>.

²⁶ Gonzales, “Museums Working for Social Justice: Resonance and Wonder,” 7; Sandell, “On Ethics, Activism and Human Rights,” 135.

One example of this kind of work is *Devin Allen: Awakenings, In a New Light* at the Reginald F. Lewis Museum of Maryland African American History and Culture in Baltimore, a solo exhibition of photographer Devin Allen's images of the Baltimore Uprising following the death of Freddie Gray in police custody in 2015.²⁷ Allen's images make visible the pain and confusion, and humanity and solidarity within the Baltimore Uprising – including, poignantly, a close-up image of a Black police officer with tears brimming in his eyes. Another example is a public program offering self-care following the deaths of Alton Sterling and Philando Castile at the hands of police officers in July 2016 at the Rubin Museum of Art in New York City. The program consisted of a 45-minute meditation session called “Healing Ourselves, Healing Our World” followed by a pair of facilitated dialogues – one for visitors of color, and one for white visitors – about dismantling structural racism.²⁸ Both of these museum initiatives implicitly endorse the #BlackLivesMatter movement and present museums as appropriate spaces for grappling with – and acting against – injustice. These programs are emblematic of the movement towards social value in museums, in which museums are acknowledging their role as storytellers of the historical and the contemporary, documenting and narrating struggles for social justice and acting as community spaces where visitors can gather around these issues.

There is a proliferation of professional efforts to promote social value across the museum field. Professional organizations such as the Inclusive Museum and the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience are expanding their membership and

²⁷ Mary Carole McCauley, “After Time Cover, Devin Allen Opens First Solo Show at Lewis Museum,” *The Baltimore Sun*, July 3, 2015, <http://www.baltimoresun.com/entertainment/bs-ae-allen-lewis-20150704-story.html>.

²⁸ “Mindfulness Meditation | Rubin Museum of Art,” July 13, 2016, <http://rubinmuseum.org/events/event/mindfulness-meditation-07-13-2016>.

influence. On social media, passionate advocates for inclusion in museums voice their ideas on the Inluseum blog and the #MuseumsRespondToFerguson and #MuseumWorkersSpeak tweet chats. Grassroots projects including Brown Girls Museum Blog, the Visitors of Color tumblr, Museum Hue, and Museum of Impact emerged to create space for new, diverse narratives. Coalitions of museum professionals have convened under umbrellas including Museums and Race and Museums as Sites for Social Action (MASS Action) to create workshops and publications to address social value.

The thought leadership of these grassroots efforts has pushed the American Alliance of Museums to center social justice issues. In 2015, AAM organized their annual conference around the theme of “The Social Value of Museums: Inspiring Change.” In 2016, AAM reinforced its commitment to social value by interrogating how museums can better address the issue of social inequality. In the announcement of Annual Meeting theme, they asked: “Are museums welcoming and accessible to all audiences? Are museums engaging communities to address controversial topics? Are museums actively developing an inclusive workplace?”²⁹ In 2017, AAM will delve into these questions yet again with a conference theme on “Diversity, Equity, Accessibility and Inclusion in Museums” in St. Louis, asking questions including:

“Who comes to museums? How do we attract and retain diverse audiences across borders and categories of sex, race, ethnicity, age, class, ability, language, sexual orientation, and gender roles and identity? How can we ensure that all audiences can access our programs, collections, and resources? How do we strengthen our museums’ roles as safe environments for cross-cultural

²⁹ American Alliance of Museums, “2016 AAM Annual Meeting Theme: Power, Influence and Responsibility,” *American Alliance of Museums Website*, 2016, <http://aam-us.org/events/annual-meeting/2016-annual-meeting-theme>.

dialogues and interactions? How do we actively deconstruct systemic biases in our field—and how will we measure our progress?”³⁰

Social justice and participatory practice

Alongside the social-justice turn, museum education and artistic production have both begun to embrace participation as a central value or objective. Many recent formulations draw a close and explicit link between these two commitments. In *The Participatory Museum* published in 2010, Nina Simon articulates a program for a participatory cultural institution:

“I define a participatory cultural institution as a place where visitors can create, share, and connect with each other around content. *Create* means that visitors contribute their own ideas, objects, and creative expression to the institution and to each other. *Share* means that people discuss, take home, remix, and redistribute both what they see and what they make during their visit. *Connect* means that visitors socialize with other people – staff and visitors – who share their particular interests. *Around content* means that visitors’ conversations and creations focus on the evidence, objects, and ideas most important to the institution in question.”³¹

Simon’s model for the participatory museum centers on the agency of museum visitors within the institution. Her text highlights the difference between traditional and participatory design: in the traditional model, “the institution provides content for the visitors to consume.”³² In the participatory model, “the institution supports multi-directional content experiences,” serving as “a ‘platform’ that connects different users who act as content creators, distributors, consumers, critics, and collaborators.”³³ Though Simon’s book contains participatory strategies for a wide range of museum practices – including curation, public programming, and online initiatives – it has become

³⁰ American Alliance of Museums, “2017 AAM Annual Meeting Theme: Gateways for Understanding: Diversity, Equity, Accessibility, and Inclusion in Museums,” *American Alliance of Museums Website*, 2017, http://annualmeeting.aam-us.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/AAM2017_theme-final_pdf_ACC.pdf.

³¹ Nina Simon, *The Participatory Museum* (Santa Cruz, CA: Museum 2.0 (self-published), 2010), ii–iii.

³² *Ibid.*, 2.

³³ *Ibid.*

a particularly central text for museum educators, the museum staff members who typically have the most direct contact with visitors. For contemporary museum educators interested in replacing passive, monologic museum tours with more visitor-centered, engaging approaches (like Yenawine had been 40 years previously), *The Participatory Museum* has been a significant resource and inspiration.

For Simon, participatory practice can be leveraged for pedagogical and political benefits. Regarding the educational benefits that visitors could receive, she writes, “participatory activities can provide valuable civic and learning experiences.”³⁴ She also sees broader potential for in participatory practice:

“When people have safe, welcoming places in their local communities to meet new people, engage with complex ideas, and be creative, they can make significant civic and cultural impact. The cumulative effort of thousands of participatory institutions could change the world.”³⁵

Through participatory practice, Simon proposes, the museums can become a platform for creating social change.

The *Next Practices* publication by the Association of Art Museum Directors – a professional organization for directors of major art museums in North America – is full of examples of participatory art museum education projects that exemplify the link between participation and social justice. *Next Practices* is comparable to *The Art Museum as Educator*, a 1978 compendium of case studies of art museum education programs. Other than Arts Awareness, *The Art Museum as Educator* contains few examples of participatory pedagogy. Yet in *Next Practices* such models are ubiquitous.³⁶ A

³⁴ Ibid., 351.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Barbara Y. Newsom and Adele Z. Silver, eds., *The Art Museum as Educator: A Collection of Studies as Guides to Practice and Policy* (University of California Press, 1978).

representative example from *Next Practices* is the Museum as Sanctuary program at the Tucson Museum of Art, intended for refugees:

“Meetings take place every Tuesday night at the museum and begin with a dynamic, interactive gallery tour led by educators specially trained in cultural sensitivity and the unique needs of traumatized individuals. These tours are participatory and discussion-based. In order to facilitate the diverse group of refugees, discussions of the art are based on both-verbal and non-verbal means of communication and questions for both internal examination and post-tour group dialogues are given. After the gallery exposure, the refugee individuals are then given opportunities to express their reactions and interpretations to their museum experience and what they have experienced over the course of the week via the multi-media creation of art.”³⁷

In the participatory, visitor-centered approach to gallery teaching, tours are dialogic, not monologic. In this case, the participants engage in non-verbal responses as well – which may include movement activities and other creative responses. This programming is specifically tailored around the needs of the audience, in this case refugees.

Another example is the Cleveland Museum of Art’s Teen CO-OP program. Teens join the staff team for the museum’s new experimental gallery and are “trained to work with the public, alongside museum professionals.”³⁸ The teens develop curriculum, create programming, and evaluate programming for preschoolers. They also work as docents, produce videos for museum audiences, and create content for brochures, the museum’s website, and an iPad tour. Though the name CO-OP implies an exchange of labor or commodities, and the process for CO-OP membership includes an application, recommendations and an interview, this is not a job but a participatory museum experience.

³⁷ Association of Art Museum Directors, “Next Practices in Art Museum Education” (Association of Art Museum Directors, April 28, 2014), 83–84, <https://aamd.org/sites/default/files/document/AAMD%20Next%20Practices%20in%20Art%20Museum%20Education.pdf>.

³⁸ Ibid., 10–11.

Critique

Contemporary scholars, artists, and educators have played an important role in making questions of equity and power dynamics central to the conversation about the social role and identity of the contemporary museum. However, many of these projects celebrate “participation” as an automatic good in itself, failing to adequately theorize the relationship between *participation as such* and the advancement of their purported social justice goals. For example, with the Teen CO-OP program as presented by the Association of Art Museum Directors: this work is presented without theoretical or methodological basis, and is described in a positive, uplifting mode (“In Teen CO-OP each teen develops research and communication skills...”) without critique or acknowledgement of flaws or challenges. Like much of the text produced by museums, this blurb is presented without authors or named staff members (the players are “teen docents” and “the museum” and “the public” and “museum professionals”), which erases the museum educators who created this programming and those teens who participated. This differs from the treatment of curators, who directly receive credit for their work in exhibitions and publications. There is no space for the teens to share their perspectives or reflections, which re-inscribes the museum’s authority. Instead, the participants’ work products – curriculum, evaluations, videos, etc. – are described in detail, suggesting that the creation of content for the museum’s use is prioritized over the participants’ experiences. Without a link to the Teen CO-OP website or a contact e-mail, or a venue for readers to submit letters or feedback, there is no channel in the field to share critiques of this kind of work – it is presented as an automatic, unqualified good. Reports such as this document paint an incomplete picture of the program with much necessary

information omitted. As evidenced throughout the *Next Practices* report, this is typical of how museums present their participatory programming.

By uncritically conflating participation with equity, even the best-intentioned participatory programs risk re-inscribing the very power dynamics they purportedly break down. One such example is Nina Simon's concept of "social bridging." One of the "core programming goals" at the MAH is "social bridging," which she defines as "build[ing] social capital by forging unexpected connections" with "unlikely partners" including "opera singers and ukulele players, Guggenheim fellows and amateur artists, history buffs and homeless adults."³⁹ In each case, these pairings are about more than "different backgrounds" or "different generations" or "distant disciplines"⁴⁰ -- it is not just difference, but difference in power and privilege. Opera singers and Guggenheim fellows and historians have opportunities and resources for training, funding, collaboration, and development that are unavailable to ukulele players, amateurs, and the homeless. By juxtaposing groups with a gap -- sometimes, in the case of homeless adults, an especially significant gap -- in power and privilege and not attending to that gap, "social bridging" programming essentially maintains and re-inscribes this disparity.

There is a discrepancy, then, between the stated objectives of many recent participatory education programs and their actual results. This discrepancy is the background for one of the central contentions underlying this project: in order to understand and analyze the current moment in service of a methodologically rigorous and politically and ethically committed approach to participation, it is critical to understand the longer history of participatory engagement in museums. That history is under-

³⁹ Nina Simon, *The Art of Relevance* (Museum 2.0 (self-published), 2016), 116.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

examined and under-theorized – a need this dissertation sets out to address by excavating an example of methodological rigor and political imagination unique in the history of museums.

Arts Awareness is particularly important in this regard, I argue, because it developed in response to a specific set of historical conditions that bear unique, instructive similarities to those that have driven the recent rise of participatory and social-justice-oriented museum practices. This dissertation aims to outline those similarities and analyze their significance.

Chapter 1 situates Arts Awareness within the institutional history of the Met as well as its broader historical moment, tracing the ways in which Arts Awareness diagnosed the museum's struggles with racial, cultural and economic diversity not simply as the result of curatorial or outreach decisions, but of institutional power dynamics within the museum itself.

Chapter 2 argues that Arts Awareness attempted to leverage the unique potential of museum education as a site for challenging these power dynamics, positing a participatory pedagogy that made critical reflection on the power relations between individual and institution a fundamental component of engagement with art, and with the museum itself.

In my final chapter, I compare the motivations, objectives and methods of Arts Awareness with those of contemporary practitioners of participatory and social-justice-oriented pedagogy through the lens of their respective approaches to the question of the “outsider.” I argue that Arts Awareness provides a crucially important model of educational practice driven by critical reflection on the relationship between pedagogy

and institutional power dynamics – a reflection that any museum education program that aspires to the mantles of “inclusion” or “social justice” as they are predominantly articulated today must undertake.

III. The Implications of Examining Arts Awareness for Contemporary Art Museum Education

In this section, I discuss what contemporary art museum educators can learn from Arts Awareness and argue for the importance of studying the history of art museum education for contemporary practitioners.

What contemporary art museum educators can learn from Arts Awareness

A close look at Arts Awareness is an opportunity for contemporary practitioners to gain a more critical perspective on their own work, and to ask new and better questions of themselves as practitioners. The pedagogical strategies of Arts Awareness can be activated towards raising critical consciousness about social justice issues within and beyond the museum. I envision a style of museum education that does not shy away from politics, which uses the museum itself as a laboratory for cultivating political lucidity and participating in the struggle for social change. These strategies can help us take on and challenge the systemic social inequalities that manifest in museums. Arts Awareness has shown us that if museums want to be progressive and to enact social change—and simply to remain relevant—they cannot shy away from addressing their own complicity in inequality. They have to address it head on.

While Arts Awareness provides an important lesson for contemporary museum educators, I’m also interested in the ways in which it can help museums look inward and

reflect on internal inequalities. While museums loudly proclaim their commitments to social value, many hesitate to take real action to address their own shortcomings, including a critical lack of diversity among staff as well as visitors and unjust internal labor practices. In this project, I analyze contemporary thought in museum pedagogy, paying special attention to the “participatory” trend spearheaded by Nina Simon, alongside Arts Awareness. In a time when participatory pedagogy is conflated with social value, as social inequality within and outside the museum continues to rise, Arts Awareness may provide our current moment with a needed illustration of methodological and political imagination. By being more self-critical and self-reflective, museum educators can do our best work towards cultivating social justice.

Arts Awareness is an under-researched and under-theorized precedent to contemporary art museum education

According to Rika Burnham, “Museum education as a whole is under-studied, under-theorized, and under-historicized.”⁴¹ Though theorizing about audience-centered institutions has a long history – Nina Simon points to the work of John Cotton Dana, Elaine Heumann Gurian, and Stephen Weil – the pivot from monologic docent tours to dialogic, visitor-centered gallery experiences created by Arts Awareness is an under-researched facet of that discourse. Arts Awareness is a critical precedent to contemporary practice.

Arts Awareness came into existence because of internal recognition in the Education Department at the Met that their programming was only meeting the needs of privileged white visitors. It came about because the museum made an effort to hire new

⁴¹ Rika Burnham, Interview with Rika Burnham, interview by Alyssa Greenberg, Audio file, October 7, 2015.

staff members – artists, people of color – who could relate to visitors and activate the museum’s collection in new ways. Arts Awareness also came into existence for many of the same reasons that *Harlem on My Mind* did – an interest in making the museum relevant to visitors of color, to visitors with less economic and class privilege. In making the museum not just a space for the elite, but a space where people from all backgrounds can come together and enjoy art. In democratizing the museum. And finally, it was an opportunity to make up for the shortcomings of the *Harlem on My Mind* debacle.

Arts Awareness was intended to re-imagine the relationship between museum and visitors. Arts Awareness was designed to strip away the museum’s privileging of art historical knowledge and instead propose pedagogy structured around a universal language of art, creating space for museum educators and visitors to co-create experiences together. However, in practice, this approach was flawed and actually had the effect of re-inscribing the societal inequities and elitism that the program was designed to challenge.

From the beginning, Arts Awareness challenged the institutional power structures of the museum. Curators, security guards, and administrators worried that Arts Awareness sessions could damage works of art. Staff members questioned the pedagogical value of Arts Awareness. Curators dismissed it as “blarney,” guards complained it was “a constant source of annoyance,” and administrators worried about students roaming “uncontrollably” in the galleries.⁴² It was expensive to run, and challenged the museum’s norms about how much education programming ought to cost,

⁴² Barbara Y. Newsom, “The Department of High School Programs and an Experiment in ‘Arts Awareness’ at the Metropolitan Museum of Art,” in *The Art Museum as Educator: A Collection of Studies as Guides to Practice and Policy*, ed. Barbara Y. Newsom and Adele Z. Silver (University of California Press, 1978), 453; Howard Conant, “An Evaluation of the 1973 Arts Awareness Program of the Metropolitan Museum of Art” (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, August 1, 1973).

and how much of the museum's resources should be extended to education. Its unconventional strategies disrupted the quiet, contemplative mood of the galleries. This history has significant implications for the contemporary conversation on what the social role of the contemporary museum – it informs our understanding of how we got here.

From Arts Awareness to Visual Thinking Strategies (VTS)

Philip Yenawine's career trajectory is the through line from Arts Awareness to contemporary participatory practice. After departing from the Met in 1974, in the late 1970s and early 1980s Philip Yenawine taught art at various institutions including the South Street Seaport Museum in New York City, the Museum of Contemporary Art in Chicago, and the Aspen Art Museum and in 1976-77 was a visiting faculty member in Art Education at UIC.⁴³

In 1983, he became the Director of Education at the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) in New York City. At MoMA, Yenawine began to develop the pedagogy of Visual Thinking Strategies (VTS) in response to a challenge from the museum's Board of Trustees.⁴⁴ Yenawine writes that in 1987, "several trustees challenged my staff and me to find out if anyone learned from our many educational options. We were asked to be accountable for our teaching: were we effective? Did people learn what we taught?"⁴⁵ He turned to cognitive psychologist Abigail Housen to gather data about whether participants in his MoMA programming were retaining what they had been taught. Yenawine wrote of Housen's results:

⁴³ Philip Yenawine, "Curriculum Vitae," May 2008.

⁴⁴ Philip Yenawine, *Visual Thinking Strategies: Using Art to Deepen Learning across School Disciplines*, 2013, viii.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 2.

“To our surprise and great dismay, she found they *didn't* retain what we taught, even immediately after an experience. When visitors attending gallery talks, for example, were asked moments later to retrace their steps and relate what they remembered from the talk they'd just attended, they didn't even recall all the images examined, much less provide an accurate recounting of what they'd been told.”⁴⁶

This failure upset Yenawine deeply on a personal level, and he continued to work with Housen to study why participants were not retaining what they had learned and to develop a new pedagogy that would enable participants to retain knowledge. This was, however, also a lesson Yenawine had learned from Arts Awareness:

“I could have people in the palm of my hand. I could get them so they were really, really enjoying it and they all wanted more at the end. But when tested, they wouldn't know what I had said. So I was just being a performer. I was a good performer. There were a lot of good performers, and there still are a lot of good performers. But that's what they're doing. They're performing. They're putting on a show. Because it isn't possible for people to take in the information at the speed at which it comes, given the lack of background people have in the arts.”⁴⁷

For the past fifteen years, Housen studied how people processed art by having viewers look at art and speak aloud in an uninterrupted stream of consciousness until they had nothing left to say. Housen then transcribed and analyzed this data, through which she developed a rubric for classifying art learners' thinking patterns from beginning viewers to experts.⁴⁸ Housen concluded that most visitors at MoMA were in the early viewing stages.⁴⁹ Yenawine, Housen, and a team of MoMA staff developed a pedagogy based on teaching viewing skills called Visual Thinking Strategies (VTS).⁵⁰ VTS sessions focus on interpreting a sole work of art, begin with silent looking at the artwork, followed by a facilitator-led collective interpretation of the artwork through dialogue, and closed with a concluding remark by the facilitator. The dialogue is anchored by three questions,

⁴⁶ Ibid., 4.

⁴⁷ Philip Yenawine, Interview with Philip Yenawine, November 2016, interview by Alyssa Greenberg, Audio file, November 1, 2016.

⁴⁸ Yenawine, *Visual Thinking Strategies*, 5.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 6.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 12.

from which the facilitator does not deviate: “What’s going on in this picture? What do you see that makes you say that? What more can we find?”⁵¹

There are many key similarities between Arts Awareness and VTS. Both programs model a move from “parades before the pictures”⁵² gallery talks to participatory pedagogy. The “language of art” approach of Arts Awareness resembles the interest in “visual literacy” of VTS. In both Arts Awareness and VTS, sessions are structured around an activity bookended by opening and closing moments. Yenawine discussed these similarities with me:

“The thing that stands to link the two programs [Arts Awareness and VTS] was that I really, really wanted people to engage with art. I wanted them to dig it. I wanted them to get into it. And with Arts Awareness, I was doing it one way. I later assessed that it didn't really actually work in the sense of giving them something they could continue to use.”⁵³

One key difference is the absence of a social rationale for the pedagogy – In his publications, Yenawine frames the entire motivation as visitors learning about art.

Yenawine explained:

“What I learned in the interim was how developmentally appropriate education is the only kind of education that actually works. Teach people at the level they can learn. Arts Awareness was a good way of getting people to a level where they could participate and have fun, but not learn. Finally I got to VTS which does both, engages people, but it also gives them a structure which they can continue to use. And we have the data that says that they do.”⁵⁴

However, in conversation with me, Yenawine did share a democratizing impulse behind VTS:

“What links the two programs is really just me and my sense, I suppose. My commitment to trying to get people to connect to art. My commitment to teaching people, not just empowered people,

⁵¹ Ibid., 25.

⁵² Philip Yenawine, Interview with Philip Yenawine, March 2016, interview by Alyssa Greenberg, Audio file, March 10, 2016.

⁵³ Yenawine, Interview with Philip Yenawine, November 2016.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

but everybody. Through line ... art-focused ... student-centered ... wanting the student to be active.”⁵⁵

VTS is now the lingua franca among art museum educators in the United States.

Michael Murawski, Director of Education and Public Programs at the Portland Art Museum and editor of the popular blog ArtMuseumTeaching.com, led a panel at the 2009 American Alliance of Museums (then American Association of Museums) conference on the “questions, challenges, and apprehensions that exist regarding this method [VTS].”⁵⁶ In preparation for the panel, he interviewed over 30 museum educators from across the United States about how VTS informs their practices including “adaptations of the original protocol, metacognitive dimensions as part of the VTS experience, pushing the boundaries of artwork selection, and alternative applications for docent and teacher training.”⁵⁷ Murawski describes the effects of VTS on the museum education field: “In addition to being one of the most commonly used teaching methods in art museums today, it is interesting to see how many other ways that VTS and its research has entered into museum practice.”⁵⁸ Murawski makes a critical point: not only is VTS a common teaching method in art museums today, but VTS permeates art museum education practice in other ways too. VTS is a significant part of the museum education discourse and informs the pedagogy and curriculum that practitioners create, even if it is an adaptation or response or a critique of VTS.⁵⁹ If museum education is where the social value of the museum is enacted, and VTS is the dominant pedagogy, a closer exploration of this key precedent to VTS is necessary.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Mike Murawski, “OpenThink: Visual Thinking Strategies (VTS) & Museums,” *Art Museum Teaching*, April 29, 2014, <https://artmuseumteaching.com/2014/04/29/openthink-visual-thinking-strategies-vts-museums/>.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

Methodology

Summary

The central research question for this dissertation is: **What are the implications of exploring Arts Awareness for contemporary practitioners?** To investigate this question, I examined two categories of primary sources: I conducted oral history interviews and I performed archival research. This dissertation follows the case study model of *From Knowledge to Narrative: Educators and the Changing Museum*, in which Lisa C. Roberts performs a close, granular study of an exhibition on the naturalist Carolus Linnaeus at the Chicago Botanic Garden as a springboard for a discussion of the history and philosophy of museum pedagogy.⁶⁰ Roberts identifies museum educators as agents at the forefront of the paradigm shift in museum practice “from knowledge to narrative” who “play an important part in adapting the institution to this change.”⁶¹ I adapt her granular approach to analyzing museum education oriented towards interpreting institutional practice writ large.

I conducted oral history interviews with Arts Awareness stakeholders. I interviewed Philip Yenawine via telephone on 3 occasions, Arts Awareness artist-educators Randy Williams and Howard Levy in person each on one occasion, and Rika Burnham, who facilitated art museum education inspired Arts Awareness pedagogy at the Met shortly after Yenawine’s departure in person on one occasion. In total, I recorded

⁶⁰ Lisa C. Roberts, *From Knowledge to Narrative: Educators and the Changing Museum* (Smi, 1997).

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 2–3.

and transcribed approximately 7 hours and 30 minutes of interview recordings. This research is exempt by the UIC IRB under the Research Protocol Number 2015-0106.

Additionally, I performed research at two archives. I examined archival material at the Metropolitan Museum of Art Archives including files on the Department of Education and the files of Director Thomas Hoving. These materials included two brochures and a series of five short films on Arts Awareness. I also examined archival material at the Smithsonian Archives of American Art including transcriptions of oral history interviews circa 1971 with Philip Yenawine and art educator Marcia Kreitman, who worked at the Met as well, and the files of Howard Conant who worked on the evaluation of Arts Awareness.

Starting Point

My own way of seeing is inextricable from the process of research. As a researcher, I am also a “participant” in what sociologist Donald Comstock calls “the socio-historical development of human action and understanding.”⁶² In other words, I am a participant and stakeholder in the social structures and institutions I am researching. I endeavor to be a self-reflexive researcher, aware of my own interpretive framework and the context of my research.⁶³ For sociologist Sharlene Hesse-Biber, reflexivity entails “recogniz[ing], examin[ing], and understand[ing] how [our] social background, location, and assumptions affect [our] research practice” and “paying attention to the specific ways

⁶² Donald Comstock, “A Method for Critical Research,” in *Knowledge and Values in Social and Educational Research*, ed. Eric Bredo and Walter Feinberg (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982), 377.

⁶³ Hilary A. Radnor, *Researching Your Professional Practice: Doing Interpretive Research* (Open University Press, 2001), 38.

in which our own agendas affect the research at all points in the research process.”⁶⁴ One way this self-reflexivity manifests in this dissertation is writing openly about my personal responses to my research: for example, how my findings might have challenged my initial expectations or how my professional experience as a museum educator informs my interpretation of pedagogy. In this section, I reflect upon how my personal, professional, academic, and activist investments influence my research.

I have had the great privilege to enroll in three institutions of higher education affiliated with a museum or gallery that provided co-curricular opportunities to work as a museum educator: Oberlin College and the Allen Memorial Art Museum, the Bard Graduate Center and the Bard Graduate Center Gallery, and the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) and the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum. As an art museum educator, I am interested in mining Arts Awareness for takeaways relevant to contemporary museum education practice. So many of the questions that Arts Awareness artist-educators grappled with are critical for contemporary art museum educators as well. These questions include: How can art museum education engage visitors who have traditionally lacked access to museums? How can art museum education resist the didacticism and oppressiveness of the museum as an institution? This parallel inspires a new set of questions for considering Arts Awareness: What were the successes and missteps of Arts Awareness? How can I learn from the missteps, in order to not repeat them? How can I learn from the successes, and push them further in my own practice today? How does Arts Awareness compare to the art museum education strategies that succeeded it, such as

⁶⁴ Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber, “Feminist Research: Exploring, Interrogating, and Transforming the Interconnections of Epistemology, Methodology, and Method,” in *Handbook of Feminist Research: Theory and Praxis*, by Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber (Sage Publications, 2012), 17.

Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) and facilitated dialogue?⁶⁵ Additionally, as a scholar of museum education and a participant in the professional discourse around museum education, I am troubled by how this discourse often perpetuates and re-inscribes inequities in privilege. I am aware of the prevalence of what education scholars Daniel G. Solórzano and Tara J. Yosso call “majoritarian” narratives – “that privileges Whites, men, the middle and/or upper class, and heterosexuals by naming these social locations as natural or normative points of reference” – by perpetuating stories that highlight a perceived deficit in a group of marginalized people.⁶⁶ Because Arts Awareness – and thus, this dissertation project – entails representations of publics who have traditionally lacked access to museums, I want to explore inclusive approaches to this representation. This invites another set of questions still: Is inclusion a sufficient goal, or merely a starting point or a detour? What are museums for – is the ultimate goal diversity or decolonization? My curiosities and investments as an art museum educator inspire me to take a deep dive into the history of Arts Awareness to understand how it was created and how it operated, its successes and shortcomings, and its implications for the field to inform my practice of art museum curriculum and pedagogy today.

I was fortunate to enroll at UIC in Fall 2011 during the inaugural year of the Museum and Exhibition Studies (MUSE UIC) program, which afforded me the opportunity to pursue coursework in museum studies. As a museum studies scholar, I am interested in Arts Awareness as a pivotal historical turning point in museological

⁶⁵ Stephen Mark Dobbs, *The DBAE Handbook: An Overview of Discipline-Based Art Education*. (Santa Monica, CA: The Getty Institute for the Arts, 1992), <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED349253>; Judith M. Burton, Arlene Lederman, and Peter London, *Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art Education* (Peter London, 1988); International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, “Designing the Arc of Dialogue,” n.d.

⁶⁶ Daniel G. Solórzano and Tara J. Yosso, “Critical Race Methodology: Counter-Storytelling as an Analytical Framework for Education Research,” *Qualitative Inquiry* 8, no. 1 (2002): 28.

practice, and a lens for addressing and interrupting histories of colonialism, sexism, racism, misogyny, and white supremacy in museums. Arts Awareness was a moment of resistance against museum didacticism and oppression, of artist-led experimentation, and of extensive community outreach and engagement. Arts Awareness is a reflection of the Met's efforts to be a leader and innovator in art museum education, and was designed to be adapted and replicated by other museums nationwide. Through archival research, I analyzed how Arts Awareness was constructed as an institutional project. I studied how and why Arts Awareness generated such passion in its believers, such distaste in its naysayers, and engendered layers of institutional controversy. I learned about this historical turning point through the personal stories of Arts Awareness facilitators, participants, and stakeholders. I examined archival material and oral history through social-justice-oriented lenses including critical race theory and feminist theory to better understand how privilege and oppression play out in museums. These narratives and analysis will uncover how Arts Awareness has created new understandings of art, education, and museums – and the relationships among them.

Hesse-Biber points out that feminist researchers often work at the margins of their disciplines, and that is a position I occupy as well. Museum studies is not recognized by the College Art Association as a subfield within art history, and many of the artists whose work I connect with Arts Awareness (and all of the Arts Awareness artist-educators themselves) are not recognized within the typical canon of art history.⁶⁷ Arts Awareness represents a doubly marginal topic: as museum studies remain marginal to the larger field of art history, education often occupies a marginal position within museums themselves. I

⁶⁷ Hesse-Biber, "Feminist Research: Exploring, Interrogating, and Transforming the Interconnections of Epistemology, Methodology, and Method," 18.

am interested in Arts Awareness in part because it is an under-examined example of a challenge to institutional power that was mounted from this marginal position, and its history has been analogously obscured by the dual hierarchies of disciplinary boundaries and institutional prestige. It should be investigated and re-inserted into official histories and interpreted as an example of how challenges to institutional power are enacted and absorbed.

I am privileged to attend a university with a graduate worker union and to be the co-founder of an activist movement in the museum field, and to have the time and resources to devote to those activities. Because of my own privilege – for example, my financial security allows me to not need to work a second job, and I have no dependents – I can devote considerable time and energy to the union as a Steering Committee member. As a Steering Committee member of the UIC Graduate Employees Organization I have experienced firsthand how an institution's working conditions and its relationship with its workers affect its capacity as a pedagogical institution. The strong contracts we negotiate, which guarantee a living wage and tuition waiver and benefits/protections for all graduate workers, is what allows graduate education to be more accessible. I have also been influenced to put labor at the forefront of my research by the recent scandals surrounding the University of Illinois' mistreatment of professors Steven Salaita, Pietro Bortone and Seung-Whan Choi,⁶⁸ reinforcing my belief that labor justice is central to an institution's capacity to promote social value.

⁶⁸ Jodi S. Cohen, "University of Illinois OKs \$875,000 Settlement to End Steven Salaita Dispute," *Chicago Tribune*, November 12, 2015, <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/breaking/ct-steven-salaita-settlement-met-20151112-story.html>; Peter Schmidt, "U. of Illinois Is Accused of Making Professor a Greek Sacrifice," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 24, 2016, <http://www.chronicle.com/article/U-of-Illinois-Is-Accused-of/235417?cid=rclink>; Corilyn Shropshire, "Professor Says UIC Forced Him to Teach Statistics Because He Is Asian," *Chicago Tribune*, December

As a founding member of Museum Workers Speak, a collective of activist museum workers who interrogate the relationship between museums' stated commitments to social value and their internal labor practices, I examine the case study of Arts Awareness as one museum's very public attempt to put its ideals into action. As a museum activist, I am attentive to and inspired by art museum education strategies that challenge the status quo of the museum field, call attention to the museum as a site of social inequality, create space for institutional critique, and take action to democratize the museum. I am interested in efforts to diversify museum publics -- both the staff and the visitors. I am interested in initiatives that leverage the museum as an agent of social justice -- such as addressing the disparity in access to art education among different populations. Arts Awareness intersects with these motivations, and is thus a compelling object of study for me as a museum activist.

I recognize that I am leveraging my scholarship to seek social change and social transformation,⁶⁹ and to challenge dominant ideology.⁷⁰ I am a former fellow and current co-director of the Publicly Active Graduate Education (PAGE) program of Imagining America, an organization that connects publicly-engaged scholars and cultural institutions. Imagining America defines engaged scholarship or public scholarship as "scholarly or creative activity that joins serious intellectual endeavor with a commitment to public practice and public consequence."⁷¹ One such example is *Mounting Frustration: the Art Museum in the Age of Black Power* by Susan E. Cahan, which builds from case

29, 2016, <http://www.chicagotribune.com/business/ct-uic-professor-sues-discrimination-1229-biz-20161228-story.html>.

⁶⁹ Hesse-Biber, "Feminist Research: Exploring, Interrogating, and Transforming the Interconnections of Epistemology, Methodology, and Method," 18.

⁷⁰ Solórzano and Yosso, "Critical Race Methodology," 26.

⁷¹ Timothy K. Eatman, "Engaged Scholarship and Faculty Rewards: A National Conversation," *Diversity and Democracy* 12, no. 1 (2009): 18–9.

studies of museum practice in the 1960s and 1970s in New York City towards a critique of the contemporary art museum that exposes complicity in white supremacy. Cahan develops historical analysis into a contemporary call to action.

Reflecting on my values and investments as a museum educator, museum studies scholar, art historian, and activist, I can articulate the agenda that I am using my research to further. That agenda begins in the discourse around museums in academia and the professional discourse in the museum field. Through my writing, I amplify the voices and experiences of those traditionally excluded from the art historical canon (such as women artists and artists of color) and from the discourses of museum education and museum studies (such as rank-and-file museum educators and visitors, who are not typically represented).⁷² I add to the museum field's conversation on democratizing the museum, participation, and shared authority – which often manifests through anecdotal rhetoric at museum conferences and on museum blogs – through a rigorous case study. I view Arts Awareness as an effort to challenge institutional power to envision a better, more inclusive future.

I am wary of museums' claims to advance social justice, knowing that their actions can belie their commitments. Museum practice is inextricable from social justice struggles. As of 2010, 34% of the United States population was people of color – yet only 20% of museum staff was people of color.⁷³ The prevalence of unpaid internships and low-wage, part-time, or temporary employment benefits applicants with economic

⁷² Roberts, *From Knowledge to Narrative: Educators and the Changing Museum*, 3.

⁷³ Betty Farrell and Maria Medvedeva, "Demographic Transformation and the Future of Museums."

privilege.⁷⁴ Nina Simon describes homeless shelters⁷⁵ and court-ordered community service programs⁷⁶ as pipelines for museum volunteers, raising questions about the ethics and power dynamics of volunteer programs.

My engagement with Museum Workers Speak reinforces this wariness. As the network has grown I have come to understand that labor practices have serious impact on *who* works in museums, *who stays* working in museums, and *who* is excluded from working in museums. These conditions disproportionately affect people of color and those from working-class backgrounds. Building on the history of labor activism in the museum field including unionization efforts, since the first Museum Workers Speak action in April 2015, we have advocated for museum professionals to “turn the social lens inward” and address internal labor practices. I believe the first step in addressing these inconsistencies is an unflinching, critical look inwards. I want to inspire self-reflection and self-criticality on the internal inequalities and inconsistencies that manifest within museums. And I believe that through this project, and its close examination of the relationship between museum workers and social value, I can add depth to this discourse.

I am committed to a vision of museums that educate and inspire. But I have concerns about the status quo in art museum education – I think it can be so much more, and I am invested in imagining new possibilities for the field. I want to discover: Can museum education be a space for challenging and critiquing the norms of the museum as an institution? I want to discover: can museum education take on and challenge the

⁷⁴ Maurice Davies, “The Tomorrow People: Entry to the Museum Workforce,” *Report to the Museums Association and the University of East Anglia* [Http://Www. Museumsassociation. Org/Careers/13582](http://www.museumsassociation.org/Careers/13582), 2007, http://www.museumsassociation.org/asset_arena/8/17/13718/v0_master.pdf.

⁷⁵ Nina Simon, “Untitled Comment,” Comment, *The Inluseum*, (October 7, 2015), <http://inluseum.com/2015/10/07/two-takeaways-from-museumnext-2015/#comment-10639>.

⁷⁶ Ng and Ware, “Excellence and Equity?,” 2014, 51.

systemic social inequalities that manifest in museums? I want to discover: How can museum education challenge institutional power, using the museum itself as a laboratory for cultivating political lucidity and participating in the struggle for social change?

I envision my project as a challenge to the art museum education community – and for the entire community of museum scholars and practitioners – to be more self-critical, to apply a political lens to our work, to understand the internal politics of the museum as part of our work. For me, Arts Awareness is situated at the core of the most critical issue in the museum field today: the inconsistency between their stated commitments to social value and their internal practices. Thus, I want to mine Arts Awareness for insights to apply in my own career as a museum change-maker, and for other museum change-makers to utilize as well.

Research Problem

The mission of an institution cannot be neatly separated from the realities of its day-to-day functioning: institutions like museums must be understood within the social, economic and political contexts in which they operate.

The economic, racial, and gender inequities that are playing out worldwide are pervasive in museums. Museums' stated claims to social value are often undermined by their internal labor practices, which reveal serious inequities along lines of race and gender. 84% of museum staff members with positions most closely associated with the intellectual and educational work of museums – including curators, conservators, educators, and leadership – are white.⁷⁷ Among museum curators, conservators, educators

⁷⁷ Roger Schonfeld and Mariët Westermann, "The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Art Museum Staff Demographic Survey" (The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, July 28, 2015), 3,

and leaders, only 4% are African-American and 3% are Latinx.⁷⁸ Women make up two-thirds of full-time museum staff but are still routinely paid less for their work than male peers; on average, women museum directors earn 71 cents for every dollar earned by male directors.⁷⁹

What are the implications of these inequities for art museum education? At “How to Make a Smart Museum: Arts, Agency, and Creativity,” an all-day art museum education workshop at the Smart Museum of Art in December 2014, artist Caroline Woolard of BFAMAPhD, an arts collective interested in alternative economies and economic justice, argued that payment and compensation is a form of pedagogy.⁸⁰ Woolard contended that by learning what things cost, we learn what our society values. This argument enables us to interpret a museum’s spending habits – and, by extension, its labor practices and the racial and gender bias therein – as an expression of the institution’s values. Interpreting and understanding art museum pedagogy is as much about the content as it is about who has – and who lacks – access to the content. Further, that hidden curriculum^{81 82} extends to teaching styles, the program’s procedures and rules, the museum’s and the program’s institutional structures and priorities, the social dynamics and relationships among facilitators and students, the teacher’s exercise of authority, activities and exercises, the facilitators’ and students’ use of language, use of

https://mellon.org/media/filer_public/ba/99/ba99e53a-48d5-4038-80e1-66f9ba1c020e/awmf_museum_diversity_report_aamd_7-28-15.pdf.

⁷⁸ Roger Schonfeld and Mariët Westermann, “The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Art Museum Staff Demographic Survey.”

⁷⁹ American Alliance of Museums and New Knowledge Organization Ltd., “2014 National Comparative Museum Salary” (Washington, D.C.: American Alliance of Museums, 2014).

⁸⁰ Caroline Woolard at Smart Museum

⁸¹ Peter McLaren, *Life in Schools: An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education* (New York: Longman, 1989), 183–84; William F. Pinar et al., *Understanding Curriculum: An Introduction to the Study of Historical and Contemporary Curriculum Discourses*, 5 edition (New York: Peter Lang International Academic Publishers, 2006), 248; Henry A Giroux, *Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition* (South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey, 1983), 72.

⁸² For more discussion of hidden curriculum, see Chapter 2.

artworks and props, the setup and norms of the museum galleries as learning spaces, class schedules, and more. All of these factors that comprise hidden curriculum must be considered and interpreted as forms of pedagogy when interpreting art museum education. At the workshop, Woolard asked the following questions: “How might art education support the political economics of cooperation?” and “How can we radicalize the institution?” and “What is a radical institution? Who is it accountable to?” Woolard’s questions point to the inextricable relationship between a museum’s internal practices and its pedagogy, and the necessity of interpreting the former to understand the latter.

But I am also interested in the implications of Arts Awareness as pedagogy. Though contemporary museums emphasize their claims for social value and public good, there has been little theorizing of how museum education contributes to this process. As a case study of an influential, yet forgotten, social-justice-oriented art museum education program – examined from multiple lenses and perspectives – this project will contribute to the discourse of how museums can cultivate social value through art museum education.

If we care about museums, we need to ask critical questions about who is working in museums, who is visiting museums, and to what extent museums’ internal practices are upholding museums’ stated commitments to social value. How did museums come to be this way? How can they be improved? What interventions are possible on the levels of internal museum practices including working conditions, and external public-facing museum practices including pedagogy and curriculum?

Parameters

According to the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), an independent government agency, as of 2014 there were over 35,000 museums in the United States.⁸³ The American Alliance of Museums (AAM) identifies the following museum types: “Aquarium, Anthropology, Arboretum/Botanic Garden, Art, Children’s, Culturally Specific, Hall of Fame, Historic House, Historic Site, History, Historical Society, Military/Battlefield, Nature Center, Natural History, Planetarium, Presidential Library, Science/Technology, Specialized, Transportation, Visitor Center, and Zoo.”⁸⁴ An institution might inhabit several of these categories (for example, the Museum of African American Art in Los Angeles is both an Art Museum and a Culturally Specific Museum) or not fit easily in any of the above categories, such as the Cooper Hewitt, Smithsonian Design Museum whose collection encompasses historic and contemporary design. Museums can be defined by the contents of their collection, by their practices (including serving as soup kitchens, loaning items in their collection to visitors, or housing graduate programs), or by the significance of their site.

Considering the diversity and breadth of the category of the museum, this dissertation focuses on the sub-category of Art Museums. In my analysis of Arts Awareness, I focus on the positioning of artists as museum educators, the experience of interpreting artworks, and the particular institutional politics of this genre of museum. Though I will refer to research on other genres of museums including Lisa C. Roberts’

⁸³ Justin Grimes et al., “Museum Universe Data File,” *Institute of Museum and Library Services*, 2014, http://imls.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/assets/1/AssetManager/MUDF_Documentation_2015q1.pdf.

⁸⁴ American Alliance of Museums, “About Museums,” *American Alliance of Museums Website*, 2016, <http://www.aam-us.org/about-museums>.

study of the Chicago Botanic Gardens, the majority of this project will be centered on Art Museums.

Research Question

My research question is: **What are the implications of exploring Arts Awareness for contemporary practitioners?**

This question allows me to, as Hesse-Biber puts it, “challenge knowledge that excludes, while seeming to include.” Arts Awareness was a highly developed, experimental program that has been influential in the field of art museum education, but its influence has gone largely unrecognized. A deeper, more nuanced understanding of Arts Awareness is necessary.⁸⁵

This question also allows me to “ask ‘new’ questions that place women’s lives and those of ‘other’ marginalized groups at the center of social inquiry.”⁸⁶ Arts Awareness contains tensions around issues of museum visitor and staff diversity and the relationship between museums’ commitment to social value and their museological practices embedded within it. These questions can “get at subjugated knowledge” that takes into account issues of race, class, and gender.⁸⁷ Most importantly, it can inform contemporary debates about the possibilities for art museum education cultivating social value.

This question foregrounds the implications that Arts Awareness might have for contemporary practitioners – that is, art museum educators, other museum staff members, artists, scholars, and activists. This approach structures my analysis of Arts Awareness in

⁸⁵ Hesse-Biber, “Feminist Research: Exploring, Interrogating, and Transforming the Interconnections of Epistemology, Methodology, and Method,” 3.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 17.

such a way that my dissertation will have the potential to become a useful resource for a wide array of practitioners at the intersection of art, education, and politics. Using extremely focused methods of oral history and archival research, I will draw out practical conclusions about how social-justice-oriented museum practices can be theorized, understood, and improved.

By focusing on practitioners, this question allows me to orient my project towards cultivating change in the museum field. Comstock is critical of research that is “far removed from the people and class it purports to enlighten and is of very little use to those engaged in concrete struggles for progressive change.”⁸⁸ By framing my project as a resource for practitioners, I am creating work that extends beyond the Ivory Tower. The aim of Comstock’s “critical method of research” is “to explicate the immanent tendencies in the historical development of a social formation so that the participants may create social change.”⁸⁹ These methods are designed for the subjects to understand themselves as social actors with agency over their social, political, and economic institutions.⁹⁰ My approach is a modification of Comstock’s approach. Instead of creating conditions for the subjects of my research to create social change, I am using the evidence from the subjects of my research to build analysis and interpretation for the application by a different set of subjects – contemporary practitioners.

Notes on Case Study Approach

I elected to pursue a single case study of a program as opposed to a comparative analysis of multiple case studies for several reasons. First, limiting my area of research to

⁸⁸ Comstock, “A Method for Critical Research,” 371.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 377.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 371.

a single case study would help keep the focus of my project within a reasonable scope for a dissertation. Second, pursuing a single case study will allow me to explore Arts Awareness in greater depth. As a case study, this project's boundaries are the Metropolitan Museum of Art in the years immediately before, during, and after Arts Awareness – from the late 1960s to the late 1970s.

Organizing Data

The majority of material I analyzed for this project comes from two collections. The first collection was a binder of photocopied materials including internal documents such as reports and memos as well as newspaper and magazine clippings from the Metropolitan Museum of Art archives. The second collection was a series of oral history interviews I conducted with Arts Awareness stakeholders and later transcribed.

For each of these collections, I organized the data by coding it in three different colors of highlighter that corresponded to the three themes of pedagogy, art, and politics. After the coding process, I examined each of the three areas in isolation and analyzed the themes that emerged in each area. I allowed my analysis to emerge from close reading of the organized data – as opposed to manipulating the data to bolster a predetermined theory or argument. I have checked my analysis by sharing it with the Arts Awareness stakeholders to verify that their constructed realities are appropriately represented. This approach reflects an interest in sharing power and authority with Arts Awareness stakeholders. In sifting through this data, I drew connections between the data and previous readings including secondary sources and archival material. Finally, I added relevant insights from my own professional and personal experiences. After compiling,

examining and analyzing these bodies of information, this analysis became the core of each of the three chapters.⁹¹

Validity

Educational researcher Hilary A. Radnor describes a set of steps to minimize threats to trustworthiness, which fortify analysis to increase the validity of interpretation. I use several of these approaches in my own research. First, I collect data through various techniques (mainly, archival research and oral history) to ensure data-source and technique triangulation. Next, I employ an interactive and iterative approach to data collection and interpretation – by switching back and forth between researching/interviewing and writing, and rereading source material and following up with sources to clarify or verify information. Finally, I engage in respondent verification or member verification to enhance accuracy.⁹²

Ethics

In this section, I examine my approaches to grappling with power and authority in my relationships with my interviewees within my research project. Sociologists Andrea Doucet and Natasha Mauthner suggest, “The focus of much current feminist scholarship has moved on from the question of *whether* there are power inequalities between researchers and respondents, to consider *how* power influences knowledge production

⁹¹ Solórzano and Yosso, “Critical Race Methodology,” 34.

⁹² Radnor, *Researching Your Professional Practice*, 39.

and construction processes.”⁹³ My interviews cover events over forty years in the past – the power dynamics and relationships among the participants have faded.

One question that emerged for me was: What are the implications of my critiquing the artist-educators’ work in my project? My thinking on this question was influenced by one of my interviewees, Rika Burnham:

“Museum education is really bad at self-critiquing itself. In all the years that I’ve been in museum education, going all the way back to Arts Awareness, I don’t remember us ever critiquing ourselves. And that’s something -- if we want to move forward as a field -- we are really going to have to address. With this whole idea that we don’t offend anybody, that we are warm and fuzzy, welcoming and forgiving, that we’re all things to all people, I think has prevented us from ... serious standards in ourselves. ... Institutions have cultures that last a long time. Far beyond the people that pass through. Museum education has had a culture that has lasted far too long [without critique]. Museum education is critiqued from the outside but not from within.

Every other field has critique built into it. Look at artists. They do studio critiques all the time. Studio visits. There’s open discussion. ... What could be more personal than putting your artwork out there? It’s more personal than your teaching out there, I would think. Where would we be if doctors didn’t do critiques? Where would we be if architects didn’t have critiques? ... Theater people, dancers, actors – they’re pretty hard on each other. Why should we not have an ethic for that? Suddenly it’s really a glaring, glaring thing.”⁹⁴

As Burnham illustrates, critique is not inherently part of the museum education discourse.

Thus, it is an intervention in the field to institute this kind of critique. As long as I focus my critique on the practitioners’ work – the teaching work they have put out into the world – and not critiquing the practitioners *as people*, I am practicing ethically sound critique. I will use the same framework of critique that an art historian might use for interpreting artworks.

⁹³ Andrea Doucet and Natasha Mauthner, “Feminist Methodologies and Epistemology,” in *Handbook of 21st Century Sociology* (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2006), 40, http://http-server.carleton.ca/~adoucet/pdfs/Doucet_Mauthner_Feminist_Methods_2006.pdf.

⁹⁴ Burnham, Interview with Rika Burnham, October 7, 2015.

Doucet and Mauthner describe “the dangers of presuming to know, speak for, or advocate for others.”⁹⁵ Even though I come from a similar cultural and educational background, and share experiences and understandings with my subjects, I am careful to not speak *for* them. I will quote my respondents’ own words directly – by transcribing the recordings of our conversations – rather than summarize them whenever possible. Using quotes will also help clarify and distinguish my subjects’ contributions from my own analysis. Comstock writes that “a consistent critical method which treats society as a human construction and people as the active subjects of that construction would be based on a *dialogue* with its subjects rather than the observation or experimental manipulation of people.”⁹⁶ By creating space for my interviewees’ own words, my project will be more dialogic.

To ensure that these quotes are accurate, I have performed member checks. I adhere to the member check practice outlined by Radnor: “key informants were asked to read transcripts and their own case interpretation for ‘respondent verification.’ They had to pay attention to the accuracy of the interpretations and to make comments.”⁹⁷ Doing member checks helps confirm the data as trustworthy foundations on which to base my own interpretations.⁹⁸

Notes on Archival Research

I accessed the archival materials I examine for this dissertation from the Metropolitan Museum of Art Archives. These materials include two publications and three films about Arts Awareness published by the Met. They also include internal

⁹⁵ Doucet and Mauthner, “Feminist Methodologies and Epistemology,” 41.

⁹⁶ Comstock, “A Method for Critical Research,” 371.

⁹⁷ Radnor, *Researching Your Professional Practice*, 39.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

memos, letters, reports, budgets, grant paperwork, training manuals, press releases, newspaper and magazine clippings, project proposals, meeting minutes, attendance statistics, and interview transcripts. Additional archival materials from outside the Met include oral history transcripts from the 1970s, housed at the Smithsonian Archives of American Art, from interviews with Arts Awareness stakeholders including Philip Yenawine, Marcia Kreitman, and Allon Schoener and a report on Arts Awareness written by Barbara Newsom and published as part of a compendium on the state of art museum education in 1978. I also viewed a video recording of *Untitled (The Alps)*, a performance art piece created by Arts Awareness artist-educators Rika Burnham, Howard Levy, and Randy Williams, at the Performing Arts Library in New York City.

Archival resources help me to address my research question – **What are the implications of exploring Arts Awareness for contemporary practitioners?** – because they enable me to explore Arts Awareness through its details. Through examining and interpreting archival materials, I can piece together details about Arts Awareness and its context that would be otherwise unavailable to me. This information includes the logistical, such as the names and roles of key stakeholders in Arts Awareness, which helped me locate subjects to interview. The archive also provides contextual information such as the stated goals and measurements of success for education at the Met. I use these materials as a source for interpretation: for example, I can interpret how a budget and expenditures reflect a hierarchy of institutional priorities. These materials also indicate the connections between Arts Awareness and art, pedagogy, and politics.

That said, I am also aware of the limits and shortcomings of archival research. The archive tells an incomplete story: missing from the archive are ephemera such as

attendance sheets and contracts, correspondence from artist-educators and teachers, lesson plans, student artwork, props, and interview and survey records from the Arts Awareness evaluation process. Additionally, I am aware that the archival material is largely filtered through the experiences of privileged white men, namely Director Thomas Hoving and Philip Yenawine. I located little material in the archive authored by women or people of color. These absences are what archivist Rodney G.S. Carter refers to as “silences” in the archive.⁹⁹ Rather than re-inscribe these silences by building my analysis from the archive alone, I combine my archival research with oral history research – including subjects who are women and people of color – to create new knowledge built from incorporating multiple voices and perspectives.

Notes on Oral History

Through oral history, I can collect details and memories – stories that the archive cannot tell. Best of all, when conducting interviews, I can ask my own questions directly. Through my interviews, I have heard stories about how the artist-educators came to be part of Arts Awareness, descriptions of individual Arts Awareness sessions, how Arts Awareness intersects with their own artistic practices and their later careers, and how their relationships with other Arts Awareness artist-educators and with their students continued after the program ended. These stories all help me to understand how Arts Awareness intersected with art, pedagogy, and politics.

I hoped to interview as many people involved with Arts Awareness as I could: staff members at the Met, students, and classroom teachers. I followed every lead. To arrange my interviews, first I compiled a list of Arts Awareness stakeholders through

⁹⁹ Rodney GS Carter, “Of Things Said and Unsaid: Power, Archival Silences, and Power in Silence,” *Archivaria* 61, no. 61 (2006), <http://journals.sfu.ca/archivar/index.php/archivaria/article/viewArticle/12541>.

names I found in the archival material. Then I found some of their contact information through Internet searches and reached out. Several of my interviewees shared names and contact information with me, and I was able to repeat the outreach process with them. I arranged one-on-one conversations in-person or via telephone. I opted for one-on-one rather than group conversations in order to establish trust and rapport with my interviewees, so that they could feel comfortable in my presence and feel heard.

Notes on Analysis

From Comstock's method for critical research, I borrow the intention to "develop an interpretive understanding of the intersubjective meanings, values, and motives held by all groups of actors in the subjects' milieu."¹⁰⁰ In other words, I will pay close attention to my subjects' understanding of Arts Awareness and its context, rather than my own suppositions as an investigator.

To this understanding of the context of Arts Awareness I have applied an analytic lens that is specifically oriented towards evaluating activist art pedagogy. In Marit Dewhurst's book *Social Justice Art: A Framework for Activist Art Pedagogy*, she presents three lenses for analysis: Context, Intention, and Process. Who is making the work (context)? For what purpose (intention)? And how does the artist approach the creation of the artwork (process)? These three lenses allow researchers to effectively evaluate the educational and social significance of activist art, and I have applied this approach to interpreting the data I have collected about Arts Awareness.¹⁰¹

¹⁰⁰ Comstock, "A Method for Critical Research," 380.

¹⁰¹ Marit Dewhurst, *Social Justice Art: A Framework for Activist Art Pedagogy* (Harvard Education, 2014), 102.

Comstock describes how an “emancipatory interest” can direct research practice towards critiquing ideology and cultivating “knowledge that informs fundamental social change.”¹⁰² In other words, my analysis can be activated towards an emancipatory agenda that resists problematic ideology and cultivates social change. In this project, the problematic ideologies I resist include histories of colonialism, sexism, racism, androcentrism, and white supremacy in museums. My agenda entails resisting oppression and highlighting art museum education practices that can cultivate social change. I will apply Solórzano and Yosso’s practice of “counter-stories” to challenge these dominant narratives by privileging the stories of Arts Awareness artist-educators whose narratives counteract problematic ideologies.¹⁰³ Dominant narratives are maintained through collection and publication of documents – for example, museum director Thomas Hoving’s papers are preserved at the Metropolitan Museum of Art Archives and his autobiography is published and widely available. By documenting and interpreting the narratives of the Arts Awareness artist-educators, whose papers were not archived by the museum and about whom no books have been written, this project provides counter-narratives.

To guide my emancipatory approach, I apply critical race theory. For Solórzano and Yosso, critical race theory contains an inherent commitment to social justice through a research agenda that leads towards “the elimination of racism, sexism, and poverty” and “the empowering of subordinated minority groups.”¹⁰⁴ I am interpreting and evaluating Arts Awareness with the intention of sharing insights that contemporary practitioners can use to facilitate social-justice-oriented art museum education programming today. This

¹⁰² Comstock, “A Method for Critical Research,” 374.

¹⁰³ Solórzano and Yosso, “Critical Race Methodology,” 32.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 26.

intention aligns with what Comstock presents as the practical intent of critical research – to help develop strategies for change.¹⁰⁵

My approach to interpreting data centers on intersectionality, an emphasis on “the interlocking effects of race, class, gender, and sexuality, highlighting the ways in which categories of identity and structures of inequality are mutually constituted and defy separation into discrete categories of analysis.”¹⁰⁶ An intersectional approach is critical for this particular project, because Arts Awareness contains fraught dynamics on the level of class, gender, and race – and my approach must be one that can account for a complex understanding of oppression.¹⁰⁷

Language and terminology

I use the term Latinx, which is the gender-neutral alternative to Latino, Latina, and even Latin@. In an interview with Public Radio International, queer, non-binary femme writer Jack Qu’emi Gutiérrez explains:

“In Spanish, the masculinized version of words is considered gender neutral. But that obviously doesn’t work for some of us because I don’t think it’s appropriate to assign masculinity as gender neutral when it isn’t ... The ‘x,’ in a lot of ways, is a way of rejecting the gendering of words to begin with, especially since Spanish is such a gendered language.”¹⁰⁸

Latinx, which is increasingly used by scholars, activists, and journalists, reflects an effort to practice intersectionality through language: to resist the gender binary and create space for trans, queer, agender, non-binary, gender non-conforming or gender fluid identities, to

¹⁰⁵ Comstock, “A Method for Critical Research,” 385.

¹⁰⁶ Hesse-Biber, “Feminist Research: Exploring, Interrogating, and Transforming the Interconnections of Epistemology, Methodology, and Method,” 13; Bonnie Thornton Dill and Marla H. Kohlman, “Intersectionality: A Transformative Paradigm in Feminist Theory and Social Justice,” in *Handbook of Feminist Research: Theory and Praxis*, ed. Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber (Sage Publications, 2012), 154–74.

¹⁰⁷ Solórzano and Yosso, “Critical Race Methodology,” 25.

¹⁰⁸ “Writer Jack Qu’emi Explains the Meaning of ‘Latinx,’” *PRI’s The World* (Public Radio International, June 21, 2016), <http://www.pri.org/stories/2016-06-21/writer-jack-quemi-explains-meaning-latinx>.

resist the patriarchal implication that what is masculine is neutral, and to be inclusive of the intersecting identities of Latin American descendants.

When referring to people of the African Diaspora, I capitalize the B in Black as a sign of respect for a group of people long relegated to lowercase in the United States since slavery. As Lori L. Tharps writes:

“This is one of my greatest frustrations as a writer and a Black woman living in the United States. When speaking of a culture, ethnicity or group of people, the name should be capitalized. Black with a capital B refers to people of the African diaspora. Lowercase black is simply a color.”¹⁰⁹ However, I do not capitalize the w in white when referring to people of European descent, because I believe that the sign of respect of capitalizing the w would reinforce white supremacy – whiteness is an umbrella category of ethnic groups, not an ethnic group itself. As a white person, I claim my racial identity as white. However, I do not claim my *ethnicity* as white, but I do claim Jewish as my ethnicity.

Race is a critical element to my analysis of Arts Awareness, and I argue that Arts Awareness is ground-breaking in that it was intentionally designed not with white students in mind, but with white students *and* students of color in mind. In a report on Arts Awareness, Bernard Friedberg claims that 70% of participants were “Black or Puerto Rican.”¹¹⁰ Because I do not have access to records of the race and ethnicity of Arts Awareness participants, and because I know that Arts Awareness students came from schools located in *El Barrio*/East Harlem (known for Puerto Rican residents) as well as the Bronx (known for Dominican residents), I will exercise the benefit of the doubt and refer to the students of color in Arts Awareness as students of color, and when writing specifically, as Black and Latinx.

¹⁰⁹ Lori L. Tharps, “The Case for Black With a Capital B,” *The New York Times*, November 18, 2014, <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/19/opinion/the-case-for-black-with-a-capital-b.html>.

¹¹⁰ Friedberg, *Arts Awareness II*, 3.

Note

The methodology articulated in this section has informed my research from the beginning, but as a scholar, my own approach to my object of study has grown and changed significantly. When I began my research, I intended to *present a case* for interpreting Arts Awareness as a pedagogical, artistic, and political practice. As I developed my methodology further, it became clear that that approach would be flawed – that I would be researching towards validating a set of preconceived notions. So I reconsidered my approach to be oriented towards researching the *implications* of looking at Arts Awareness. This approach allowed me to let the data shape my analysis. And, in fact, when I began to look at Arts Awareness this way, I became able to see just how flawed my previous approach was. For example, allowing myself to look at the *implications* of interpreting Arts Awareness as art led me to a much more nuanced understanding of the relationship between the artist-educators’ *own* artistic practices and their work in Arts Awareness. However, the rubric of the pedagogical, artistic and political continued to guide the development of my argument in its initial form.

As evident from the structure articulated in this introduction, that rubric no longer holds. As a scholar attuned to pedagogy and educational processes, this result makes sense: I began to see that, for Arts Awareness, pedagogy, performance and activism are not neatly separable as modes of practice, and one of the reasons Arts Awareness is worth examining is that it is acutely attuned to this entanglement. That is to say: I have allowed myself to be open to changes. Through the process of writing the following sections, I have learned about Arts Awareness and about myself. It is not surprising that a museum

educator would have been changed by the process of education research. The body of this dissertation represents the results of my inquiry.

I also began this project with an interest in re-inserting Arts Awareness into canonical narratives of art history from which it has been excluded. These narratives include Institutional Critique (Arts Awareness was concurrent with and in dialogue with Institutional Critique projects by artists including Hans Haacke and Daniel Buren), museum interventions (Arts Awareness shares key themes and tactics with museum interventions by artists and collectives including Andrea Fraser, Fred Wilson, the Guerrilla Girls, and Occupy Museums), and art protest (Arts Awareness overlaps with the Art Workers Coalition and the Black Emergency Cultural Coalition). As a social-justice-oriented art historian, the potential for these projects and Arts Awareness to mutually illuminate one another remains of the utmost significance, because of considerations of race, gender, and labor. My focus on close analysis of Arts Awareness pedagogy and immediate historical context has, unfortunately, rendered those questions – along with my original, programmatic focus on labor – outside this particular project’s scope, but they remain worthy topics for further inquiry. Additionally, the data I have collected indicates other ways that Arts Awareness has had a lasting impact, such as on participating students. In future projects, I intend to explore the impact of Arts Awareness further, beginning with incorporating the perspectives of Arts Awareness alumni including Fred Wilson.

Chapter 1

“If the structure does not permit dialogue the structure must be changed.”

-- Paulo Freire

Introduction

Harlem on My Mind was a response to the tumultuous social climate of the late 1960s; as Bridget R. Cooks notes, it took place against the backdrop of the Vietnam War, the recent assassinations of Martin Luther King Jr. and Robert F. Kennedy, and protests and riots in major American cities.¹¹¹ Interestingly, Cooks notes how this exhibition defied public expectations for the museum: “The Met had established an identity as a cultural stronghold of artifacts and artistic knowledge. There were no practical, social, or professional expectations that the museum would take on an active role in the social politics of the day, particularly in 1969.”¹¹²

Even though *Harlem on My Mind* had, for the Met, relatively progressive intentions, it immediately drew criticism due to the museum’s decision to omit artwork by Harlem’s flourishing artist community, and was viewed within the Met as a failure. Looking back in 2016, Rika Burnham noted that though she started working at the Met several years after *Harlem on My Mind*, the exhibition and the ensuing scandal were very salient in the minds of the Met’s staff – in fact, it was a taboo topic.¹¹³ For the Met, the controversy incited internal reflection about how the museum could more effectively address contemporary social issues, and one result of that reflection was Arts Awareness.

¹¹¹ Cooks, “Black Artists and Activism,” 8.

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Rika Burnham, Interview with Rika Burnham, interview by Alyssa Greenberg, August 10, 2016.

Because the Met launched Arts Awareness in the hope that this new education initiative could accomplish what *Harlem on My Mind* failed to, an examination of the institutional culture that shaped *Harlem on My Mind* is essential for understanding the genesis of Arts Awareness. This chapter argues that Arts Awareness diagnosed *Harlem on My Mind*'s failure as the result of institutional power dynamics within the museum itself – and, critically, the ways in which those power dynamics informed the *implicit pedagogies* of the *Harlem on My Mind* exhibition. Arts Awareness was driven by the recognition that, in order for the Met to accomplish its stated social objectives (which I will discuss in more detail momentarily) the Met would not only need to democratize its curatorial and programming decisions, but also fundamentally transform the hierarchy of knowledge production within the museum.

The origins of Harlem on My Mind

Although they differed drastically in their analysis and implementation, *Arts Awareness* and *Harlem on My Mind* began with the same intention: democratizing the museum. According to Cooks, the museum's new leadership, including recently hired director of the Met Thomas Hoving and Allon Schoener, curator of *Harlem on My Mind*, "hoped to mix current cultural issues with the traditions of the prestigious institution."¹¹⁴ With a background in both museum work (trained as an art historian, he was previously a curator at the Cloisters) and public service, Hoving had a reputation for blending the traditional with the contemporary. As the Parks Commissioner as well as Administrator of Recreation and Cultural Affairs for New York City under Mayor Lindsay, he organized a portfolio of non-traditional programs including "be-ins, love-ins, traffic-free

¹¹⁴ Cooks, "Black Artists and Activism," 10.

bike ridings, Puerto Rican folk festivals, and happenings.”¹¹⁵ In his autobiography, Hoving wrote that he was “inspired by the creativity of downtrodden blacks [sic]” and hoped to “encourage them to come to the museum.” He “expected the show to become a symbol of my fighting to persuade the museum world to get into the swim.”¹¹⁶ Reflecting on the controversy, he wrote that he was “a member of the white, liberal establishment, one who had emerged from the optimistic and naïve Lindsay administration” who had not heeded the warning signs: “A series of fires were burning. I had seen the smoke and foolishly had ignored the signs of conflagration. I had dismissed the growing trouble as simply ‘community fuss.’”¹¹⁷ Hoving intended for *Harlem on My Mind* to cultivate dialogue and build understanding between Black and white communities. He wrote:

“To me *Harlem on My Mind* is a discussion. It is a confrontation. It is education. It is a dialogue. And today we better have these things. Today there is a growing gap between people, and particularly between black [sic] people and white people. And this despite the efforts to do otherwise. There is little communication. *Harlem on My Mind* will change that.”¹¹⁸

Harlem on My Mind’s creators aimed to accomplish these objectives through the exhibition’s choice of medium: photography. Creating a photography-centered exhibition was a major shift for the Met, and indicates Schoener’s intention to radically shift museum practice towards a more democratic, inclusive approach. Using photography also signaled a social history approach, a departure from art exhibitions based on art-historical canon. As the artist Romare Bearden wrote to Schoener in a letter dated June 6, 1968, “As I see it, the sort of show you are putting together should be in the Museum of the

¹¹⁵ Ibid.; Jozefa Stuart, “How Hip Should a Museum Get?,” *Life Magazine*, 1969, 14.

¹¹⁶ Thomas Hoving, *Making the Mummies Dance: Inside the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (Simon & Schuster, 1993), 165.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 166.

¹¹⁸ Cooks, “Black Artists and Activism,” 5; Thomas Hoving, “Preface,” in *Harlem on My Mind: Cultural Capital of Black America, 1900-1968*, ed. Allon Schoener (New York: Random House, 1968), unpaginated.

City of New York, the New-York Historical Society, or some similar place.”¹¹⁹ Though the Met would not formally accept photography as an art medium until the establishment of the photography department in 1992, photographic reproductions were the main medium in *Harlem on My Mind*. The majority of photographs were sourced from highly esteemed Harlem photographers Gordon Parks and James VanDerZee, who were not credited as artists.¹²⁰ For Schoener, photography was an inherently democratic medium, and utilizing it would sidestep the cultural hierarchy implicit within an art exhibition.¹²¹ In the *Harlem on My Mind* catalogue, he writes, “Images and sounds – documentary in character – have been organized into a pattern of experiences re-creating the history of Harlem as it happened.”¹²² For Schoener, photographs were documents with inherent veracity and objectivity, and his usage of them reflected his desire to convey truth.¹²³

Although the inclusion of photography did represent a new direction for the Met, activist groups quickly identified the more glaring problem with this supposedly more inclusive exhibition: it did not include works by Black artists or incorporate the perspectives of the Black community it documented. In the summer of 1967, Schoener assembled a three-person advisory committee of political and cultural leaders Jean Blackwell Huston, Regina Andrews, and John Henrik Clarke – all three were Harlem residents.¹²⁴ On November 22, 1968, this committee (as well as the Harlem Cultural

¹¹⁹ Cooks, “Black Artists and Activism,” 17; Romare Bearden to Allon Schoener, “Letter from Romare Bearden to Allon [Schoener],” June 6, 1968, Box 42 -- Harlem on My Mind Folders, John Henrik Clarke Papers.

¹²⁰ Cooks, “Black Artists and Activism,” 27.

¹²¹ Susan Cahan, *Mounting Frustration: The Art Museum in the Age of Black Power* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016), 33; Allon Schoener, Interview with Allon Schoener in Grafton, VT, interview by Susan Cahan, December 17, 1998.

¹²² Allon Schoener, “Editor’s Foreword,” in *Harlem on My Mind: Cultural Capital of Black America, 1900-1968*, ed. Allon Schoener (New York: New Press, 1995).

¹²³ Cahan, *Mounting Frustration*, 33.

¹²⁴ Cooks, “Black Artists and Activism,” 17–18.

Council) withdrew their support for the exhibition citing their lack of influence. In a letter to artist Romare Bearden, Clarke wrote:

“Right now I don’t know where the project, “Harlem on My Mind” is going and I am not encouraged by some of the late developments relative to it. The basis of the trouble with this project is that it never belonged to us and while alot [sic] of people listened to our suggestions about the project. Very few of these suggestions were put into use.”¹²⁵

The Black Emergency Cultural Coalition (BECC) formed for the purpose of protesting against *Harlem on My Mind*.¹²⁶ They sought changes on an institutional level including planning a supplementary exhibition to *Harlem on My Mind* with members of the Research Committee of African American Art at the Met, consulting with Hoving on the exhibition, formal meetings with museum administrators, and public demonstrations.¹²⁷ Their demands included an increase in Black staff members at the museum including “on a curatorial level and in all other policy-making areas of the museum” and challenged the museum “to seek a more viable relationship with the Total Black Community.”¹²⁸ These demands identified the need for change at the level of institutional practice. They directly address the lack of representation of Black artists and the absence of Black stakeholders in *Harlem on My Mind*. Their vision of institutional change also includes establishing a fund to collect works of art by Black artists – transforming institutional priorities by changing how money is spent and which artworks are deemed valuable enough to collect. These institutional changes were what representatives of the Black art community wanted of the Met and similar institutions – not the insufficient changes brought forth by Schoener in *Harlem on My Mind*.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 18.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 22.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 30; Cathy Aldridge, “‘Harlem on My Mind’: A Boxed in Feeling,” *New York Amsterdam News*, February 1, 1969; Romare Bearden to Thomas Hoving, “Letters from Romare Bearden to Thomas Hoving,” September 6, 1968, Box 42 -- Harlem on My Mind Folders, John Henrik Clarke Papers.

¹²⁸ J. Richard Gruber and Benny Andrews, *American Icons: From Madison to Manhattan, the Art of Benny Andrews, 1948-1997* (Univ. Press of Mississippi, 1997), 142; Cooks, “Black Artists and Activism,” 25.

Pulitzer Prize winning novelist Junot Diaz describes how white supremacy operates in museums. He delivered this persuasive statement as an audience member at “Kimono Wednesdays: A Conversation,” a panel co-organized by the Boston Museum of Fine Arts (MFA) and the activist collective Decolonize our Museums (then known as Stand Against Yellow Face) in 2016. The panel was created in response to Decolonize Our Museums’ claims that the museum perpetuated racism and cultural appropriation through an education program called “Kimono Wednesdays.” “A docent spoke on [Claude] Monet’s *La Japonaise*, which features his wife Camille Monet wearing a red *uchikake* and a blond wig to ‘emphasize her Western identity.’ Attendees were encouraged to wear a replica of the *uchikake*, take photos, and share them on social media.”¹²⁹ According to the museum, “The framing of the event through a Western lens sparked protest, counter-protest and much conversation and debate about issues including Orientalism, racialized iconography, institutional racism, representation of minority groups, and cultural appropriation.”¹³⁰ The second-to-last audience member to participate in the Q&A, Diaz shared his perspective on how white supremacy manifests in museums:

“I wanted to hone in on ... the term ‘white supremacy.’ It would be probably useful if we ... understood that there is a folkloric definition for the term, which is perhaps what people tend to know, which is the idea that white supremacy is guys with hoods and folks burning crosses. And then there is the technical description, which I think a lot of people are not as aware of. And I think part of what perhaps is happening in the audience is that folks are deploying the technical description and so they want to be sure that someone who is the head of an institution like this is actually aware that there is a commonly accepted description of the racial system in which we are all a part of. Which we all participate in. Which has us all in its grip. And it is very uncomfortable because most of the time I think the shorthand that we’re taught, what we see in media, what we see in conversations, is the shorthand ‘race.’ Folks will say ‘Oh, we’re talking about race.’ But

¹²⁹ “Decolonize Our Museums Tumblr,” *Decolonize Our Museums*, accessed December 20, 2016, <http://decolonizeourmuseums.tumblr.com/>.

¹³⁰ “Kimono Wednesdays: A Conversation,” *Boston Museum of Fine Arts*, February 7, 2016, <http://www.mfa.org/programs/lecture/kimono-wednesdays-a-conversation>.

that's actually a component of this larger system which is technically and widely accepted as white supremacy. Now this is why I think it's super important to be able to, you know, withstand that. Because even though 'white supremacy' has the term 'white' in it, white supremacy in fact involves all of us. You can be in a country, say, I'm from the Dominican Republic, let's say, there's no white people, for the sake of this thought experiment, there's no white people in the Dominican Republic. It doesn't make any difference. White supremacy still functions at full power. And I think that why, perhaps, some people are getting kind of up ... because many of us who have spent a lot of time studying this or participating in the critical language that helps us understand this system, we want folks to be able to hold that description and to hold that technical term and to understand that even though there is this generic, folkloric term 'white supremacy' it doesn't get rid of this very important, technical definition -- sociological and political -- that is perhaps the only accurate description we have for our racial system. And I think that that's why I would argue that ... if you're at school or if you're not familiar with the term, or you're the head of a major institution, I think it's really, really important for us to get all on the same page with this. Because white supremacy isn't only about white folks. Yeah, like you could get rid of -- I've said this a number of times to my students -- you could get rid of every white person on the planet and white supremacy wouldn't have lessened in power one inch. It lives in every single person whether they know it or they wish to admit it or not. It is the first truly global hegemonic system and I think that part of the reason we say an institution like this is engaged in white supremacy is because of our technical and critical understanding of the term. Now, a lot of folks aren't really comfortable with it because the thing is, is that the very term that we most need to address is the one that is invisible and erased and occluded. It's not an accident that the very hegemonic racial system that grips us -- it's not an accident that we don't know the term. And if we hear the term, we're deeply uncomfortable with it."

This definition is particularly relevant to this project because it is addressed primarily to a museum director and museum visitors, and considers how white supremacy operates on an institutional level in museums. Specifically, he urges then-incoming MFA director Matthew Teitelbaum to pay serious consideration to white supremacy as a part of his responsibility as head of a major institution. He encouraged the audience to look beyond overt manifestations of racism – the folkloric definition – towards a technical understanding. Diaz's explanation emphasizes the way that white supremacy operates: it is invisible, erased, occluded – and pervasive.

Staff within the museum articulated similar concerns. Harry S. Parker III, who was working in Hoving's office at the time and later as Vice Director of Education from 1971-1973, recalled,

“Here it was [an exhibition] at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, but it ignored African American art. Which was amazing ... I remember thinking how stupid we were to ignore art when, here, that's the medium we're theoretically the most interested in. When the show started to come together why weren't any of us out there saying, ‘Well, aren't you going to include some art, Allon? This is an art museum.’”¹³¹

Read with Diaz's call to action for self-reflexivity about white supremacy in museum practice, Parker's concerns about the exclusion of Black art reflects white supremacy.

By concentrating decision-making among Schoener's staff and selected staff members that did not reflect Harlem's residents (what Sara Ahmed, who researches the effects of race in institutions, might have called “being appointed by whiteness”¹³²) and denying Black representation by excluding artwork by Harlem artists, *Harlem on My Mind* created conditions under which its intended dialogue, communication, and discussion would be impossible. Thus, in spite of its lofty goals, the Met leveraged its institutional expertise to perpetuate a narrative of white supremacy. Though Hoving intended to break down barriers between Black and white communities, he reinforced them.

Like the BECC and Parker, Philip Yenawine was attuned to the need for change in the distribution of authority in the Met. But, I argue, Arts Awareness began from a particular set of insights that, though it may seem like a truism to contemporary readers, was a major departure for the museum that produced *Harlem on My Mind*: institutional

¹³¹ Cahan, *Mounting Frustration*, 33; Harry S. Parker III, Interview with Harry S. Parker III in San Francisco, CA, interview by Susan Cahan, July 19, 1999.

¹³² Sara Ahmed, *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life* (Duke University Press, 2012), 4.

power dynamics inform the pedagogical implications of a museum exhibition, and pedagogy, in turn, is always a site at which those institutional power dynamics are reinforced or challenged. In the following section, I examine the institutional structure and culture to which Arts Awareness responded. Drawing on Cooks, Susan Cahan, and other scholars who have analyzed *Harlem on My Mind*, I identify a discrepancy between the pedagogical intentions behind *Harlem on My Mind* and the actual pedagogical relations it implicitly created between museum and visitor – what Philip Jackson would call its “hidden curriculum.”¹³³ I conclude by arguing that Arts Awareness forwarded an alternative vision of the relationship between pedagogy and institutional authority – a vision which I will examine in detail in the following chapter.

Arts Awareness as an institutional intervention

To fully understand the significance of Arts Awareness as an *institutional* intervention, it is important to consider the internal context at the Met in which Arts Awareness developed. According to artist-educators working at the Met at the time of *Harlem on My Mind*, the exhibition’s exclusion of Black perspectives was symptomatic of a more systematic tendency to marginalize artists of color: Randy Williams, a Black painter and one of the Arts Awareness artist-educators, shared with me the effects that *Harlem on My Mind* had on his career at the Met. Williams told me, “I think *Harlem on My Mind* was a horrible, horrible, horrible, horrible idea.” He described one element of the aftermath, which was particularly relevant to his own career as an artist: “I remember getting a phone call because they were looking for Black artists to see if they could

¹³³ Philip Wesley Jackson, *Life in Classrooms* (Teachers College Press, 1990); Philip W. Jackson, “The Consequences of Schooling,” *The Unstudied Curriculum*, Ed. Norman V. Overly, 1970, 1–15; Pinar et al., *Understanding Curriculum*, 248.

mount a show. An exhibition which never came home. I had a painting that was picked up and taken to the museum and then delivered [back to him] because nothing ever came of the show.”¹³⁴ The exhibition of Black artists never came to fruition at the Met during the era of Yenawine and Arts Awareness. Instead, Williams observed an increase of funding to culturally specific organizations and community museums like the Studio Museum in Harlem, the Jamaica Arts Center, and the Storefront Museum, allowing them to gain visibility.¹³⁵ Rika Burnham, too, pointed out that Randy Williams had never had his artwork exhibited at the Met or collected by the Met.¹³⁶ This detail is as critical as it is poignant – what are the implications of Williams being recognized as an artist-*educator* at the Met, but not an artist? This dynamic reveals a devaluing of Williams’ work – that he was deemed fit to teach about other artists’ works in the collection and to engage with the public, but not to be recognized as an artist by having his work join the collection or be exhibited in the museum. And this dynamic has a racial dimension, because Williams is a Black artist whose one chance at being exhibited at the Met was for a Black art show that ultimately never took place. And the public that he was engaging at the Met were high school students, many of whom were students of color. His role was to engage other people who looked like him as visitors. It also reveals the elevated status of curation over education in the museum. There are racial implications to that, too – curation becomes a practice of maintaining white supremacy through collection and exhibition, and education becomes the practice of outreach towards diversity.

¹³⁴ Randy Williams, Interview with Randy Williams, interview by Alyssa Greenberg, Audio file, October 8, 2015.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ Burnham, Interview with Rika Burnham, October 7, 2015.

Before *Harlem on My Mind*, in the mid-1960s, Yenawine and Schoener had previously clashed at the New York State Council on the Arts over the question of how authority should be distributed. Examining this conflict reveals the differences in their approaches to community engagement. Yenawine was assistant to the Director and then interim Director of the organization until Schoener took over the helm as Director. For Yenawine, Schoener was an aggressive leader, who imposed his taste onto the upstate museums that were their constituents – such as replacing a humble mimeograph catalogue with “Madison Avenue graphics.”¹³⁷ Yenawine perceived Schoener’s tactics as “interference,” saying, “You can show people your own publications and maybe up-grade their tastes, you don’t tell people what to do. ... Allon [Schoener] really didn’t like to ask museum directors what kind of programs the Council should be running; he wanted to decide what they were and then announce it.”¹³⁸ In other words, Yenawine explained, “Allon felt that he didn’t need to consult. ... The Council used up a whole lot of money on programs that its staff devised, rather than giving it to programs that other people devised.”¹³⁹ Yenawine objected to the autonomy Schoener exerted by imposing his tastes on groups with a different set of values from his own and by creating programming without consulting stakeholders.

Instead, Yenawine’s approach was defined by what he called “community control.” “That they truly share the power and the decision of what the programs are.”¹⁴⁰ Of course, this dynamic of community control – or at least community co-creation – was what activists had demanded, and been denied, with *Harlem on My Mind*. Unlike the

¹³⁷ Philip Yenawine, Oral history interview with Philip Yenawine, [ca. 1971.], interview by Kathy Rosenbloom, Transcript, ca 1971, 2, Smithsonian Archives of American Art.

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 3.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

creators of *Harlem*, Yenawine recognized the significance of institutional power structures – whose voices are considered when decisions about content and programming are made.

An examination of Schoener's remarks in the "Editor's Foreword" to the *Harlem on My Mind* exhibition catalogue illustrates how the difference between his approach and Yenawine's would play out at the level of pedagogy. There were, in fact, explicit pedagogical purposes behind Schoener's curatorial choices in *Harlem on My Mind*:

"Didactic educational methods – based on the principle that one source of information transmits its output to a recipient – have dominated our thinking for centuries. In our present world of overloaded stimuli, such techniques no longer have continuing validity. We don't respond, as we once did, to an orderly progression of facts thrust at us in a fixed order. Because we are surrounded by a bewildering variety of choices, each individual assumes a unique role. He is not compelled to respond to information emanating from one source, nor is he a captive of the person who organizes the patterns of data directed to him. From all of the information available from a variety of sources, each person selects what he wants for himself and reacts to it. He tunes in on what he wants to and tunes out on what he doesn't care about. Instead of being a passive recipient who digests what is directed to him, the individual becomes an active participant by making his own choices. As a result of his unique reactions, the individual who responds to an experience becomes as important in the communication process as the one who organizes it. In other words, the audience itself becomes a creative force. Participation implies more effective communication."¹⁴¹

On its face, Schoener's emphasis on engaging museum visitors as active participants seems to have a democratizing bent. Schoener's rejection of "didactic educational methods" based on "an orderly progression of facts thrust at us in a fixed order" would seem to resonate with Yenawine's rejection of "parades before the pictures"¹⁴² pedagogy. But Schoener's approach to engagement is fundamentally monologic: it entails presenting the visitor with photographs, who then exercises agency

¹⁴¹ Schoener, "Editor's Foreword."

¹⁴² Yenawine, Interview with Philip Yenawine, March 2016.

by only communing with the photographs that the visitor finds absorbing. For Schoener, the visitor exercises agency by selecting which images to tune into, or tune out from. Through this agency, according to Schoener, the visitor assumes a role as integral as the curator's. Though the visitors are selecting the images that interest them most, they are still selecting from an array determined by the curator himself – not just which photographs, but that there are photographs at all (as opposed to artworks.) Though Schoener imagines this relationship as an equitable power dynamic, it is not. Though the visitor can choose which photographs to make meaning from to shape their own experience, the curator still exerts ultimate control.

Schoener's description of the museum visitor inadvertently reveals the problem itself: "he is not ... a captive of the person who organizes the patterns of data directed to him."¹⁴³ Schoener's unfortunate use of the word *captive* aside (which, to me, evokes the trans-Atlantic slave trade), he minimizes his role in curator as shaping the information available to museum visitors. Due to his conviction that photographs are objective, documentary images, he downplays how salient his own point of view is in *Harlem on My Mind*. Cooks writes:

"Schoener chose instead to construct an atmosphere that would re-create the way that he experienced Harlem from his position of privilege. The exclusion of art was Schoener's strategy to re-create the experience of Harlem on his mind."¹⁴⁴

"Schoener takes his place as the author who speaks the exhibition's title. It is Harlem on Schoener's mind that was displayed in the galleries."¹⁴⁵

By not creating space for Harlem residents in shaping the exhibition, by denying Harlem artists representation, the visitors to this exhibition *were* captive to his point of view.

¹⁴³ Schoener, "Editor's Foreword."

¹⁴⁴ Cooks, "Black Artists and Activism," 17.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 21.

Again, Sara Ahmed's writing on race in institutions is relevant. She writes, "whiteness tends to be visible to those who do not inhabit it."¹⁴⁶ In other words, it was not visible to Schoener to what extent *Harlem on My Mind* was shaped by his own perspective.

In this way, Cooks suggests a link between the problematic distribution of power in the creation of the exhibition and the monologic flow of knowledge. Cooks also points out this linkage with respect to the exhibition's attitude toward photography, describing *Harlem on My Mind* as a "popular humanistic project" rather than "engaging in a reflective examination and understanding of the diversity of the community that [Schoener] chose to represent."¹⁴⁷ By focusing on photography and treating it as an objective, authoritative representation of reality, Schoener created conditions in which a "reflective examination" that incorporated multiple perspectives would be impossible. For Cooks, this approach failed "to go beyond the limits of humanism to understand the specific attributes of cultural struggle, values, and politics."¹⁴⁸ By making the photography speak for itself, that is, *Harlem on My Mind* repeats its foundational erasure of the knowledge of Black stakeholders at the level of medium.

Public curriculum and hidden curriculum

The concepts of *public curriculum* and *hidden curriculum* help illustrate the reason for the discrepancy between Schoener's stated pedagogical intentions and the actual pedagogical effects Cook identifies. Typically, art museum education is understood as a practice through which traditional values are upheld – which can be understood through the theory of public curriculum put forth by Elizabeth Vallance. For

¹⁴⁶ Ahmed, *On Being Included*, 3.

¹⁴⁷ Cooks, "Black Artists and Activism," 13.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 10–13.

Vallance, “there is a public curriculum inherent in the orderly images, and in the order in which these images are presented and seen, in art museums.”¹⁴⁹ The categorization and organization of the artworks in a museum facilitate the construction of meaning around the collection as a whole—that is, they facilitate the production of certain narratives of the history of art.

For Vallance, any venue or interaction that influences the way individuals construct meaningful narratives about the world—such as the media, politics, or conversations with friends and family—comprises public curriculum.¹⁵⁰ However, the art museum’s public curriculum is distinctive in several key ways: it is “an informal, randomly accessed structure of knowledge, expressed in visual images and available ... to all who enter the building,” and its students are a particular self-selected subset of the general public.¹⁵¹ Visitors absorb the rules and norms inscribed into the public curriculum, which then influence their understandings of and responses to art and thus their “receptiveness to innovation and to change.”¹⁵² This curriculum is not neutral: “The museum staff, advertently or inadvertently, by definition exert some control over the curriculum available to the visitor.”¹⁵³ And visitors do not experience the elements of public curriculum equally: Vallance is concerned with the “problem of the inaccessibility of difficult art” that “reflects a tacit awareness that not everyone is equally part of the culture that we represent at museums.”¹⁵⁴ The term public curriculum makes visible that museum education comprises both art historical content and tacit social messages.

¹⁴⁹ Elizabeth Vallance, “The Public Curriculum of Orderly Images,” *Educational Researcher* 24, no. 4 (March 1995): 4.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Ibid., 6.

¹⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

Carol Duncan indicates how these messages are absorbed in *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*, arguing that “the organization of the museum setting” constructs “a kind of script or scenario which visitors perform.”¹⁵⁵ This script includes visitors performing “museum manners” such as speaking quietly, muting mobile phones, disabling flash photography, walking and not running, and not touching the artwork. It also includes social divisions such as placards thanking major donors and trustees, exclusive perks for museum members, and museum identification badges, which imply that museum professionals such as curators and museum educators possess specialized expertise and status that is unavailable to the public. By performing this script or scenario, museum visitors internalize all of the rules, norms, and messages inscribed within it—messages about who belongs and who does not.

For Vallance, museum educators are the mediators between the public curriculum of the museum and visitors’ personal experiences: “We must encourage [visitors] to enter a foreign world, make it fun, and help these listeners to derive meaning from the stories that can be put together from the works of art before them.”¹⁵⁶ For Vallance, the museum educator’s task is “not further to control what people learn but to provide as many avenues to approaching the largely foreign language of art as we can, to guide them to make their own connections and to form their own rewarding categories.”¹⁵⁷ Though the public curriculum of the museum is extensive and coherent, Vallance argues that “hearing, or seeing, its coherence requires . . . an active, willing effort and the application of interpretive skills” that can be engendered by a museum educator.¹⁵⁸ The fact that

¹⁵⁵ Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums* (Taylor & Francis, 1995), 20.

¹⁵⁶ Vallance, “The Public Curriculum of Orderly Images,” 4.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 7.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 13.

mediation by a museum educator is emphasized suggests that coherence is *not* an inherent feature of public curriculum itself, but is imposed on it from the museum's perspective. In this way, traditional art museum education upholds societal norms.

Conceptualized by Philip Jackson¹⁵⁹ and referenced by Henry Giroux, "hidden curriculum" points more explicitly to the connection between the museum's interest in inculcating the norms of behavior that Vallance and Duncan identify and the maintenance of power. The conceptual tool of hidden curriculum makes visible the objections that Yenawine had to traditional gallery teaching pedagogy, and how he sought to address these flaws in Arts Awareness pedagogy. Giroux defines hidden curriculum as "the ideologies and interests embedded in the message systems, codes, and routines that characterize daily classroom life"¹⁶⁰ and Peter McLaren explains,

"...hidden curriculum deals with the tacit ways in which knowledge and behavior get constructed, outside the usual course materials and formally scheduled lessons ... by which students are induced to comply with the dominant ideologies and social practices related to authority, behavior and morality."¹⁶¹

Applied to museum education, hidden curriculum makes visible what kinds of learning are happening in museums beyond art-historical content. In the *Encyclopedia of Curriculum Studies*, scholar Robert Boostrom explains that for Jackson, hidden curriculum could indicate reasons for student success or failure in school – that the inability to master hidden curriculum may have more serious consequences than the inability to master official curriculum.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁹ Pinar et al., *Understanding Curriculum*, 248; Jackson, *Life in Classrooms*; Jackson, "The Consequences of Schooling."

¹⁶⁰ William F Pinar, *Understanding Curriculum: An Introduction to the Study of Historical and Contemporary Curriculum Discourses* (New York: P. Lang, 1995), 248; Giroux, *Theory and Resistance in Education*, 72.

¹⁶¹ Pinar, *Understanding Curriculum*, 248; McLaren, *Life in Schools*, 183–84.

¹⁶² R. Boostrom and Craig Kridel, "Hidden Curriculum," *Encyclopedia of Curriculum Studies* 2 (2010): 439.

This is why it is critical to understand that Yenawine's commitment to "community control" was more than just an organizational management preference. Like Cooks, Yenawine recognized that institutional power dynamics necessarily imprint themselves on pedagogy through hidden curriculum. An anecdote Yenawine shared about the tension between the curatorial and education departments at the Met illustrates his sense of the way institutional power dynamics influence pedagogy: he described a lunch meeting with "a tremendously intelligent, lovely curator" who thought Arts Awareness was "terrific" and supported it despite its disruptions to the gallery space. Yet, as the curator told Yenawine, "it [Arts Awareness pedagogy] essentially works at cross-purposes with what we're trying to do."¹⁶³ Yenawine explains that "her mandate in the Museum is to continue to create galleries which are more and more better suited [sic] to essentially an educated public."¹⁶⁴ For Yenawine, this looks like more didactic material (both wall text and video), more densely curated galleries with less open space, dramatic lighting, and more immersive period rooms.¹⁶⁵ This approach is different than a museum Yenawine would design:

"In my museum we'd have lots of space, variable lighting; we could move things around and touch them. I want a whole different kind of environment in which to work, where we could participate. I want a museum where people expect there to be noise and loud sounds, where they'd be expecting people to move, where you'd walk into a gallery and, instead of expecting quiet and hush and a guide book or an acoustic-guide stuck in your ear, you'd expect to put on a period costume and move in a way you can't move now."¹⁶⁶

For Yenawine, these two approaches – curatorial and educational – were incompatible.

Though they currently co-exist, and the curator has validated and accepted the disruption

¹⁶³ Yenawine, Oral history interview with Philip Yenawine, [ca. 1971.], 16.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 17.

of Arts Awareness in her galleries, it is still understood (by both the curator and Yenawine) as just that – a disruption. And this imbalance has pedagogical implications: for Yenawine, the curator’s mandate privileges the monologic transfer of knowledge from museum to visitor – a mode of learning that Yenawine saw as favoring an elite, educated public – whereas his approach activates the individual’s experience as a source of knowledge in its own right. One strategy maintains traditional power dynamics and elitism, and the other re-imagines museum practice. Yenawine describes the museum’s philosophies as “schizophrenic.” “So they have educational goals that coincide with mine, and curatorial goals which coincide with hers. So they can say yes to everybody, making it impossible for any of us to function well.”¹⁶⁷ This is Yenawine’s critical departure from the logic of *Harlem on My Mind*: he recognized that power relations *within* the institution cannot be quarantined from the experience of museum learning, that they will also situate the museum and the visitor in a particular set of epistemological power relations. Riffing on Freire’s dictum that pedagogy is inherently political, we might say that, for Arts Awareness as well as for Cooks, institutional politics are also inherently pedagogical: The pedagogical orientation of the museum experience is shaped by institutional power structures, and that pedagogical orientation, in turn, sets up relations of power between museum and visitor. But for Arts Awareness, if pedagogy was central to the problem, it was also central to the solution.

Arts Awareness and race

The motivation – and justification – behind Arts Awareness pedagogy was to address racial and class inequity. This motivation was based on a critique of the

¹⁶⁷ Ibid.

inadequacy of art education in schools, particularly the inequity of access to quality art education in the segregated school system of New York City. The second evaluation report of Arts Awareness states, “Schools have done even less than museums with the history of art, and painfully little with studio art.”¹⁶⁸ They dismissed schools on the levels of both quantity and quality: for the limited instruction in these areas, and for deficient instruction that inhibited a “real relationship with visual art” emphasizing perception and response to art, which is “not a skill our society values.”¹⁶⁹ The report states,

“Relevance” and “community” remain ephemeral terms. The bureaucracies in public schools and cultural institutions are generally conservative and tend to limit new approaches rather than encourage them. The desire to serve the inner-city child remains a desire, the potential still only hinted at; culture for the masses is still a dream.¹⁷⁰

Arts Awareness was envisioned by its creators as a corrective to the low quality of art education in public schools. By referring to the dearth of art education for the “inner-city child” and “the masses,” they are underscoring their view that the group with the least access to quality art education are students from poor and marginalized communities. That said, their language does contain deficit-based thinking, including the mandate to “serve” inner-city youth and the dream of “culture for the masses” that erases the cultural forms that marginalized communities create.

This motivation was also often framed around references to elite culture and its lack of relevance to “community” audiences. The report also states,

“It is now a cliché to say that educational institutions must enter the mainstream of American life with new curricula of great relevance to the rich, the poor, the minorities, and the majorities from kindergarten through graduate school. It is equally a cliché to say that museums and other cultural institutions with education programs must enter this mainstream of relevance not only by updating

¹⁶⁸ Friedberg, *Arts Awareness II*, 1.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 3.

¹⁷⁰ Friedberg, *Arts Awareness, a Project of the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, 3.

those services available in the museum itself but by expanding and decentralizing services outside museum walls into the ‘community.’”¹⁷¹

Arts Awareness was motivated by a recognition that the museum was an elite institution only accessible by, and relevant to, the experiences of a privileged few. They frame the gap in relevance by emphasizing the disparity between rich and poor, between (racial) majorities and minorities. Significantly, their call to action entails transforming institutional practice: not only by changing how programming such as education operates in the museum, but also through community engagement.

Arts Awareness was designed for, and tested on, high school students with marginalized identities. As I have discussed elsewhere in this dissertation, Arts Awareness was the product of institutional self-reflection in which the Met’s Department of Education realized that its programming was created by and for elite white audiences. As concluded in the Newsom Report, its programming had “a more natural affinity with suburban and private schools than with those in the urban ghettos.”¹⁷² Arts Awareness was an attempt to engage with the latter group: 70% of the participants were Black or Puerto Rican.¹⁷³ The critical intervention of Arts Awareness was to create art museum education curriculum and pedagogy that would be relevant for all students across lines of race, class, and cultural background– that did not uphold traditional, elite value systems of studying art and of art history. The report stated, “Class activities described in this report have all been used successfully with a variety of age, racial, and economic groups, but primarily with urban high school students.”¹⁷⁴

¹⁷¹ Ibid.

¹⁷² Barbara Newsom, “The Metropolitan Museum as an Educational Institution: A Study with Recommendations (‘The Newsom Report’)” (New York, NY: Metropolitan Museum of Art, November 1970), 30.

¹⁷³ Friedberg, *Arts Awareness II*, 3.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 9.

Arts Awareness was not always able to put its theoretical aims into practice evenly. Perhaps Arts Awareness' most critical shortcoming was the gap between its stated commitments in theory and its results in practice. One such example of a practical shortcoming is how Arts Awareness approached the relationship between art-historical training and racism. Rika Burnham, an art educator who began working at the Met shortly after Arts Awareness ended, shared the following reflection with me:

“When I look at the Arts Awareness film – and again, I wasn’t there – but it strikes me as being rather racist ... With no intention of that whatsoever ... But the idea you’re going to give a nonverbal language... strikes me now as... without any intention... only good intentions... that you’re disempowering students of color to participate in the intellectual life of the museum. You were actually marginalizing them.”¹⁷⁵

In other words, Burnham suggests that by jettisoning art-historical content in a museum education program designed for students of color, Arts Awareness was implicitly – yet unintentionally – barring students of color from participating in the intellectual life of the museum.

In my next chapter, I will suggest that Arts Awareness did not dismiss art-historical content entirely, but rather positioned it in dialogue with other forms of knowledge – at least at the level of its pedagogical theory. However, Burnham’s critique points to the potential for a disconnect between Arts Awareness’ theoretical aspirations and the ways in which its pedagogy was actually put into practice: in practice, the pedagogy was shaped by teachers’ implicit biases and the variance among the artist-educators’ skill sets. For example, in my next chapter I discuss a vignette from an Arts Awareness film in which artist-educator Jennifer Muller darts out her tongue when prompting the students to describe the atmosphere of the museum, sending a visual signal

¹⁷⁵ Burnham, Interview with Rika Burnham, October 7, 2015.

of solidarity to her students -- a gesture that reveals her implicit bias of how *she* perceives the museum's stuffiness, and leads the students towards following suit in their responses. The ability to enact Arts Awareness pedagogy varied widely across the cohort of artist-educators: Randy Williams noted that Frances Cole did not return to the Met for the second year of the Arts Awareness program. He explained to me, "It was just too much for her. She was really sweet but she couldn't manage those kids. She did the same thing over and over again in every gallery."¹⁷⁶ Yenawine, too, noted that Cole was the "least successful" because she "couldn't get out of the classical music thing."¹⁷⁷ The variance between artist-educators like Williams, who was determined by Yenawine to be "what I call a good Arts Awareness teacher,"¹⁷⁸ and those like Cole who was not, reflects the existence of a gap between Arts Awareness theory and practice. Arts Awareness did not adequately address that gap.

Arts Awareness and institutional power

To fulfill *Harlem on My Mind's* unmet mandate of creating more inclusive dialogue with diverse audiences through participation, it would be essential to transform the structure of institutional practice, and Arts Awareness did this by locating pedagogy as a site for making visible and interrogating the structures of institutional power. The most radical element of Arts Awareness was the way that it critiqued the museum as an institution, modeled an approach to museum pedagogy with institutional critique built in, and engaged visitors in institutional critique as well.

¹⁷⁶ Williams, Interview with Randy Williams.

¹⁷⁷ Yenawine, Interview with Philip Yenawine, March 2016.

¹⁷⁸ Newsom, "The Department of High School Programs and an Experiment in 'Arts Awareness' at the Metropolitan Museum of Art," 454.

Arts Awareness claimed pedagogy as the site of this challenge, and did so by foregrounding the *institutionality* of the museum – making visible the implicit power structures the museum encodes. As Yenawine said, “I just want to get [Arts Awareness participants] to be aware that there is an environment.”¹⁷⁹ In my next chapter, I examine Arts Awareness’ pedagogical plan of attack.

¹⁷⁹ Yenawine, Oral history interview with Philip Yenawine, [ca. 1971.], 17.

Chapter 2: “Let’s construct our own space:” Arts Awareness as Pedagogical Practice

Arts Awareness advanced a participatory pedagogy in which critiquing the power dynamics of the relationship between individual and institution – and re-imagining and transforming that relationship – is inherent to engagement with art, and with the museum itself.

Introduction

Arts Awareness pedagogy was a radical departure from previous art museum education at the Met and other museums, which was typically didactic docent-led lecture tours emphasizing art-historical expertise that Yenawine nicknamed “parades before the pictures.”¹⁸⁰ Because of that, working in this new, experimental way required a leap of faith. True belief in the Arts Awareness method was central: For Yenawine, what is “quite critical in Arts Awareness teaching is that you’ve got to have confidence in what you’re doing; you’ve got to believe it, or it can fall apart.”¹⁸¹ At the core of Arts Awareness philosophy is the premise that, through close looking at artworks and by responding to elements of art (such as line, texture, tension, focal point, spatial relationships, color, and mood) through artistic experiences/art-making, students would recognize and recall the elements of art and respond to them upon future encounters.¹⁸²

¹⁸⁰ Yenawine, Interview with Philip Yenawine, March 2016.

¹⁸¹ Newsom, “The Department of High School Programs and an Experiment in ‘Arts Awareness’ at the Metropolitan Museum of Art,” 454.

¹⁸² Ibid.

Critics of Arts Awareness questioned the program's capacity for cultivating learning in the museum. In an interview with researchers on art museum educations from the Council on Museums and Education in the Visual Arts (CMEVA) on August 1, 1974, Henry Geldzahler, then curator of twentieth-century art at the Met, said:

"I'm from another school, another time. You don't go to eight years post-high school art historical training without being hurt by it and touched by it. I still see it in the old-fashioned way. And I still think that pushing blue things around the gallery is not the answer. Like there'd be a squared-off arch, which one person has. Another would have a column. Then you'd go into the Blumenthal Patio and move the column through the arch. I couldn't believe my eyes."¹⁸³

Geldzahler's statement illustrates his investment in traditional art historical training for museum professionals and traditional art historical knowledge as the kind of knowledge that museums should teach to visitors. Continuing Geldzahler's line of critique: What kind of learning was happening in Arts Awareness, if not traditional art historical education? How was "pushing blue things around the gallery" radical? Was Arts Awareness frivolous?

The CMEVA report summarized Arts Awareness artist-educator Howard Levy's response to Geldzahler's critique:

"To hear from the other side, the author of the arches exercise, Howard Levy, remembers the episode as a moment of significant psychological growth in his students: they learned by opposing arches of various sizes that smaller arches could neutralize larger ones and thus, according to Levy, that apparently overwhelming authority figures could be neutralized by the alliance of lesser figures. The demonstration, set in a museum space containing several arches, was meant to be a visual experience that dramatized a point (admittedly political as well as aesthetic) the Arts Awareness staff wanted to make."¹⁸⁴

¹⁸³ Ibid., 456.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid.

For Levy, this exercise approached art-historical knowledge in a novel way – through deconstructing the geometry of arches – towards cultivating both aesthetic and political insights.

Arts Awareness was a nexus of the aesthetic and the political. Arts Awareness was part of an institution-wide initiative for addressing broader social problems in New York City. In an interview with me, Levy was clear that Arts Awareness was understood as a social justice project:

“It was very clear the impetus was ... we have these kids ... this is early seventies now... cultural outreach is absolutely the order of the day. Hoving is the director. The Met had all this conflict about building into Central Park, and all that stuff, and this was part and parcel. They did *Harlem on My Mind*. So it was an outgrowth of all that.”¹⁸⁵

In a moment when the Met was generating unfavorable newspaper headlines and a growing reputation as an elitist institution for a proposal to build an extension on public land in Central Park and for the *Harlem on my Mind* scandal that galvanized protesters, the Met sought to repair their image through “cultural outreach” programs like Arts Awareness that could build positive relationships with people of color from upper Manhattan and the Bronx.

Considering the critiques of Arts Awareness as ahistorical and frivolous and its context as a “cultural outreach” program during a moment in which the Met was in the hot seat as an elitist institution, this chapter investigates the extent to which Arts Awareness can be understood as a social-justice-oriented pedagogy.

¹⁸⁵ Howard Levy, Interview with Howard Levy, interview by Alyssa Greenberg, Audio file, October 7, 2015.

Curriculum theory and social justice pedagogy

Yenawine did not design Arts Awareness with theory in mind, though he did retroactively apply theories of “structural psychologists, Piaget-type people” and discuss the project with researchers including David Perkins, then the director of Project Zero at Harvard.¹⁸⁶ Today, the discourse of curriculum theory contains a rigorous framework for social justice pedagogy. Because this research was unavailable to the Arts Awareness practitioners at the time, I, too, am applying this framework retroactively. I apply curriculum theory frameworks by Pauline Lipman, Sonia Nieto and Patty Bode, Therese Quinn, and Olivia Gude towards investigating how Arts Awareness can be understood as a social-justice-oriented pedagogy. What new insights does social justice education theory reveal about Arts Awareness, and what new insights does Arts Awareness offer to the discourse of social justice education theory? Though Arts Awareness is aligned with this theory, it is not a textbook example of social justice pedagogy. Elsewhere in the dissertation, I consider Arts Awareness through other theoretical frameworks from the arts and critical race theory.

For example, theories of social justice pedagogy emphasize cultivating agency in students. Yenawine said of his students:

“... We found that quite often [they were] expressing themselves by Arts Awareness activities, and they were getting confidence in their own ability to deduce something through the encouragement we gave them by saying, ‘You’re right. That’s terrific.’ And if they were just telling how they felt, and moving how they felt, they were exhibiting a whole lot: they were breaking down barriers they had put between themselves and other people.

For example, most of them wore coats and hats and had transistor radios when we’d start programs, and we couldn’t get them to take them off. [But finally] we got them over their fear of

¹⁸⁶ Newsom, “The Department of High School Programs and an Experiment in ‘Arts Awareness’ at the Metropolitan Museum of Art,” 455.

being ripped off, which was one of their basic fears. We could also get them to ... take off this armor they always wore ... They were letting defenses fall.”¹⁸⁷

Although Arts Awareness did not – and could not have – addressed the cultivation of agency in a specific, programmatic way using the language of contemporary theories of social justice pedagogy, that theory nevertheless provides a useful vocabulary for understanding the extent to which critique and transformation of injustice were, as I will argue, intertwined with Arts Awareness’ approach to pedagogy. Applying this theory allows me to analyze Arts Awareness not only at the levels of content, pedagogy, and curriculum but on a programmatic level as well – to analyze Arts Awareness within the context of the Met, New York City, and society. I hope contemporary practitioners can utilize this analysis to consider the possibilities for art museum education pedagogy as social-justice-oriented pedagogy.

First, I apply Pauline Lipman’s four “social justice imperatives” – equity, agency, cultural relevance, and critical literacy – which she uses as a lens through which to interpret the implications of education policies – to Arts Awareness.¹⁸⁸ Below, I highlight elements from Lipman’s definitions that particularly pertain to Arts Awareness.

“Equity – all children should have an intellectually challenging education ... [emphasis on] redressing the effects of historical and embedded inequalities and injustice (Tate, 1997) ... special efforts must be made to overcome past injustice and historically sedimented inequalities of race, gender, and class. ... Policies and programs perpetuate social inequality and injustice when they prepare students of specific racial or ethnic, class, or gender groups for different life choices ... and when they perpetuate knowledge that excludes the perspectives, experiences, and contributions of marginalized groups.

Agency – education should support students’ ability to act on and change personal conditions and social injustice. It should prepare young people to participate actively and critically in public life,

¹⁸⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸⁸ Pauline Lipman, *High Stakes Education : Inequality, Globalization, and Urban School Reform* / (New York : RoutledgeFalmer, 2004), 16–17.

support a sense of possibility, and arm young people with tools to survive and thrive in the face of multiple forms of oppression and marginalization (Giroux, 1988).

Cultural relevance – educators should use students’ cultures to support academic success, help students create meaning, develop sociopolitical consciousness, and challenge unjust social conditions (Ladson-Billings, 1994). Cultural relevance operates within a context of critical examination of difference, power, and the multiple histories and experiences of people in the United States and globally (Sleeter & McLaren, 1995).

Critical literacy – students need tools to examine knowledge and their own experience critically and to analyze relationships between ideas and social-historical contexts, or in Freire’s words, “Read the world” (Freire & Macedo, 1987). This includes grounding curriculum in students’ experiences and challenging official knowledge that erases and distorts the histories and interests of subordinated social groups (Macedo, 1994).¹⁸⁹,

The four imperatives in Lipman’s framework are broad enough to create space for interpreting Arts Awareness on multiple levels. It suggests questions on a content level such as: does Arts Awareness curriculum focusing on personal responses to art rather than traditional art-historical themes necessarily amplify “the histories and interests of subordinated social groups” in a way that a more “official” curriculum does not? It also invites questions on a programmatic level, such as: by recruiting Black and Latinx students in alternative high school programs, does Arts Awareness take a stance on programs that “prepare students of specific racial or ethnic, class, or gender groups for different life choices”?

Next, I apply Sonia Nieto and Patty Bode’s definition of social justice education. Again, I highlight elements from Nieto and Bode’s definitions that particularly pertain to Arts Awareness:

“First, it challenges, confronts, and disrupts misconceptions, untruths, and stereotypes that lead to structural inequality and discrimination based on race, social class, gender, and other social and human differences.

Second, a social justice perspective means providing all students with the resources necessary to learn to their full potential ... [including] *emotional resources* such as a belief in students’ ability

¹⁸⁹ Ibid.

and worth; care for them as individuals and learners; high expectations and rigorous demands on them; and the necessary social and cultural capital to negotiate the world.

A third component of a social justice perspective is *drawing on* the talents and strengths that students bring to their education. This requires a rejection of the deficit perspective that has characterized much of the education of marginalized students, to a shift that views all students—not just those from privileged backgrounds—as having resources that can be a foundation for their learning.

A fourth essential component of social justice is creating a learning environment that promotes critical thinking and supports agency for social change.”¹⁹⁰

Though Nieto and Bode’s model parallels Lipman’s in several areas including addressing structural inequality and cultivating social change, its student-centered perspective is an additional valuable angle for investigating Arts Awareness. Their discussion of emotion, too, is aligned with Arts Awareness’ attention to personal responses to art. Their rejection of the “deficit perspective” is especially pertinent to considering Arts Awareness, one of the first museum education programs to acknowledge and address how students from privileged and marginalized backgrounds experience art museums differently.

For Therese Quinn, “social justice art education is utopian *and* practical; it looks ahead to the more democratic society we can dream up and create in our classrooms, and at the same time it is grounded in the lives and concerns of our students.”¹⁹¹ As a small (and costly) pilot program that would face significant barriers to scale up and make accessible to all, Arts Awareness itself occupies this paradoxical position. Quinn writes, “working for social justice through teaching requires practicing and fostering attention to the complexities and deep structures of daily life, and then, developing and implementing

¹⁹⁰ Nikola Hobbel and Thandeka K Chapman, “Writing in Academic Genres: Is Social Justice a Learning Outcome?,” in *Social Justice Pedagogy across the Curriculum: The Practice of Freedom*, ed. Thandeka K Chapman and Nikola Hobbel (New York: Routledge, 2010), 238; Sonia Nieto and Patty Bode, *Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural Education* (Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon, 2008), 11.

¹⁹¹ Therese Quinn, Lisa Hochtritt, and John Ploof, eds., *Art and Social Justice Education: Culture as Commons* (Routledge, 2011), xx; Therese Quinn, “Out of Cite, out of Mind: Social Justice and Art Education,” *The Journal of Social Theory in Art Education* 26 (2006): 282–301.

engaged responses aimed at change.”¹⁹² This framing resonates with Arts Awareness, in which students and artist-educators collectively grapple with “the complexities and deep structures of daily life” through the lenses of artworks and the museum. Yet there were never any products of Arts Awareness targeted at social change. In fact, Quinn and William Ayers account for this shortcoming: they write that social justice education is “always more possibility than accomplishment.”¹⁹³ That said, Arts Awareness’ existence itself was a pointed call for cultural change in museums and in society. Finally, Therese Quinn identifies eight “social justice themes and practices” in education: self-awareness, democracy, collectivity, activism, public space, history, social literacy, and imagination.¹⁹⁴ Again, though several of these themes emerge in Lipman’s and Nieto and Bode’s models, Quinn’s model adds additional depth by considering collectivity, public space, and imagination – all of which are central features of Arts Awareness.

Social justice pedagogy in Arts Awareness

Applying these frameworks of social justice pedagogy from the discourse of curriculum theory, this chapter traces the ways in which key characteristics of social justice pedagogy emerge in Arts Awareness. I argue that Arts Awareness advanced a participatory pedagogy in which critiquing the power dynamics of the relationship between individual and institution – and re-imagining and transforming that relationship – is inherent to engagement with art, and with the museum itself. In the first section, I

¹⁹² Therese Quinn, “Social Justice and Arts Education,” in *Social Justice Pedagogy across the Curriculum: The Practice of Freedom*, ed. Thandeka K Chapman and Nikola Hobbel (New York: Routledge, 2010), 227.

¹⁹³ Quinn, Hochtritt, and Ploof, *Art and Social Justice Education*, xx; Therese Quinn and William Ayers, “Foreword,” in *See You When We Get There Teaching for Change in Urban Schools*, by Gregory Michie (New York: Teachers College Press, 2005), viii.

¹⁹⁴ Quinn, “Social Justice and Arts Education,” 226; Quinn and Ayers, “Foreword”; Quinn, Hochtritt, and Ploof, *Art and Social Justice Education*, xx.

introduce “nonverbal learning,” the key to Arts Awareness pedagogy. Next, I identify and analyze two closely related subsets of nonverbal learning:

1. Embodied learning – pedagogy that cultivates reflection on *embodiment in space*, to give individuals tools for critical engagement with the institution
2. Affective learning – pedagogy that uses individual aesthetic experience and the effect of emotion on the body as a way to put learners’ lived experience in a dialogic relationship with established art-historical narratives

Critically, my discussion of affective learning includes a corrective to critiques of Arts Awareness as ahistorical or not pedagogically rigorous: I argue that Arts Awareness reconfigured the hierarchy of knowledge in order to leverage the *unique* potential of the museum as a social laboratory. Finally, I argue that these pedagogical strategies extend beyond the museum’s walls, using the museum as a laboratory for considering institutions and power dynamics writ large.

I. Nonverbal learning

Yenawine’s definition of nonverbal learning

The key critical concept behind Arts Awareness is the theory of nonverbal learning, a term used by Yenawine and fellow members of his department as a theoretical rationale for Arts Awareness. With nonverbal learning, rather than relying on words to convey ideas, ideas are experienced through multiple senses and exchanged through multiple art forms -- all of which is geared towards eliciting personal reactions to art. For Yenawine, the Arts Awareness system “does not put down [verbal] information; it simply

doesn't rely on it. It does not tell me back what I told you.”¹⁹⁵ The theory of nonverbal learning relies on an interdisciplinary approach -- engaging multiple media, multiple senses -- and posits that the process and language of each art form can inform the understanding of others. Yenawine highlighted how information can be conveyed through multiple senses and multiple forms and posited that the impact of nonverbal information is lasting.¹⁹⁶

In a 1971 oral history interview, Yenawine describes an Arts Awareness session that embodies nonverbal learning.

“The dance artist and the musician artist were working together in the Armor Gallery. They had a thing where the kids put corrugated cardboard around their joints in order to make it difficult to move, to get the sense of what it would be like to move in armor. Then they did a series of movement exercises having to do with things like passing a roll, and trying to accomplish what you'd have to accomplish with armor, what movements are suggested. Then after they took off the cardboard, they continued to try to move in these very awkward, jerky kinds of motions. The music guy set up a thing where, using their own props like the jewelry they were wearing or their own mouths, they could create a battle through sound – riding on horseback, with the clanging and all. We made a tape, and it sounded like the soundtrack from *Ivanhoe*. Anyway, they were contemplating what it would be like to wear armor, and then looking at it more seriously because of that. Also, they were dealing with an environment that wasn't their own environment, but something they were able to create.”¹⁹⁷

This session challenged participants to engage with the armor collection through nonverbal means. The participants' exploration and experimentation involved sound, costumes, movement, and imagination – not words. They responded to implicit questions – What does it feel like to wear armor? What was the environment like for which this armor was intended? – through close looking, creative problem-solving, and experimentation with movement and sound.

¹⁹⁵ Newsom, “The Department of High School Programs and an Experiment in ‘Arts Awareness’ at the Metropolitan Museum of Art,” 454.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁹⁷ Yenawine, Oral history interview with Philip Yenawine, [ca. 1971.], 7–8.

Not all nonverbal learning (and teaching) looks the same--the Arts Awareness method of nonverbal learning is adaptable to multiple teaching styles and strengths. Not all teaching styles must, for example, privilege movement as a form of nonverbal learning. Yenawine said,

“Randy [Williams, a member of the staff who was a cornerstone of the program] is what I call a good Arts Awareness teacher, and he almost never uses movement. It’s not required. The thing that’s his strength is his studio activity. But what he’s trying to do is get kids to be aware of the fact that information comes into their eyes and that they have a response to it.”¹⁹⁸

Williams’ approach privileges students attending to their own personal responses to artwork through studio activities. His success as an Arts Awareness artist-instructor relies upon his unique teaching persona and style.

Because nonverbal learning is interdisciplinary and does not rely exclusively on language, Arts Awareness staff were challenged to describe this kind of learning and to evaluate Arts Awareness on measures beyond questionnaires or oral interviews. For that reason, the Arts Awareness staff looked to behavior-based evidence to better understand the impact of Arts Awareness. This kind of evidence includes comfort in the museum -- for instance, students’ willingness to let go of their belongings including coats and radios -- and students’ engagement with one another and with the artist-instructors. Yenawine draws on Piaget’s method of observation to make this point. Yenawine said,

“The best commentary, the most coherent, the most intelligent, the most objective commentary I’ve heard on this kind of teaching has come from structural psychologists, Piaget-type people who are aware that in order to study what’s going on in education you’ve got to do a lot of observation of people, that seeing the patterns [of behavior] is as important as any information you might get from any kind of question or test.”¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁸ Newsom, “The Department of High School Programs and an Experiment in ‘Arts Awareness’ at the Metropolitan Museum of Art,” 454.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., 455.

Piaget's methodology actually was a hybrid of both observation and testing, which Piaget theorized would combine the best qualities of these two methods while avoiding their limitations.²⁰⁰ That said, Yenawine would have agreed with Piaget that "Observation must be at once the starting point of all research dealing with child thought and also the final control on the experiments it has inspired."²⁰¹

Yenawine did not design Arts Awareness with learning theory in mind. Rather, he created a program and then analyzed it with education researchers afterwards. Arts Awareness, in other words, had its genesis in the same understanding of non-linguistic knowledge that it attempted to practice pedagogically. He continued,

"In discussing the ... project with people like David Perkins [director of Project Zero at Harvard] I've gotten as far as I ever have in understanding what cognitive education goes on in essentially nonverbal situations--and there's a whole load of it. People don't really want to take that into account. If you can't add it up in the end, if you can't write it down, if it doesn't become a sentence--which of course it can in some kids and can't in others, shouldn't, doesn't need to--[it doesn't count.]"²⁰²

Yenawine was not working from an established theoretical model or set of best practices – but rather, from his intuition that traditional "parades before the pictures"²⁰³ pedagogy was flawed and observations about how artists solve aesthetic problems. As Howard Levy explained to me,

"[Yenawine's] realization ... that you can't just bring them in and talk about ... what this lady in an Ingres portrait might be like. Because they don't know and they don't care. Quite rightly. You had to do something else, and it had to be something that was really methodological."²⁰⁴

²⁰⁰ Susan Jean Mayer, "The Early Evolution of Jean Piaget's Clinical Method," *History of Psychology* 8, no. 4 (2005): 370.

²⁰¹ Ibid., 371; Jean Piaget, Joan Tomlinson, and Andrew Tomlinson, eds., *The Child's Conception of the World*, (London; New York: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd.; Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1929), 4.

²⁰² Newsom, "The Department of High School Programs and an Experiment in 'Arts Awareness' at the Metropolitan Museum of Art," 455.

²⁰³ Yenawine, Interview with Philip Yenawine, March 2016.

²⁰⁴ Levy, Interview with Howard Levy.

That methodology became Yenawine's approach of nonverbal learning.

Nonverbal learning is inherently challenging to describe, quantify, and evaluate. Evaluating Arts Awareness as a form of learning was required to defend Arts Awareness against skeptics, to secure support from within the Met and grant funding from outside organizations, and to persuade practitioners to adapt Arts Awareness in other museums and schools. This circumstance impacted the design of the Arts Awareness evaluation, which included observations of the sessions as well as oral interviews with participants.

Although the term “nonverbal learning” importantly conveys an understanding of knowledge as something that can be developed non-linguistically, it risks obscuring that Arts Awareness actually has a significant verbal component. Yenawine uses the term “words-oriented experience” to describe typical “parades before the pictures”²⁰⁵ gallery teaching in contrast to Arts Awareness. However, Arts Awareness pedagogy often uses words – though in ways that differ substantially from typical gallery teaching. Yenawine describes one such session:

“Yesterday, a marvelous thing happened. We had tape recorders, and we asked the kids to go to another room with them – we asked them to choose a picture, to describe it, describe the people who were in the picture, and then talk like that person would, and say something that person might say. Then they brought the tape recorders back. We played the tapes and we tried to figure out who it was they were talking about, and discuss the whole way the kids had come up with what they ‘interpreted.’ What happens with this is that, first of all, the kids look at things, and then, secondly, they look with insight. And whatever they think is just fine, is dead right. There’s no way you can say it’s wrong.”²⁰⁶

In a typical gallery teaching scenario, educators and students would use words to convey descriptions of an artwork – much as they do in this session. The difference is that in the Arts Awareness session, the students are then positioned in a role of creative agency by

²⁰⁵ Yenawine, Interview with Philip Yenawine, March 2016.

²⁰⁶ Yenawine, Oral history interview with Philip Yenawine, [ca. 1971.], 7.

interpreting the artwork through recording imagined dialogue. Just as movement or painting or photography are used in Arts Awareness pedagogy, words are used as a creative, expressive medium as well.

II. Embodied learning and space

Embodied learning

Embodied learning is a key subtype of nonverbal learning for Arts Awareness. In *Complete Engagement: Embodied Response in Art Museum Education*, Olga M. Hubard applies the concept of embodied learning to art museum education. Hubard writes, “learners are whole beings, creatures that make sense of the world through bodily sensations and feelings as well as through rational processes.”²⁰⁷ Embodied learning refers to this experience of making sense of the world through bodily sensations and feelings. For Hubard, embodied learning is particularly relevant in art education because of aesthetic experience: “unlike the contents of written texts, artworks present themselves as visual (or virtual) entities that exist in the same space we do.”²⁰⁸ Expanding on that, I suggest that embodied learning is particularly relevant in art *museum* education because participants are responding to (the aesthetic experience of) the museum itself as well as the artworks.

Hubard identifies two approaches for facilitating embodied responses to artworks: a discursive approach and a non-discursive approach. Arts Awareness pedagogy contains both approaches. In this section, I focus on a particular example of an Arts Awareness session in which participants explore their unique personal, physical reactions to space

²⁰⁷ Olga M. Hubard, “Complete Engagement: Embodied Response in Art Museum Education,” *Art Education* 60, no. 6 (2007): 47.

²⁰⁸ Ibid.

before applying those understandings to interpreting architecture. This example models both a discursive and a non-discursive approach. Marcia Kreitman describes,

“So, we don’t start with the idea of learning about Rome or Greece and then get into their architecture. We start by saying, ‘Okay, let’s deal with space.’ Let’s try to experience space ourselves. Let’s turn on to the fact that there is space. Let’s become aware of our own reactions. Let’s become aware of how we feel in space. How do certain spaces make us feel[?] Would we like, for example, to be curled up in a corner? Because each one of us react[s] to a space differently, we might create a space where some of us might feel lost while others of us might feel free and secure. Let’s begin to examine the kinds of space we like and don’t like. Let’s construct our own space. And then say ‘Okay, now let’s take a look at the kind of space that the Roman civilization built for themselves. Or that the Greeks built. Or that were built in the Middle Ages. Let’s look at the way they dealt with space.’ And with our own reactions, we can begin to understand other civilizations on a different level. Then we can look at the architecture of different times and begin to study the ways they organized and controlled their spaces, and the meanings behind them. So we start from there and then deal with other people on a personal level.”²⁰⁹

In the discursive approach, facilitators ask students questions about what it might feel like to inhabit a given artwork.²¹⁰ In this example, Kreitman asks students to imagine how they would feel in spaces built by the Greeks or Romans, eliciting verbal responses.

Hubard notes that though words can describe embodied response – and are the preferred medium of art historians – words have a limited capacity to represent embodied experience.²¹¹

The non-discursive approach is the approach Arts Awareness is best known for – eliciting participants to respond to artwork through movement, sound, poetry, photography, and painting. In the session described by Kreitman, she challenges participants to create artistic responses to the artwork: “Let’s construct our own space.”²¹²

On one level, Kreitman’s challenge models Hubbard’s non-discursive approach by

²⁰⁹ Marcia Kreitman, Oral history interview with Marcia Kreitman, [circa 1971], interview by Kathy Rosenbloom, Transcript, ca 1971, 5, Smithsonian Archives of American Art.

²¹⁰ Hubbard, “Complete Engagement,” 48.

²¹¹ Ibid.

²¹² Kreitman, Oral history interview with Marcia Kreitman, [circa 1971], 5.

eliciting creative, embodied responses to artwork. For Hubbard, the non-discursive approach enables visitors to access “the embodied ways of knowing that are so essential to aesthetic experience” by responding to artwork through their bodies and emotions, by accessing elements of the artwork that might elude discourse, and by responding through processes other than rational thought.²¹³ On another level, Kreitman is challenging participants to respond not just to the architecture of the Greeks or Romans *but to the architecture – and environment – of the museum itself*. In Arts Awareness, embodied learning is leveraged to rethink individuals’ relationship to the space of the institution, and to exert agency over that space.

Embodied learning and *an* experience

Howard Levy described three interwoven intentions for Arts Awareness participants: “To understand art, to feel included in the museum, and to make art.”²¹⁴ Embodied learning connects the artwork, the museum, and the individual’s creative agency. Arts Awareness focuses on the physical space of the institution and how that shapes individuals’ experiences – allowing for the rethinking of individuals’ relationships to the space of the institution to feel comfortable and included in the museum – thereby creating ownership of the space.

Arts Awareness reflects embodied learning in its holistic approach to learning that emphasized wholeness and flow, and physical, personal, and interpersonal responses to space and to the museum itself. Rika Burnham and Elliott Kai-Kee use John Dewey’s philosophy of experience as the theoretical groundwork for their art museum education practice, a philosophy that reflects Arts Awareness’ holistic approach to learning as well.

²¹³ Hubbard, “Complete Engagement,” 48.

²¹⁴ Levy, Interview with Howard Levy.

In *Art as Experience*, Dewey makes a distinction between ordinary experience and “*an* experience.” *An* experience is characterized by a feeling of wholeness and unity, and concludes with senses of enjoyment and fulfillment.²¹⁵ *An* experience is cohesive and contains a flow, including “a movement of anticipation and culmination, one that finally comes to completion.”²¹⁶ For Dewey, the experience that best demonstrates *an* experience is experience with art.²¹⁷ For Burnham and Kai Kee, they aspire for visitors to leave the museum having “felt engaged and focused by ‘*an* experience’ of an artwork that took them out of their ordinary lives.”²¹⁸ Arts Awareness curriculum exemplifies Dewey’s philosophy of *an* experience – which is perhaps unsurprising considering that Burnham herself was a practitioner of Arts Awareness pedagogy at the Met. The Arts Awareness booklet describes an Arts Awareness session structure in this way:

“Some kind of appropriate, relaxing warm-up is a good first step, followed by several activities that build on each other and introduce the visual ideas to be dealt with. Next, relate the visual activities to works of art. Close with a summation, questions, and discussion or concluding activity, perhaps suggested by the group. The last sequence is necessary to ensure the experiences make sense to the students and to provide clarification if necessary.”²¹⁹

The flow of Arts Awareness curriculum – starting with a warm-up, beginning with personal experience, interpreting artwork, and culminating in a creative response to artwork – resembles the cohesiveness with a satisfying conclusion that Dewey describes. This holistic approach can be traced back to influences on Arts Awareness including Stanislavsky’s Method, T-groups, and Isadora Duncan’s dancing in museums.

²¹⁵ Rika Burnham and Elliott Kai-Kee, *Teaching in the Art Museum: Interpretation as Experience* (J. Paul Getty Museum, 2011), 9; John Dewey, *Art as Experience* (New York: Berkley Pub. Group, 2005), 36–37.

²¹⁶ Burnham and Kai-Kee, *Teaching in the Art Museum*, 9; Dewey, *Art as Experience*, 39.

²¹⁷ Burnham and Kai-Kee, *Teaching in the Art Museum*, 9; Dewey, *Art as Experience*, 39.

²¹⁸ Burnham and Kai-Kee, *Teaching in the Art Museum*, 9.

²¹⁹ Friedberg, *Arts Awareness II*, 9.

Influences on Arts Awareness

Arts Awareness pedagogy was influenced by Russian actor and producer Konstantin Stanislavsky's Method.²²⁰ In this system, actors activate their emotional memories – in other words, their recollections of past experiences and feelings – on stage, cultivating a genuinely emotional experience that would be impossible using actors' conventional tips and tricks for representing emotion.²²¹ Kreitman's Arts Awareness session relies on the same sense of emotional memory: "Let's become aware of our own reactions ... Would we like, for example, to be curled up in a corner?"²²² In Kreitman's exercise, participants draw from their emotional memories to interpret works of art. By activating emotions as a source of knowledge, this work reflects Nieto and Bode's attention to emotional resources.

In addition, Stanislavsky's dismissal of actors' usage tricks or shortcuts to convey emotions as clichés or inauthentic resonates with Yenawine's critiques of the shallowness of "parades before the pictures"²²³ gallery teaching. Stanislavsky's connection of creativity to emotion would likely have resonated with Yenawine: at the moment of creativity, Stanislavsky writes, "there develops an interaction of body and soul, of actions and emotions, thanks to which the external helps the internal, and the internal evokes the external."²²⁴ By emphasizing personal responses to artwork and valuing participants' emotional knowledge and experiences, Arts Awareness builds on Stanislavsky's linking of emotions and creativity. The interplay between internal and external Stanislavsky

²²⁰ Newsom, "The Department of High School Programs and an Experiment in 'Arts Awareness' at the Metropolitan Museum of Art," 453.

²²¹ Irina Levin and Igor Levin, *Working on the Play and the Role: The Stanislavsky Method for Analyzing the Characters in a Drama* (Ivan R. Dee, 1992), 7.

²²² Kreitman, Oral history interview with Marcia Kreitman, [circa 1971], 5.

²²³ Yenawine, Interview with Philip Yenawine, March 2016.

²²⁴ Levin and Levin, *Working on the Play and the Role*, 8.

describes is mirrored in Arts Awareness through the interplay among artworks, students' personal responses to the artworks, and participants' creative responses to the artworks – in this case, from the emotional reflections to the personal responses to the interpretation of art. The intense fusion and communion of emotion and art described by Stanislavsky, and mirrored in Kreitman's description ("And with our own reactions, we can begin to understand other civilizations on a different level"), resonates with understanding Arts Awareness as *an* experience.

Known as encounter groups, sensitivity training, or T-groups (T for training), this phenomenon was a major influence for Arts Awareness.²²⁵ Major American companies such as American Airlines and General Mills established T-groups in the late 1940s, developed from group therapy for World War II veterans who returned with "battle fatigue," now known as post-traumatic stress disorder. A form of group therapy, T-groups were part of the human potential movement that derived from humanistic psychology.²²⁶ By the mid-1960s, T-groups were a major cultural phenomenon. An article from the journal *Sociological Inquiry* in 1971 describes T-groups in this way: "In short, sensitivity training has become something to be talked about, something which certain types of people engage in, an integral part of popular culture."²²⁷ The phenomenon of sensitivity training may be most recognizable to contemporary audiences from the retreat that Don Draper visits in the series finale of the television show *Mad Men*, set in 1970, which was a reference to the Esalen Institute in Big Sur, California.

²²⁵ Newsom, "The Department of High School Programs and an Experiment in 'Arts Awareness' at the Metropolitan Museum of Art," 453.

²²⁶ Jonathan D. Moreno, "What You Didn't Know About That *Mad Men* Encounter Group," *Psychology Today*, *Impromptu Man*, (May 21, 2015), <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/impromptu-man/201505/what-you-didnt-know-about-mad-men-encounter-group>.

²²⁷ Kurt W. Back, "Varieties of Sensitivity Training," *Sociological Inquiry* 41, no. 2 (1971): 133.

The Esalen Institute was best known for intensive small group experiences. The structure and experience of Arts Awareness borrows heavily from T-groups: the emphasis on small-group interaction, emotional connection (Don reminds his companion Stephanie of the mantra “be open”), and creative and embodied activities (like Kreitman’s space exercise above, or in *Mad Men*, Don and his fellow participants participate in a typical exercise “us[ing] non-verbal gestures to communicate feelings to one another” which happens to also be an Arts Awareness warm-up).²²⁸ The emotionally intense small group experiences that T-group participants sought, the collective exploration of space that Kreitman facilitated, and the momentary escapes from ordinary life of Burnham and Kai-kee’s visitors all reflect collective versions of *an* experience. These small-group experiences oriented toward emotional knowledge also reflect two of Quinn’s social justice themes and practices – collectivity and self-awareness.

Finally, Arts Awareness pedagogy is influenced by Isadora Duncan’s dancing in museum galleries in the twenties.²²⁹ In her autobiography, Duncan describes visiting the British Museum: “Raymond made sketches of all the Greek vases and bas-reliefs, and I tried to express them to whatever music seemed to me to be in harmony with the rhythms of the feet and Dionysiac set of the head, and the tossing of the thyrsis.”²³⁰ By close looking at artworks and interpreting them through the medium of dance, Duncan’s description reads like the curriculum of Arts Awareness. For Duncan, too, her dancing at the British Museum represented an escape from ordinary life – *an* experience.

²²⁸ Friedberg, *Arts Awareness II*, 11.

²²⁹ Newsom, “The Department of High School Programs and an Experiment in ‘Arts Awareness’ at the Metropolitan Museum of Art,” 453.

²³⁰ Isadora Duncan, *My Life (Revised and Updated)* (W. W. Norton & Company, 2013), 42.

For Arts Awareness, the key to creating this special kind of experience was getting participants to think about, and inhabit, their embodied relationship to the space of the museum. The example of Kreitman's session well demonstrates the cohesiveness and flow of an Arts Awareness session – each moment builds on the one before it. Each beat of the session is centered on the participant's physical relationship to the space. This description embodies how Arts Awareness was *an* experience, and how Arts Awareness relied on its participants' personal experiences in the space of the museum.

Institutional space

Arts Awareness pedagogy is oriented towards cultivating agency in institutional space. In a space permeated by institutional power dynamics, embodied experience becomes a tool to rethink the relationship between visitor and institution. Embodiment *in institutional space* is specifically about foregrounding the institutionality of the museum – how the physical site shapes experience, encoding specific relationships and behaviors.

In Arts Awareness, this emphasis on individuals' embodied relationships to the space of the museum is oriented towards cultivating agency. Embodied learning is leveraged towards re-thinking the relationship between individual and institution in a space that is loaded with institutional power dynamics. Because this embodied experience occurs *in institutional space*, it is specifically about foregrounding the institutionality of the museum. And how physical space shapes experience and encodes specific relationships and behaviors.

In *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*, Carol Duncan indicates how museums shape experience through tacit social messages that visitors absorb. Duncan argues that “the organization of the museum setting” constructs “a kind of script or

scenario which visitors perform.”²³¹ This script or scenario includes visitors performing “museum manners” such as speaking quietly, muting mobile phones, disabling flash photography, walking and not running, and not touching the artwork. This script or scenario also includes social divisions such as placards thanking major donors and trustees, exclusive perks for museum members, and museum identification badges that declaim that museum professionals such as curators and museum educators possess specialized expertise and status that is unavailable to the public. By performing this script or scenario, museum visitors internalize all of the rules, norms, and messages inscribed within this script or scenario — messages about who belongs and who does not, and how to perform belonging.

Arts Awareness disrupts the prescriptive norms of the institutional space by positioning students not as art appreciators, but as artists. Their experience with the artwork in the Met's galleries is not passive but active. Yenawine said, “What we try to do with various activities is to get the kids to simulate — not imitate, but simulate — the creative process, so that they do what artists do: they participate, for example, in choice-making. They are aware that there *are* choices to be made.”²³² His distinction between simulate and imitate is key. Imitation is a passive experience, in which the student repeats the aesthetic choices of an artist. In simulation, the student is positioned as an artist responding to an artwork, making their own aesthetic choices. Yenawine explains,

“Say, for instance, that you’re working from a painting ... to translate the colors to lines. There’s a process that you’re going to go through that has ... to do with figuring out what both [colors and lines] mean (whatever ‘mean’ means.) You can’t define it very well, but there is an impact.”²³³

²³¹ Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals*, 20.

²³² Newsom, “The Department of High School Programs and an Experiment in ‘Arts Awareness’ at the Metropolitan Museum of Art,” 454.

²³³ *Ibid.*, 454–55.

Arts Awareness participants use simulation of artworks to create meanings for themselves, reflecting the orientation towards agency that Lipman and Bode and Nieto promote.

Cultivating agency and ownership

Though Arts Awareness did not explicitly make the connection between embodied learning and re-imagining the relationship between individual and institution, I argue that applying the concept of hidden curriculum indicates how Arts Awareness *was* using embodied experience to leverage a critique of the institution, or to imagine a new way of being inside the institution.

Howard Levy shared the following description of a session he led at the MoMA – but that is emblematic of Arts Awareness pedagogy nonetheless – to convey to me how embodied learning conveys agency and ownership. He described an encounter with a painting by Kazimir Malevich, an artist known for abstract compositions with geometric shapes:

“So we sat in front of Malevich and I read them a quote from Malevich which says his work is ‘Very realistic and very emotional.’ ... And I say, ‘So this is what he said about it. What do you think?’ They said, ‘He’s fucking crazy. There’s nothing realistic about this. And there’s nothing emotional about this.’ So we went upstairs to the classroom. I put a slide big up of one of the big pictures we had looked at. Let’s say there were six objects – six shapes. I’d pick six kids and I’d lay them on the floor. I said, ‘You’re the black rectangle, you’re the red triangle, *dadadada*. And I asked the other kids to associate – just associate, quickly – two nouns, two verbs, two adjectives. They did that. I then took one of the kids and said ‘Okay, you’re outta here, go sit with the other kids. And now, guys, look at the five instead of the six – two nouns, two adjectives, two verbs.’ I took another one out. Basically, I was reducing. And what they began to see was, as you got smaller, as you got less objects, the tension between the objects was greater. The words began to be much more highly charged. They began to be more narrative, which led to the realism. They wanted to say ‘okay, that’s a mother and child.’ Something like that. And then we looked back at the picture and for the first time one of them recognized no shape was touching the edge of the canvas, and that all pieces were holding each other

in place, as if gravity, and they understood the physical, the tension which they had just done. They had just done a reduction exercise. Pure reduction leads to tension.”²³⁴

Interestingly, in this example, the participants are creating embodied responses *collectively* – both the participants participating in the tableau (embodying Hubbard’s non-discursive approach) and the participants contributing words (reflecting Hubbard’s discursive approach) played necessary roles in the exercise, collectively creating knowledge that they applied to the painting at the culmination of the session.

Levy emphasized how critical the participants’ embodied experiences were to this exercise, within the context of the museum: “The museum says it’s important for you to say what you did, who you are. Covertly, obviously. To use that horrible phrase of ‘ownership.’ They take a momentary bit of ownership of themselves inside this big white building.”²³⁵ By referring to the covert messages of the museum – in this case, that it is valuable and worthy of space for individuals to announce their identities and their accomplishments – Levy is referencing the hidden curriculum of the museum, enacted by the rituals performed by museum visitors that Duncan describes. In this session, Levy subverts this messaging of the museum – that an artist like Malevich should be prominent, and that his identity and artwork be studied and circulated – towards amplifying the identities and experiences of the participants themselves. Thus, this exercise critiques the institution while emphasizing and amplifying the participants’ agency.

²³⁴ Levy, Interview with Howard Levy.

²³⁵ Ibid.

Hidden curriculum

The concept of hidden curriculum reveals how, in Arts Awareness, thinking about being in the institution was actually always about power. Scholar Robert Boostrom writes in the *Encyclopedia of Curriculum Studies* that hidden curriculum is used as “an explanatory mechanism for the reproduction of social inequality.”²³⁶ Boostrom explains that scholars including Jean Anyon, Michael Apple, and Henry Giroux identify hidden curriculum as a means by which dominant groups uphold their social privilege, through messages of inequities along lines of race and class being implicitly taught to students through their experiences in the classroom and school – messages which undermine overt curriculum about democracy and equity.²³⁷ Hidden curriculum manifested within Arts Awareness itself, for example in the moment when artist-educator Jennifer Muller darts her tongue.

Yenawine opposed the power dynamics he observed between museums and visitors. He explained,

“There was no way we could have taken a class of tough girls from the Bronx to a Degas painting and explained movement. We would have been put down right away. But with Arts Awareness, we could do a *true* movement thing, and they loved it. They really looked at the paintings, and they couldn’t stop talking about what they meant.”²³⁸

In other words, the hidden curriculum of the museum – an unfamiliar, imposing environment that lacked other people who looked or behaved like them – inhibited students from having a positive experience. In designing Arts Awareness, Yenawine created programming that would allow the students to develop a close relationship with the museum and a deep understanding of the objects and experiences there. Through Arts

²³⁶ Boostrom and Kridel, “Hidden Curriculum,” 439–40.

²³⁷ Ibid.

²³⁸ Newsom, “The Department of High School Programs and an Experiment in ‘Arts Awareness’ at the Metropolitan Museum of Art,” 456.

Awareness, the artist-educators could help students become accustomed to the museum environment and able to interpret it – and, even, re-imagine it. Multiple-visit programming allowed for Arts Awareness to expand students’ relationships with public space and with history – both practices outlined by Quinn.

Social justice implications

This attention to cultivating students’ ownership and agency resembles social justice education as Nieto and Bode describe it, and an internal document at the Met specifically discusses the potential for cultivating agency through art museum education to have broader social impact.

In November 1970, the Met published an internal report called “The Metropolitan Museum as an Educational Institution” written by Barbara Newsom. Published the same year that Yenawine was hired as Associate Museum Educator-in-Charge, Department of High School Programs, the “Newsom Report” indicates the prevailing perspective, priorities, and concerns of the department at the time of his appointment. I interpret this document, in particular Newsom’s recommendations, as an indication of the direction in which Yenawine was charged to steer the department. Newsom’s report articulated the shortcomings of the Met’s current gallery teaching pedagogy for high school students.

“Less reliance on the verbal, more on the visual. If it is to make a more lasting impression with its subject matter, the Museum must work harder on the student’s eyes and less on his ears, both to capitalize on what the Museum uniquely has to offer and to avoid in every possible way turning the Museum back into a school. The lecture has undoubtedly outlived its usefulness.”²³⁹

Newsom’s recommendation encourages practitioners to abandon the traditional gallery lecture format, arguing that it inhibits students from retaining content, makes insufficient

²³⁹ Newsom, “The Metropolitan Museum as an Educational Institution: A Study with Recommendations (‘The Newsom Report’),” 32.

use of a student's encounter with an artwork and the museum, and re-inscribes the restrictiveness of the classroom experience from which gallery teaching was intended to be a respite. Newsom's juxtaposition between museums and schools reflects her criticism of the school environment, that its "rigid and compartmentalized" schedule that prioritizes college entrance exams and leaves "school-leavers" unprepared, and marginalizes the study of art as a "fringe activity."²⁴⁰ She goes on to claim that with the current school system, "We box our young men and women off into cells where we have no contact with them or they with us" and compares schools to jails and insane asylums, that isolates youth from adult culture and from society.²⁴¹ For Newsom, the museum environment has the capacity to be an escape from the pressures and restrictions of schools, where youth can have the freedom to experiment creatively, interact with adults in a less hierarchical atmosphere, and participate in civic life. Newsom advocates for a new, re-imagined kind of gallery teaching in which students have a visual experience in the museum, a meaningful primary encounter with works of art and with the museum itself. This re-imagined vision of gallery teaching reflects Quinn's value of education that engages students with public space and democracy.

Newsom also advocates for an attitude shift within the museum, to create opportunities for overlooked students. Another of her recommendations states:

"Maintaining a willing attitude at the Museum and an openness to all students. The vital ingredient ... is the attitude of the Metropolitan itself. What is required of members of the Metropolitan staff – and to an encouraging degree, many meet the requirement well – is that they be willing to join the society of unconventional thinkers who will ultimately break the mold of formal education for teenagers and draw these young adults into their own interesting and productive lives."²⁴²

²⁴⁰ Ibid., 25.

²⁴¹ Ibid., 38.

²⁴² Ibid.

She recognizes that a barrier to re-imagining art museum education is the attitudes within the museum staff itself. If the staff adheres to traditional notions of what how museum pedagogy is structured, and who traditional audiences are, change will not be possible. Changing staff attitudes – joining “the society of unconventional thinkers” – is necessary to re-imagine the possibilities for educational experiences in museums. This re-imagined attitude reflects Lipman, Nieto and Bode’s call to address structural inequality through pedagogy and to create opportunities for students’ agency.

Newsom is particularly attentive to how museums can be a nurturing environment for youth to have creative experiences beyond the norms of their classroom education. Though Newsom envisions the museum as a valuable learning environment from students from all backgrounds, she advocates for the museum as a beneficial environment for students with marginalized identities in particular. She writes,

“There is also a corollary to this requirement of the staff. This is that they be willing to bring in not just well behaved, quite [sic] young people, who will do what they are told and disappear. Many of those worth saving are not always well behaved, and some of them may even be “troublesome,” as any young people who have any spirit are.”²⁴³

Newsom is particularly attentive to the positive effects that the museum can have on youth with marginalized identities, who tend to be written off by museum staff as either unsuitable or too much trouble to work with. This motivation reflects Nieto and Bode’s calls to reject discrimination and the “deficit perspective” that is used to characterize marginalized students. Newsom makes a distinction between audiences who are “an elite prepared by education and breeding to apprehend [art]” and those who are not.²⁴⁴ For Newsom, cherry-picking high school students whose behavior reflects their elite status is insufficient. She envisions the museum as a valuable space for learning for students not

²⁴³ Ibid.

²⁴⁴ Ibid., 35.

just from elite backgrounds, but from marginalized backgrounds as well. Her choice reflects Lipman's calls for equity and – through recognizing the unique needs and experiences of students with marginalized identities – attention to cultural relevance. She raises the “very uncomfortable question” of whether the museum is doing enough to cultivate a love of art in all segments of society.²⁴⁵ For Newsom, for the museum to uphold its mission that art is valuable for all (and not only the elite) and that the museum is an important educational resource in society, the museum needs to push farther to make have positive impact on youth with marginalized identities.

In summary, through Arts Awareness' emphasis on embodied learning in the institutionalized space of the museum, participants re-imagined their individual relationships to the institution. By re-thinking the relationship between individual and institution, Arts Awareness participants re-negotiated power dynamics. In the following section, I discuss how affective learning in Arts Awareness made considering power dynamics an even more explicit part of its program than embodied learning did. The following section also contains a critical intervention, offering a corrective to the critique that Arts Awareness was ahistorical.

III. Affective learning, aesthetic experience, and historical knowledge

Criticisms of Arts Awareness

In the beginning of this chapter, I presented the critique of Henry Geldzahler that Arts Awareness was ahistorical – that it devalues traditional art-historical training and knowledge. Jane Norman, who was a senior Rockefeller fellow at the Met from 1974-75, asserted that “[Arts Awareness] is not museum education. It uses art as a backdrop. You

²⁴⁵ Ibid., 39.

can only dance in front of a Jackson Pollock, not a Chinese landscape or a Renaissance madonna.”²⁴⁶ Yenawine refuted Norman’s statement, arguing that artworks are not used as a background and that Arts Awareness can be effective with Renaissance art.²⁴⁷ For Norman, Arts Awareness was an inadequate vehicle for conveying art-historical content. By separating Arts Awareness from her notion of museum education, Norman implies that Arts Awareness has defined itself in opposition to traditional museum education. In *Experience and Education*, Dewey warns that “For in spite of itself any movement that thinks and acts in terms of an ‘ism becomes so involved in reaction against other ‘isms that it is unwittingly controlled by them.”²⁴⁸ Does Arts Awareness, by self-defining in reaction to traditional museum education, become unwittingly controlled by the norms of traditional museum education? Though Arts Awareness is positioned in opposition of and in reaction to methods of traditional art-historical training, it does not reject art-historical knowledge outright.

I argue that Arts Awareness was not ahistorical: rather, it posited a model in which aesthetic experience – an individual’s personal, emotional response to an artwork – provides a new way of thinking about individuals’ lived experiences. In other words, individual experience is a kind of historical context in itself. Arts Awareness puts individual-experience-as-historical knowledge in dialogue with art-historical knowledge.

Geldzahler’s critique of Arts Awareness being ahistorical dovetails with other critiques about programs like Arts Awareness. Arts Awareness reflects a broader movement in art museum education in the 1970s – what Kai-Kee has called the

²⁴⁶ Newsom, “The Department of High School Programs and an Experiment in ‘Arts Awareness’ at the Metropolitan Museum of Art,” 457.

²⁴⁷ Ibid.

²⁴⁸ John Dewey, “Preface,” in *Experience And Education* (Simon and Schuster, 2007), vii.

‘sensitivity’ movement in museum education.²⁴⁹ Kai-Kee compiled quotes from museum leaders to elaborate on this trend. Museum educator and fine arts professor John T. Murphey argued, “The only correct use of a museum education department is as a catalyst to experience ... the amplification of a visitor’s feeling rather than his knowledge.”²⁵⁰ Harry S. Parker III, who was the Vice Director for Education at the Met from 1971-73, vowed that museums would “ride the wave of feeling over thought which seems to be mounting today.”²⁵¹ Finally, George Heard Hamilton, director of the Sterling and Francine Clark Institute, claimed that museums were responsible for providing “the most fundamental aesthetic experiences within its power, rather than exercises in historical retrospection.”²⁵² Taken together, these quotes are suggestive of Kai-Kee’s critiques of this trend – the privileging of aesthetic formalism over historical context.²⁵³ Murphey, Parker, and Hamilton’s descriptions well illustrate how Arts Awareness reflects a broader movement both within museum education and on a social/cultural level -- a turn towards sensitivity. Next, these critiques all contain an implicit bias – by privileging “knowledge” or “thought” over “feeling,” or “historical retrospection” over “aesthetic experience” – which suggests that these critics still subscribe to traditional values of art museum pedagogy that privilege certain kinds of knowledge or experience – namely, traditional art-historical content. All of these critiques suggest that the emphasis

²⁴⁹ Burnham and Kai-Kee, *Teaching in the Art Museum*, 38.

²⁵⁰ Elliott Kai-Kee, “A Brief History of Teaching in the Art Museum,” in *Teaching in the Art Museum: Interpretation as Experience*, by Rika Burnham and Elliott Kai-Kee (J. Paul Getty Museum, 2011), 38; John T. Murphey, “What You Can Do with Your Museum Education Department,” *Museum News* 49, no. 2 (October 1970): 16.

²⁵¹ Kai-Kee, “A Brief History of Teaching in the Art Museum,” 38; Harry S. Parker III, “The Art Museum and the Time of Change,” *Art Education* 24, no. 9 (1971): 8.

²⁵² Kai-Kee, “A Brief History of Teaching in the Art Museum,” 38; George Heard Hamilton, “Education and Scholarship in the American Museum,” in *On Understanding Art Museums*, ed. Sherman E. Lee (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975), 117.

²⁵³ Kai-Kee, “A Brief History of Teaching in the Art Museum,” 38.

on feeling is *at odds with* art-historical knowledge. Instead, Arts Awareness is an experimental art museum pedagogy that dismisses this understanding of feeling and art-historical knowledge as incompatible. As Yenawine narrates in an Arts Awareness film, “Art history was not the best handle by which to reach a kid ... There is a gap between him and the art object. How do you best cross that barrier?”²⁵⁴ Instead, the Arts Awareness program experimentally privileges feeling, personal response, and lived experience as valued ways of knowing *and puts that way of knowing in dialogue with art-historical knowledge*. The basis of this creative curriculum choice was to re-imagine the museum as an authoritative knowledge producer, to re-imagine the museum as a space where diverse ways of knowing are valued – in short, to democratize the museum. This effort to interrupt the traditional hierarchies and power dynamics of the museum is significant.

This criticism of curriculum as ahistorical was echoed by criticism of this type of pedagogy – with its emphasis on improvisation and formalism – as frivolous or shallow, lacking in pedagogical rigor. Susan Mayer, lecturer of art education and coordinator of museum education at the University of Texas at Austin questioned: “We could see that children were enjoying dancing in the gallery – but were they learning anything?”²⁵⁵ Additionally, Laura Chapman prompted educators to “consider when and where and why you might ask children to lie down on a cold slab floor and try to become purple triangles.”²⁵⁶ Olivia Gude maintains a similar critique of K-12 school art programs: “I

²⁵⁴ Fred Wardenburg and Davis Bernstein, *Arts Awareness*, Instructional (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1972).

²⁵⁵ Kai-Kee, “A Brief History of Teaching in the Art Museum,” 38; Susan M. Mayer, “Alternatives in Me-You-Zeums,” *Art Education* 31, no. 3 (1978): 18.

²⁵⁶ Kai-Kee, “A Brief History of Teaching in the Art Museum,” 38; Laura H. Chapman, “The Future and Museum Education,” *Museum News* 60, no. 6 (1982): 54.

rarely see meaningful connections being made between these formal descriptors and understanding works of art or analyzing the quality of everyday design. I ponder the piles of exercises on line, shape, or color harmonies left behind by hundreds and hundreds of students each year.”²⁵⁷ These critics may dismiss Arts Awareness as insufficiently rigorous on the basis of the playfulness of creative responses to artworks in the gallery, and alongside that its interest in formal aesthetic experience. However, the attention to improvisation and formalism in Arts Awareness is the connective tissue between affective knowledge and art-historical knowledge enabling participants to, as Yenawine said above, “cross that barrier.”

Lived experience as historical knowledge

The criticisms that Arts Awareness was ahistorical and lacked pedagogical rigor failed to understand what Arts Awareness was actually about: rethinking what counts as historical knowledge, and what the relationship is between different kinds of historical knowledge (specifically, including both individuals’ lived experience as well as art-historical knowledge.)

Arts Awareness treated lived experience as a meaningful kind of historical context in its own right for engaging with art. Arts Awareness was an experiment in emphasizing visual experience alongside art historical information, and in taking advantages of the museum’s less restrictive environment. Arts Awareness was an experiment in creating a gallery teaching experience that was inclusive and meaningful to youth from all backgrounds, not just the elite. This excerpt from Newsom’s

²⁵⁷ Olivia Gude, “Postmodern Principles: In Search of a 21st Century Art Education,” *Art Education* 57, no. 1 (2004): 6.

recommendations well illustrates this change in technique from information-based to valuing lived experience:

“It is not good enough to point something out and to tell the student what it means, or even to ask the question and have someone deliver the answer. Each student should have the chance to make the discovery for himself. He can be guided by the structure of the activity and the nature of the questions it is meant to answer, but he should be able to create his own response, and he cannot do this in a crowd of people in which answers are popping up before he has had time to think them through.”²⁵⁸

The didactic, information-based techniques Newsom describes echo the classroom dynamic that she hopes to interrupt. Instead, Newsom advocates for creating space for individual students to respond to artworks and make interpretations on their own, individual terms. By considering the experience of individual students, choice enacts Lipman’s principles of agency. Yenawine explains, “Planning an Arts Awareness class is much the same as planning any other educational experience. A structure is required, although one based on self-expression rather than absorption of information.”²⁵⁹ In other words, this change is a change of mindset as much as technique.

In terms of technique, Newsom recommends:

“A lecturer (if she must continue to be called that) would do far better to spend her preparation time devising activities that would help students, and their teachers with them, observe the work of art for themselves – sketching, taking notes or pictures, or even writing poems, as one lecturer has encouraged her students to do.”²⁶⁰

It is easy to envision how Arts Awareness developed from Newsom’s recommendations. Even the gesture of removing the facilitator’s title as lecturer reveals the transformation Newsom has in mind – lecturing, and the implicit didacticism of the lecture format, disappears. The lecture is replaced by an emphasis on visual encounters to art and

²⁵⁸ Newsom, “The Metropolitan Museum as an Educational Institution: A Study with Recommendations (‘The Newsom Report’),” 32.

²⁵⁹ Friedberg, *Arts Awareness II*, 9.

²⁶⁰ Newsom, “The Metropolitan Museum as an Educational Institution: A Study with Recommendations (‘The Newsom Report’),” 32.

creative responses. These activities activate the emotional, social, and cultural resources that Nieto and Bode indicate students possess.

Arts Awareness represents a rejection of the traditional gallery teaching as at best, inhibiting learning and underutilizing the artwork and the museum, and at worst, restrictive, hierarchical and boring. Arts Awareness utilizes the unique capacity of artwork to “incite, excite, and irritate” to cultivate learning experiences inside the museum.²⁶¹ By focusing on visual encounters and creative responses to art, Arts Awareness activates the individual knowledge and lived experiences of participants. In so doing, Arts Awareness aligns with a second strategy of social justice education Quinn indicates – namely, “building in students’ expertise and rich knowledge.”²⁶²

Affective learning as a way to bridge lived experiences to art-historical knowledge

Though there is a significant body of literature in the field of Affect Studies, little has been published on affect in museums. For this dissertation, I will focus on Lisa C. Roberts’ research on affect and museum learning. Roberts describes affective learning as “experience-based” in contrast to “information-based.”²⁶³ She describes the influence of affective learning on museum visitors’ motivation to engage with museum content, receptivity to museum content, and influence of museum content on their values.²⁶⁴ Critically, Roberts notes that affective learning “has never fit easily into museums’

²⁶¹ Quinn, “Social Justice and Arts Education,” 226; L. S Vygotskiĭ, *The Psychology of Art* (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1971), 252.

²⁶² Quinn, “Social Justice and Arts Education,” 227; J. Kahne and E. Middaugh, “Is Patriotism Good for Democracy?,” in *Pledging Allegiance: The Politics of Patriotism in America’s Schools*, ed. Joel Westheimer (New York: Teachers College Press, 2007), 115–26.

²⁶³ Lisa C. Roberts, “Affective Learning, Affective Experience: What Does It Have to Do with Museum Education,” *Visitor Studies: Theory, Research, and Practice* 4 (1992): 162.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 165–67.

dominant epistemology.”²⁶⁵ She claims the museum field’s “neglect of affective learning is rooted in the system of values that dominate the institution” and is reflective of educators’ low status on the institutional hierarchy of museums. Arts Awareness pedagogy used affective learning as the connective tissue between participants’ lived experiences and art, and the museum itself. For example, in one activity featured in the Arts Awareness film, the camera follows each student in a circle as they respond to the prompt “I want to go ‘round and I want everyone to give a word, the first word that comes to mind, that relates to the height.” Responses ranged from the serious (“dead,” “lonely,” “forever,” “huge,”) to the humorous (“Wilt Chamberlain.”) Yet in this activity, dialogue is only one part of the session, one way of engaging with students’ personal reactions to artwork -- further in the session, the students go on to use movement.²⁶⁶ Dialogue is not the end in and of itself, but rather a part of a larger experience that combines dialogue with -- and in service to -- other ways of knowing.

Watching the Arts Awareness films, the pedagogy reminds me of the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience’s facilitated dialogue pedagogy. Flowing from experience questions to connection questions to exploratory questions to action-oriented questions, this dialogue is a Freirean process that begins with the lived realities and experiential knowledge of individuals and builds towards imagining a liberating future. In a scene interrogating the museum, an artist-educator uses each of these type of questions. “Why would you want to come to a museum?” is an experience question, which activates the participant’s knowledge through lived experience. “Why would you tell someone to visit?” and “What would you tell somebody about the museum?” are both connection

²⁶⁵ Ibid., 164.

²⁶⁶ Ibid.

questions, tying lived experience and museum experience together. Referring to the figures on a television screen in the gallery, the artist-educator asks “Is that in the past? The people out there in the television?” These are exploratory questions, drawing on both lived experience and museum experience to come to new conclusions. Finally, “Will you come here when you don’t have a class?” is an action-oriented question, geared towards uncovering what effects the museum experience might have on participants’ future choices.²⁶⁷ These strategies reflect Nieto and Bode’s call to draw on students’ strengths and knowledge, and Quinn’s consideration of the complexities of daily life as a social justice theme. The theory of non-verbal learning does not address how dialogue was an essential tool for communication and learning utilized by Arts Awareness.

Activating affective knowledge and art-historical knowledge towards critique of the institution

Arts Awareness used this pedagogy to call attention to the hidden curriculum of the museum as an institution, specifically its messaging of what kinds of knowledge matter. This new understanding – bolstered by affective knowledge – was used to leverage a critique of the museum as an institution, specifically the power dynamics therein.

Allon Schoener, the curator of the controversial *Harlem on My Mind* exhibition, and Yenawine worked together – and skirmished – at the New York State Council for the Arts (NYSCA) prior to their appointments at the Met. The dynamic of Schoener’s autonomous decision-making style and Yenawine’s unease with it – “You don’t tell

²⁶⁷ International Coalition of Sites of Conscience, “Designing the Arc of Dialogue”; Wardenburg and Bernstein, *Arts Awareness*.

people what to do”²⁶⁸ – would re-emerge later in their careers at the Met, where only one of these two men appears to have learned from the experience. Yenawine created a form of pedagogy that emphasized coparticipation and – as he would repeat with *Harlem on my Mind* -- Schoener chose not to take stakeholders’ perspectives into account, resulting in a disastrous controversy, which I discussed in the previous chapter. When Yenawine began working the Met, “It was exciting to think about the challenge to make a place like this relate to individual people as distinguished from just faces.”²⁶⁹ For him, the Met’s elitism manifested through a lack of connection to individuals. He derided how the Met staff referred to the regular lecture attendees as “the blue haired ladies,” and did not recognize their names or faces. For Yenawine, this disconnect with individual visitors impacted pedagogy – “the programs were not very personal.”²⁷⁰ Engagement on an individual lesson is critical for Yenawine: his approach is to “involve people in an experience that makes them relate to what they’re looking at.”²⁷¹ His ideal museum experience is one that engages a museum visitor’s lived experiences and personal responses to art.²⁷² The theory of coparticipation centers around an experience co-created by facilitators and participants, that engages museum visitors as autonomous individuals. Yenawine incorporated his particular personal and political values into his work at NYSCA and the Met – a set of values that are counter to most typical institutional structures, which tend to be disinterested in sharing power.

The philosophy of Arts Awareness entailed jettisoning “information-based” pedagogy to re-imagine what kinds of knowledges matter. Yenawine criticized the Met’s

²⁶⁸ Yenawine, Oral history interview with Philip Yenawine, [ca. 1971.], 2.

²⁶⁹ Ibid., 3.

²⁷⁰ Ibid.

²⁷¹ Ibid., 4.

²⁷² Kreitman, Oral history interview with Marcia Kreitman, [circa 1971], 6.

previous practices of “one-shot deal” school group visits because they lacked opportunity for connecting with students on an individual level.²⁷³ He describes a typical visit in this way:

“[School group visits] operate on this basis of accepting appointments made by teachers for kids to see a particular part of the collection. These more or less relate to what’s going on in the classroom and it’s essentially a program where a guide, who is very skillful, takes the kids into the galleries and tries to get them to raise questions. And they do – they’ve got a million of them – and then they discuss the answers. But there’s a right and a wrong, information-based idea behind this.”²⁷⁴

Yenawine opposes what he calls “information-based” pedagogy, which contains implicit right and wrong ideas and therefore privileges certain kinds of art-historical knowledge. In these programs, the overt or planned curriculum is about art-historical content, and the hidden curriculum is that the white, female, highly educated docent is the holder of knowledge that enables her to interpret art, and that the students are unequipped to perform interpretation themselves. Because this pedagogy is designed to align with classroom learning, it feeds into the conventional curriculum presented in schools.

Yenawine elaborates on the two typical strategies for information-based art museum pedagogy: art appreciation and studio. He describes:

“Mostly art is taught either from an ‘appreciation,’ that is from a historical standpoint, which is usually learning artists’ names and periods – to recognize a Greek column and differentiate between a Doric and an Ionic column – or it is taught as a process and an activity, and usually taught pretty badly.”²⁷⁵

These two approaches both exemplify “information-based” pedagogy, with the content areas being “tombstone” art-historical content (names, dates, etc.) and studio technique. Both approaches reinforce a dynamic in which the educator contains the knowledge – about how to distinguish between Doric and Ionic columns, or how to paint “well” – and

²⁷³ Yenawine, Oral history interview with Philip Yenawine, [ca. 1971.], 3.

²⁷⁴ Ibid., 4.

²⁷⁵ Ibid., 14.

the students as blank slates. In developing a new kind of art museum pedagogy, Yenawine was responding to these two approaches as models of what *not* to do, and devised strategies that did not rely on “information-based” teaching. By promoting this theory and practice of nonverbal learning, the Arts Awareness staff is positioning their work in contrast to the traditional understanding of gallery teaching as a monologic lecture that was prevalent at the Met and other museums.

Though Yenawine acknowledged that some students may learn through this information-based model, he asserted that most will not. First, information-based pedagogy simply will not hold most students’ attention. In other words, it was boring. Second, because of the social dynamics inherent in information-based teaching: As Yenawine puts it, “It’s a matter of stance on behalf of most high school kids: ‘You’re just not going to treat me like that and expect me to learn something. Offer me something real, not just words.’”²⁷⁶ The pedagogy of information-based pedagogy conveyed the message to students that the facilitator had all of the right answers, and that they as learners were blank slates. It invalidates the lived experience and knowledge that students already possess. Worse, even, than boring: Yenawine interpreted this dynamic as patronizing and hierarchical – thwarting the agency described by Lipman, Nieto, and Bode.

Affective learning with art: framing individuals’ lived experience as historical knowledge

Arts Awareness used affective engagement with art to frame individuals’ lived experiences as a legitimate form of knowledge, a historical context in and of itself.

²⁷⁶ Ibid., 4.

Through Arts Awareness, Yenawine created opportunities for students to bring their own histories into the museum. For Yenawine, a “real” experience for high school students is one that grows out of their personal experiences and lived realities.²⁷⁷ This consideration reflects Lipman’s discussion of cultural relevance and lived experience. Yenawine explains:

“An information-based program does not take into account that a kid knows that he could turn off the television and turn it back on tomorrow night, and Walter Cronkite will still be there and the information will not have changed that much.”²⁷⁸

I interpret Yenawine’s Walter Cronkite anecdote to mean that much of what students learn they learn outside of school walls – for example, through watching the evening news. They internalize information – for example, about current events – and perhaps also messages about social dynamics – for example, that white men are authoritative possessors of knowledge.

The anecdote also suggests that while learning new information may not be life-changing, learning a new way of seeing might be.

“If you offer them an experience with something like dancing in a gallery, like moving to works of art, or an experiment with color that creates an environment, they don’t want to go back to an information-based approach to the Museum. And I’ve worked both ways with kids. When I started teaching, essentially all I had to go on was that information kind of thing. And although I didn’t have that much information to give out, and I knew that, I had feelings, and we could discuss those as the starting point for discussing somebody else’s.”²⁷⁹

For Yenawine, structuring pedagogy around feelings and experiences made more sense than buying into the elitist ideology of information – no one’s feelings or experiences are privileged above anyone else’s. Feelings and experiences were shared common ground among all participants. For the Arts Awareness educators, feelings became the starting

²⁷⁷ Ibid., 5.

²⁷⁸ Ibid.

²⁷⁹ Ibid., 6.

point for developing new ways of looking at art – by putting those feelings in dialogue with art-historical knowledge.

Affective knowledge and art-historical knowledge in dialogue

It is important to note that, for Arts Awareness, considering individuals' lived experiences as a form of historical knowledge did not simply mean rejecting art-historical knowledge out of hand, but rather, situating art-historical knowledge as one kind of knowledge in a dialogic relationship with the other forms of knowledge that individuals bring into the museum. In this way, through Arts Awareness, critique of the institution emerges through art-historical learning.

Participants *did* absorb art-historical content through Arts Awareness. Though absorbing art historical content was not a stated goal of Arts Awareness, the staff members recognized that that kind of learning was happening. For artist-instructor Randy Williams, his goal was to incite students' curiosity in the artwork that they saw and for the students to absorb art historical information unintentionally. He positioned his teaching approach in contrast to traditional art history gallery teaching: "Never say artworks are great. Don't try to work on appreciation."²⁸⁰ He noticed his students were familiar with all of the paintings in the twentieth-century gallery, and had absorbed information about artists and artistic movements, and how certain artworks were created, after ten Arts Awareness sessions. None of this information had been taught directly. Instead, the students were learning in response to their own questions about the

²⁸⁰ Newsom, "The Metropolitan Museum as an Educational Institution: A Study with Recommendations ('The Newsom Report')," 456.

artworks.²⁸¹ In so doing, this strategy adheres to Lipman’s theorization of cultural relevance and critical literacy.

Affective learning and challenging hidden curriculum

Arts Awareness leveraged the learning of art-historical knowledge to challenge the hidden curriculum of the museum as an institution by positing a decentralized notion of connoisseurship. In Arts Awareness, feelings are the mechanism for connecting with a work of art. Yenawine explain that the key to his pedagogy is having students be “able to dig what somebody else has done.”²⁸² He wants his students to connect on an emotional level with artworks that are not part of their everyday visual culture – such as a fresco, tapestry, or period room. In so doing, students engage directly with history – a practice that Quinn advocates for.

Yenawine recognizes that in order for his students to “dig” artworks, they must develop their ability to look critically at artwork (artwork in the museum as well as their own creations) and their sensibility of design. He bemoans the absence of this skill set in society: “America is being destroyed by the inability of anybody on a large scale to look critically at what they see and respond to it.”²⁸³ Perhaps ironically, part of this process of critical looking reflects a very traditional concept in art history: connoisseurship.

Yenawine explains, “although number painting has somewhat gone out of style, a lot of people still think like that they did something and therefore it’s good. They did something and the process was good, but it doesn’t mean that the product was good or that it had

²⁸¹ Newsom, “The Department of High School Programs and an Experiment in ‘Arts Awareness’ at the Metropolitan Museum of Art,” 456.

²⁸² Yenawine, Oral history interview with Philip Yenawine, [ca. 1971.], 15.

²⁸³ Ibid.

any kind of creative effect.”²⁸⁴ Though Yenawine is interested in democratizing the art museum through expanded audience, he still upholds the notion that not all artwork is “good” or belongs in a museum.²⁸⁵

Decentralized connoisseurship

Kreitman’s session on Greek and Roman architecture exemplifies a dialogue between individuals’ lived experience as historical knowledge – in other words, participants’ embodied responses to the artworks as a form of knowledge – and art-historical knowledge. Her approach was not ahistorical; her intention was to “begin to understand other civilizations.”²⁸⁶ Rather, her objective was to circulate art-historical knowledge *in a new and different way*. Namely, by contextualizing it within participants’ embodied responses.

Howard Levy shared with me another example of circulating art-historical knowledge contextualized within participants’ embodied responses:

“There were three consecutive galleries in the old days: the little Romanesque chapel, the big Gothic court, and then behind the Gothic court was the Neoclassic sculpture [court]. ... I asked the kids to come in. ... I asked them to write a paragraph on what they did before they got to the museum that day. And we read a couple of them. ‘Gone to class.’ And then I said ‘Okay, there are no more words in the English language. That’s it. Now let’s look at what you see in Romanesque art. Tell me some of the words you associate as you look at these sculptures and icons. I said ‘Okay, I want you to try to – only using those words – create a Romanesque paragraph. So what is it that you really want to choose here? If you want to repeat words, you can, *dadadada*, if you think grammar is important to you, *dadadada*.’ And then they did that. And then we moved to Gothic. And so they looked at the Gothic. And then I said ‘Okay, same thing, now make this into a Gothic paragraph. And then make this into a Neoclassic paragraph.’ And the words began to reflect the move from this to this to this. And they could essentially – what I realized certainly in

²⁸⁴ Ibid.

²⁸⁵ Ibid.

²⁸⁶ Kreitman, Oral history interview with Marcia Kreitman, [circa 1971], 5.

the words section – and I think Rika in the movement section – was that you ask the students to solve the same problems that the artist is trying to solve.”²⁸⁷

This session clearly builds on and reinforces the art historical narrative maintained by the institution – the narrative of progress through time enacted through the ritual of walking through enfiladed galleries (in this case, from Romanesque to Gothic to Neoclassical) described by Duncan in *Civilizing Rituals*.²⁸⁸ The rupture between the institution’s art historical narrative and Arts Awareness occurs here: Critically, the students used their own words – the paragraph they had written about their day – as the materials for their creative responses through poetry to the Romanesque, Gothic, and Neoclassical artworks. *Their own words* and their own embodied responses become a necessary tool for interpreting the artworks, and are positioned in dialogue with art-historical knowledge. The pedagogy emphasizes and leverages the visitors’ agency in two ways: first, by centering their own words and embodied and responses, and second, by positioning the visitor as an artist who is solving the same projects as the artist – reified by the museum – is solving. Through this pedagogical approach, Arts Awareness does not frame art-historical knowledge as obsolete or irrelevant. Instead, it challenges the museum’s privileging of art-historical knowledge over other ways of knowing. Arts Awareness proposes a museum pedagogy in which art-historical knowledge and embodied response are in dialogue.

Learning outside museums

The museum experience is not hermetically sealed – museum visitors’ experiences of museums are informed and shaped by their personal learning experiences. Arts Awareness’ holistic approach to individuals’ experiences in the museum reflects

²⁸⁷ Levy, Interview with Howard Levy.

²⁸⁸ Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals*, 104.

how learning occurs outside the museum as well – both in schools and in everyday life. Arts Awareness points towards how museum learning is unlike classroom learning, and thus should not be understood in the same ways as classroom learning. This framework of how different learning environments cultivate different kinds of knowledge is not new -- consider the distinction between “book smarts” and “street smarts.” For Yenawine, the nonverbal learning of Arts Awareness resembles the learning that transpires outside of the classroom, in the “real world” -- learning that derives from (inter)personal, emotional, and social experiences. Yenawine said,

“It’s always so irritating to me that when you ask someone what the most important learning events are in their lives, basically they don’t talk about school situations. They might mention something that is close to a classic learning experience, like walking into a space and being aware for the first time of ... what Byzantine art was all about [for instance]. ... Usually it’s not the lecture on Byzantine art that they remember, [even though that might have been] critically important in bringing them to the point of being able to walk into a Byzantine church and getting a sense of what it was like in that part of the world in the early Christian era. A lot of people learned the most from the divorce they had or the child they birthed.”²⁸⁹

Because Yenawine finds the classroom experiences of his Arts Awareness students so lacking, he is irritated by the pervasive myth that the most important learning experiences happen inside schools. Yenawine recognizes that moments of learning can – and, most often, do – occur outside of classrooms. He presents museums as one such environment for learning. And a museum can be a place not just to learn about art, but to learn about society. This strategy reflects Lipman’s attention to critical literacy, to strengthen students’ awareness of personal conditions and social injustice.

Museum as a social laboratory

²⁸⁹ Newsom, “The Department of High School Programs and an Experiment in ‘Arts Awareness’ at the Metropolitan Museum of Art,” 455.

If life outside the museum necessarily informs the museum experience, Arts Awareness was also designed for experiential knowledge to flow in the other direction. For Arts Awareness, the museum has a *unique* potential as a social laboratory – in part because of the relevance of art-historical knowledge. In the vignette above, Yenawine clarifies his understanding of traditional museum learning and proposes an additional framework for theorizing museum learning. He explains that museum learning comes from the museum environment – such as, in the example above, the experience of walking into a gallery of Byzantine art for the first time. Yenawine suggests that any kind of content knowledge a museum visitor may absorb is comprised of both the content of the docent’s lecture as well as the embodied experience of responding to the artwork in the gallery. But Yenawine also proposes something further: that museum learning can be a form of learning through lived experience, just like divorce or childbirth. That the museum can be a space for learning through lived experience about social inequality.

Leveraging the unique potential of art-historical knowledge

By using affective engagement to situate individual experience in dialogic relation with art-historical knowledge, Arts Awareness sought to leverage that unique potential. Arts Awareness provided students with the tools to grapple with the manifestations of social inequality within the museum itself. Learning about the museum itself opens the door to learning about the manifestations of social inequality within their schools, and in society at large. Through Arts Awareness, students engage deeply with a new learning environment and discover what kind of an institution the museum is. Kreitman discusses an example of this in a session she facilitated in a French eighteenth century gallery:

“Much to my surprise, the students chose the French eighteenth century room. And we did whole lots of things – from exploring and talking about history, getting their reactions, to the way the

richer people lived, and how the poor people lived, the social and political aspects, to questions dealing with the Museum itself, like how the objects got here, how they were chosen and who takes care of them.”²⁹⁰

Through this session, the Museum itself becomes an object of study – the students grapple with the issues of acquisition, curation, and preservation that museum professionals grapple with, and these issues’ connections to colonialism and elitism. The students also investigated the environment through their personal responses to the museum, as demonstrated in one of the Arts Awareness films. In this scene, Jennifer Muller, the movement and dance instructor, calls attention to the physical discomfort of being present in the museum. She asks students to observe the feeling of the room – and then widens her eyes, and darts her tongue out mischievously. She is indicating the stuffiness and exclusivity of the museum. She prompts that the Great Hall might feel different from outside, the subway, their home, their bedroom, their shower. She suggests that it’s a “very different feeling to be here.” The students respond with restricted, stilted movement – many even create their own straitjackets by flattening their arms into their clothing. By prioritizing the lived experience of students as a form of knowledge, Arts Awareness becomes what Tamara Beauboeuf-Lafontant calls “politically relevant teaching” that is “relevant” to the *political* experiences of inequity and disenfranchisement of their students.²⁹¹

Challenging power dynamics

Central to Arts Awareness’ challenge to the hidden curriculum of the museum as an institution was how the power dynamics external to the museum informed experience

²⁹⁰ Kreitman, Oral history interview with Marcia Kreitman, [circa 1971], 5.

²⁹¹ Quinn, “Social Justice and Arts Education,” 226–27; Tamara Beauboeuf-Lafontant, “A Movement against and beyond Boundaries: Politically Relevant Teaching among African-American Teachers,” *The Teachers College Record* 100, no. 4 (1999): 705.

inside the museum, *and vice versa*. That is, the museum can be a social laboratory for challenging social power dynamics writ large. The hidden curriculum of museums includes elitist ideals about *who* is (and is not) knowledgeable or authoritative in museums, *what* kinds of knowledge are (and are not) valuable in museums, and *what kinds* of personal responses to art are (and are not) appropriate in museums.

Manifestations of hidden curriculum in museums that Arts Awareness facilitators grappled with include the prevalence of white women with extensive educational pedigrees positioned as docents, the prevalence of white and privileged students on school tours, and the overrepresentation of artworks by white male artists in the Met's galleries. This hidden curriculum sends the message that museums are institutions created by and for privileged white people – and that the youth of color in Arts Awareness did not belong, and that their insights or personal responses to art were unwelcome. This shift reflects a disruption of structural inequality indicated by Lipman, Nieto, and Bode.

In summary, Arts Awareness was not ahistorical. Rather, through embodied and affective learning, Arts Awareness posited a model in which individuals' personal responses to artwork were contextualized as a form of historical knowledge, and put into a dialogic relationship with art-historical knowledge. This re-imagining of what kinds of knowledge are valued and perpetuated in museums shifted the hidden curriculum of the museum as an institution, positioning the museum as a social laboratory.

IV. Outside the institution

Arts Awareness was about more than just personal and creative responses to artworks – it was about responses to the museum itself. This turn to interpret the museum itself is one of the most significant – and underexamined – elements of Arts Awareness

pedagogy. That Arts Awareness was about not just interpreting but critiquing the museum and using the museum as a lens through which to grapple with social inequality, even more so. This practice reflects Lipman's call for education that challenges structural inequality and helps students develop sociopolitical consciousness.

These political intentions were minimized within the written documentation of Arts Awareness, but can be brought to the surface. In the booklet for Arts Awareness, the stated intentions for the program included to "break down barriers between high school students and art objects and the institutions which house these objects."²⁹² This statement acknowledges that there are barriers not just between students and artworks, but between students and *the museum itself*. And it positions museum education as a practice that can investigate and address those barriers, cultivating positive relationships between youth and artworks and youth and museums. This barrier is also mentioned internally, David Kusin refers to goals of Arts Awareness including "the lessening of hostility towards 'education' generally, and of possible intimidation by this large institution more specifically."²⁹³ The learning goals of Arts Awareness include learning about the museum itself, and changing students' response from intimidation to something more positive. Creating the conditions for students to learn about the museum as an institution primes them for grappling with the problems in museums, schools, and the world at large through the lens of societal inequality. This practice reflects Nieto and Bode's interest in critical thinking towards social change.

Through interpreting art, they interpret museums. As John Dewey wrote, "the first stirrings of dissatisfaction and the first intimations of a better future are always found in

²⁹² Friedberg, *Arts Awareness, a Project of the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, 1.

²⁹³ David Kusin to Stephanie Singer, "Ref.: Grant #A 40-51-72," April 1, 1975, 2, Metropolitan Museum of Art Archives.

works of art.”²⁹⁴ Arts Awareness exposes the museum as both a space for exploring the liberatory capacity of art and for conducting creative experiments, and as an institution that reinforces and perpetuates social exclusion.

Similarly, responses to the museum itself were also always responses to more than just the museum, they were responses to the larger social and political world. Maxine Greene connects the arts to the cultivation of “social imagination: the capacity to invent visions of what should be and what might be in our deficient society, on the streets where we live, and in our schools.”²⁹⁵ In Arts Awareness, politics – an awareness of the heterogeneity of learning environments in New York City, of how social inequality operates – was built into the pedagogy itself.

Yenawine presents the museum as a component of the students’ environment, and positions the museum itself not only as the site of study, but as an object of study as well. For Yenawine, the museum is “a creative part of their environment” in contrast to negative elements such as the banal spaces of their neighborhood architecture (he mentions Co-Op City, a housing development in the Bronx where many Arts Awareness students likely lived, in particular) and their school buildings.²⁹⁶ He explains,

“I think people only learn to appreciate that banality when they can contrast it to something. If their whole world is dirty streets, a general kind of visual pollution, sign blight, where it’s school and television, where the best things they see are graphics that come in magazines, what do they have to compare it to? I don’t think very much. So, in a sense, I say, ‘Take people to a special place.’”²⁹⁷

For Yenawine, the banality is perceptible not only through objects such as signs and televisions but through *environments* such as streets and school buildings. This banality

²⁹⁴ Quinn, “Social Justice and Arts Education,” 223; Dewey, *Art as Experience*, 360.

²⁹⁵ Quinn, “Social Justice and Arts Education,” 226; Maxine Greene, *Releasing the Imagination: Essays on Education, the Arts, and Social Change* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1995), 5.

²⁹⁶ Yenawine, Oral history interview with Philip Yenawine, [ca. 1971.], 9–10.

²⁹⁷ Ibid., 10.

of everyday life reinforces the specialness of the museum itself. In the same way, it is not just the artworks within it, but the museum itself as an environment, that becomes an object of study.

The museum experience becomes a lens through which societal inequalities become visible. For Yenawine, the way of looking – the awareness – that Arts Awareness pedagogy cultivates can be extended from the museum environment to applications in all other environments. He explains, “An expanded awareness makes [students] much more capable of dealing with the environment in which they live, much more critical of its negative aspects, much more attentive to its positive aspects.”²⁹⁸ This point is a crucial element of Arts Awareness pedagogy, and one that I believe is under-discussed in the existing narratives of Arts Awareness, which tend to focus on the eye-catching visuals of interpretive dance and bongo drums in the galleries and downplay the political implications of this pedagogy. Arts Awareness pedagogy was designed to give students the skill set of critical consciousness – a new awareness of their lived realities. Kreitman underscores this intention: “One of the major goals is to develop different ways of experiencing, of becoming aware. And hopefully they can apply this to all aspects of their lives, not just in the Museum. They’re learning to see in a new way.”²⁹⁹

Conclusion

As I argued in the introduction to this project, the contemporary museum field’s emphasis on participation, and the movement of the field towards social justice, have been collapsed together without sufficient analysis about the implications of this conflation. Arts Awareness is an example of social justice pedagogy in which critique

²⁹⁸ Ibid., 11.

²⁹⁹ Kreitman, Oral history interview with Marcia Kreitman, [circa 1971], 5.

and transformation are baked into the pedagogy itself. But this element is unique to Arts Awareness: the same cannot be said of participatory pedagogy post-Arts Awareness, including VTS, in which critique has been scrubbed out. However, because this critique is essential to the pedagogy's social-justice orientation, I question how effective post-Arts Awareness participatory art museum education can be as a social-justice-oriented pedagogy.

Chapter 3

In this chapter, I situate Arts Awareness pedagogy alongside contemporary participatory and social-justice-oriented museum education initiatives. I illustrate their differences in approach, and the pedagogical implications of those differences, through a study of how Arts Awareness and more recent initiatives approach a central question: the role of the “outsider.” I argue that Arts Awareness’ deployment of “outsiders” proceeds from the recognition that a truly inclusive museum pedagogy *must* incorporate space for the destabilization of power dynamics within the museum, and that contemporary practitioners of participatory and social-justice museum education must contend more fully with the implications of this lesson from Arts Awareness if they are to realize the objectives of social justice and “relevance” that frame the current discourse.

Arts Awareness’ outsiders: use of artists as educators

As one of the first programs to position artists as museum educators, it is plausible to imagine that the practitioners considered teaching as a component of their artistic practice. However, their perspectives complicate this idea. Burnham challenged this notion the most succinctly: “All of us had a feeling that our high art, our real art, was other.”³⁰⁰ For the Arts Awareness artist-educators, they felt there was a distinction between their Arts Awareness practice and their “high” art.

By positioning artists as museum educators, Arts Awareness enlisted practitioners with a desired characteristic: fluency in the language of art. Ironically, though the booklet

³⁰⁰ Burnham, Interview with Rika Burnham, October 7, 2015.

on Arts Awareness published by the Met emphasized the “non-verbal techniques”³⁰¹ of Arts Awareness pedagogy, the metaphor of language permeated Arts Awareness discourse.³⁰² It explained that all instructors were conversant in “certain aesthetic qualities” including “texture, line, space, structure, color and mood” that are “common to all the arts and are translatable from one art form to another.”³⁰³ This reference to translation is an entry point to understanding the philosophy behind Arts Awareness: they sought teachers who understood how these aesthetic qualities could be communicated and translated among art forms including dance, music, painting, photography, video, acting, and writing. The intention of Arts Awareness was not to cultivate fluency in an art form, but rather, to cultivate fluency in these aesthetic qualities. The skill of fluency in these aesthetic qualities – also described as “the language of art”³⁰⁴ – is, within the Arts Awareness philosophy, the sensibility that artists bring to art museum education.

However, for Burnham, Levy, and Williams, their practices as educators *did* infiltrate their practices as artists. As Burnham phrased it, it was “Arts Awareness morphing into our work.”³⁰⁵ Together, they created *Untitled (The Alps)*, an eighteen-minute performance choreographed by Rika Burnham, original word score written and read by Howard Levy, and fluorescent light sculpture created by Randy Williams. The piece was danced by Rika Burnham, Shawn Hiers, Verne Hunt, and Dale Orrin. A surviving video recording preserves a performance of the work filmed on June 9, 1981 at the American Theatre Laboratory in New York City.³⁰⁶ For Burnham, the inspiration for

³⁰¹ Friedberg, *Arts Awareness, a Project of the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, 7.

³⁰² Friedberg, *Arts Awareness II*, 3.

³⁰³ *Ibid.*

³⁰⁴ Newsom, “The Department of High School Programs and an Experiment in ‘Arts Awareness’ at the Metropolitan Museum of Art,” 453.

³⁰⁵ Burnham, Interview with Rika Burnham, October 7, 2015.

³⁰⁶ *Untitled (The Alps)*, Videocassette, vol. 2, Choreographers Showcase (American Theatre Laboratory: Video D Studios, 1981).

this work “was all based on triangles.”³⁰⁷ Predictably, the artists created triangles with words (*“A for altitude, L for length, P for periphery”*), with an asymmetrically placed light fixture that shone a triangle onto the stage, and with the dancers’ bodies twisted into triangles. Triangles also emerged as a conduit connecting lived experience to art museums. Levy’s score referenced a trio of late medieval painters -- Giotto, Duccio, and Cimabue -- depicting the holy trinity and a triptych by the Flemish painter Hugo Van Der Goes (*“its very own triangle.”*) Through the image of triangles, the score connects the audience (*“you walk into the first gallery ... there are three paintings”*) and the protagonist (*“Here I am in Florence ... it feels like it’s still the Renaissance ... it is our triangle”*) to the world of art and museums. Through studying the triangle imagery in painting (*“I have looked at so many paintings ... so many exercises in perspective, vanishing points ... everything leads back to that point”*), the protagonist comes to better understand their own personal relationships (*“so subtly almost unconsciously I think I began to acknowledge our single point ... our vanishing point.”*) I interpret this performance as a representation of the intentions and implications of Arts Awareness – a representation of how a visual theme such as triangles can be a mechanism for using art and museums to interpret lived experience. The artists model how to experience art not to better understand art history, but to better understand our own lives. *Untitled (The Alps)* is the ultimate creative response to works of art – a more fully realized, polished version of the activities and creative responses to art in Arts Awareness sessions. In this performance, Burnham, Levy, and Williams demonstrate how to connect responses to art and art museums to personal, lived experience.

³⁰⁷ Burnham, Interview with Rika Burnham, October 7, 2015.

Before Arts Awareness, the Met's education staff had valued art-historical knowledge in their hiring selections. By hiring artists instead, the department loosened ties with the conventions/values/forms of knowledge implicitly upheld by art historians – both what they know and how they come to know it. This shift created space for experimentation in art museum education. As dancers, photographers, painters, musicians, and more, and not art historians, the new cohort of educators were less influenced by conscious and unconscious norms and traditions of art museum education. In fact, being artists gave them license to experiment.

A New Kind of Art Museum Education: Art Museum Education as Participatory Practice

By replacing traditional docents with artists and allowing them creative freedom, Arts Awareness swapped traditional art historical content and didactic, “parades before the pictures”³⁰⁸ pedagogy with a new kind of content – what they called “the language of art”³⁰⁹ – and a new kind of pedagogy that focused on participatory experiences. To illustrate this new approach to art museum education, I will focus my analysis on a particular Arts Awareness session, a representative example.

The instructions from an Arts Awareness session on drapery in sculpture demonstrate the participatory approach to art museum education. These instructions come from a collection of Arts Awareness curricula published by the Met. The session begins, “Set the mood with a discussion of today’s clothing, what it does for the wearer, and what

³⁰⁸ Yenawine, Interview with Philip Yenawine, March 2016.

³⁰⁹ Newsom, “The Department of High School Programs and an Experiment in ‘Arts Awareness’ at the Metropolitan Museum of Art,” 453.

it indicates to other people.”³¹⁰ This focus on drapery centers a discourse that the students are already participating in: we all express ourselves through what we choose to wear, and we “read” others based on what they are wearing.

Next, “Using Greek or Roman statues as models, have the students divide into groups of two or three and drape each other in the same manner as the sculpture. Do the same thing with sculpture of another period.”³¹¹ This activity is designed to apply close looking and visual analysis – what Yenawine describes as a *way of seeing* – to the artwork. Drapery becomes an inroad to make distinctions and comparisons among sculptures, to make emotional and psychological connections to the artwork, and to interpret the artwork.

Next, “Have them make their own Greek or medieval sculpture, using subject and composition appropriate to the period. Encourage the students to evaluate their creations by comparing them to ‘real sculpture.’ ... Move to another gallery and repeat the process.”³¹² The lesson pivots from positioning the participants as observers and interpreters to positioning them as creators. At this point, they are both artists *and artworks themselves* within the gallery. In this step, participants combine critical looking skills with lived experience to create art, as artists do. This activity reflects embodied learning – an opportunity to learn not just by observing and discussing, but by physically relating to the concept of drapery through draping themselves. Multiple ways of learning are incorporated into each session.

³¹⁰ Friedberg, *Arts Awareness II*, 11.

³¹¹ Ibid.

³¹² Ibid.

Finally, “Discuss what you can and cannot learn about a society from observing art in this way.”³¹³ The culminating discussion shifts to a more philosophical approach -- what can and *can't* we learn from the gallery? This move destabilizes the museum's position as the authoritative knowledge producer and disseminator. This prompt opens the door to a conversation about how the museum's way of looking, way of storytelling, is only one way of doing so. This step is a form of self-critique—a reflexive and transparent question about the limits of pedagogy as it is being practiced, inviting students to evaluate the learning process themselves. This Arts Awareness is emblematic of participatory practice, in which students are engaging with the museum as observers, interpreters, critics, and artists.

The artist-educators of Arts Awareness were outsiders to the pedagogical norms of the museum. But Arts Awareness' real departure was not the hiring of artists as educators *per se*, but the fact that the artists were given the freedom to incorporate their perspectives and expertise into their pedagogy with the knowledge that their choices may actively challenge the norms and power relations of the museum. Giving artists the degree of autonomy in the galleries that Arts Awareness did was not only an affront to the norms of museum learning, but had the potential to cultivate new and subversive ways of relating to the museum itself.

Outsiders in contemporary participatory practice

Nina Simon and *The Art of Relevance*

Contemporary practitioners of participatory pedagogy often claim a social mission, but their approach to the role of outsiders – in other words, museum

³¹³ Ibid.

practitioners without past experience in museum work or education in museum studies – often reinscribes the power dynamics they claim to be challenging. This is evidenced by the example of Nina Simon’s concept of social bridging, discussed in the introduction to this dissertation.

In this section, I explore how Simon articulates social value in her book *The Art of Relevance*, going into particular depth because she does not define social value outright. Considering Simon’s insufficient acknowledgement of how white supremacy and social power dynamics manifest in museums, I argue that Arts Awareness demonstrates how truly transformative participatory pedagogy cannot exist without attention to how structural power dynamics condition pedagogy.

In *The Art of Relevance*, Nina Simon expands on the claim for the social value of museums that she introduced in *The Participatory Museum*. Her original claim was that participatory projects in museums can “make significant civic and cultural impact” and that “the cumulative effort of thousands of participatory institutions could change the world.”³¹⁴ If participation is a “design technique,” then relevance is the preparation for enacting that method.³¹⁵ Simon defines relevance as a key that “unlocks new ways to build deep connections with people who don’t immediately self-identify with our work.”³¹⁶ For Simon, relevance is a means, not an end: “Relevance is just a start. It is a key. You’ve got to get people in the door. But what matters most is the glorious experience they’re moving towards, on the other side.”³¹⁷ For Simon, relevance is the

³¹⁴ Simon, *The Participatory Museum*, 351.

³¹⁵ Ibid., 6.

³¹⁶ Simon, *The Art of Relevance*, 23.

³¹⁷ Ibid., 31.

factor that primes visitors to pay attention, to visit, and to engage with museums – the foundation on which museums can build effective, meaningful programming.³¹⁸

Though not mentioned explicitly, *The Art of Relevance* is fundamentally about social value. Simon, and Jon Moscone, the author of the preface, both dance around the core problem that the book endeavors to address. Moscone writes, “Let’s face it: we have a problem. It’s not that we don’t see the numbers declining, or the funding priorities shifting, or the world passing us by. The problem is: what do we do?”³¹⁹ Here, Moscone is describing symptoms of a lack of social value. Specifically, he writes that the California Shakespeare Theater was “relevant to our culturally upbeat, politically engaged and mostly white audience”³²⁰ but “we had almost zero relevance to communities of color. Individuals, yes, but communities, no.”³²¹ Moscone was not simply interested in expanding his theater’s audience to be more demographically diverse – he was genuinely interested in creating theater “that mattered to more people.”³²² Moscone’s desire is a reflection of the movement towards social value in the museum field described by Laura Lott, quoted in the introduction of this dissertation. Moscone’s response to a racial divide – as well as to a social climate and funding climate shifting away from his institution’s priorities and demographics – was to take action to be more relevant to people of color. And his experience also reflects the risks Lott describes – he described

³¹⁸ Ibid., 23.

³¹⁹ Jon Moscone, “Preface,” in *The Art of Relevance*, by Nina Simon (Museum 2.0 (self-published), 2016), 16.

³²⁰ Ibid., 17–18.

³²¹ Ibid., 16.

³²² Ibid., 17.

the “risk” of losing relevance to his white audience: “for some, I broke a promise I didn’t even know I made.”³²³

Simon dances around the issue of social value, too. Her first anecdote describes a collection of museum artifacts that was relevant to a museum professional and a family with personal ties to the artifact, yet “to nearly everyone else, they weren’t relevant at all. And ‘everyone else’ often includes the people making decisions about funding and societal value.”³²⁴ Significantly, Simon notes that social value is not determined or negotiated by museum professionals or individual visitors. Later, Simon refers to targeted marketing as “antithetical to the public mandate that so many organizations strive to fulfill.”³²⁵ This reference to a ‘public mandate’ is one of Simon’s few direct references to social value in the entire book – one of the few acknowledgements that institutions like museums have public missions (and are often subsidized by taxpayers’ money), and references to the problem of social value that the book dances around.

Simon never explicitly names that the movement towards social value in museum work is the momentum behind her project. Rather than address social value explicitly, she leans heavily on the term *community* to define groups of people based on categories including race, class, geographical location, disability status, and more – such as “community of Oaxacan culture-bearers”³²⁶ or the “tight-knit community” of “families” with “both hearing and hearing-impaired family members.”³²⁷ Significantly, she does not reference the white community. Community typically denotes *other* for Simon (with few exceptions, such as positioning herself as part of the Santa Cruz community.) Typically,

³²³ Ibid., 18.

³²⁴ Simon, *The Art of Relevance*, 21.

³²⁵ Ibid., 115.

³²⁶ Ibid., 101.

³²⁷ Ibid., 112.

community denotes other to the norm of the privileged – white, cisgendered, able-bodied, class-privileged. Her use of the term community is closely linked to her usage of the terms insider and outsider. Her use of *community* and *outsider* (and, implicitly, *white* and *insider*) are often, in effect, interchangeable – such as her section on “outsider guides” in which she recommends that “the most productive way for insiders to learn more about new communities is to engage a guide.”³²⁸ The binary of insiders and outsiders is a euphemism that obscures that Simon’s intended audience is white-privileged museum professionals, and the underlying assumption is that museum professionals are reading her text because they desire for their work to be relevant to outsiders/community – the other.

Nowhere is this dynamic clearer than in the section where Simon speaks directly to privileged, white people (confusingly, by interchangeably referring to privileged, white people as “us” and “they” and “you”):

“Professionals often ignore the role that the people in the room play in the reception of the experience. We focus on the content: the art, the story, the park. We do that because we ARE the people in the room. They look like us. White museum professionals don’t think of a museum as a ‘white’ place, because they don’t experience whiteness overtly. They think of a museum as a place for art, or history, or science. Not for whiteness. But if you walk into a museum for the first time, and everyone you see is white, and you are not white, you will notice.”³²⁹

This section is the clearest articulation of the problem that *The Art of Relevance* sets out to address – that privileged, white museum professionals desire to address the barriers inhibiting marginalized people including people of color, people with disabilities, and poor people from engaging with museums. Relevance is defined by an inherent value for white, privileged people and, in the same way, lack of relevance is relative to people with

³²⁸ Ibid., 76.

³²⁹ Ibid., 66.

marginalized identities. For example, Simon notes in her description of the Laundromat Project – a nonprofit organization that hosts artist residencies and art workshops in New York City laundromats – that laundromats are “ripe for artistic intervention” because “they attract diverse, local people, many of whom are lower-income.”³³⁰ That view erases the art and culture that already exist in the neighborhoods in which the Laundromat Project operates, demonstrating a deficit perspective. Like in Moscone’s preface, relevance is specifically a project for connecting with people with marginalized identities – which defines social value.

However, I lay this all out not to critique Simon for euphemistic language or for not naming social value explicitly. Rather, by defining *The Art of Relevance* as a text fundamentally about social value, I can interpret her analysis of institutional change in terms of social value.

Simon’s discussion of institutional change in *The Art of Relevance* is inhibited by her insufficient acknowledgement of how white supremacy and power dynamics manifest in museums. Her definition of relevance – social value through connecting with people with marginalized identities – fundamentally preserves and maintains white supremacy and privilege. She accuses museums that equivocate on issues of relevance: “Many institutions take a schizophrenic middle ground on relevance. They swing between issuing press releases about change while reassuring insiders that none of the good stuff will be impacted.”³³¹ However, I believe Simon enacts a similar style of equivocation in terms of social value. Her keynote at the 2015 MuseumNext conference in Indianapolis was called “Fighting for Inclusion” and included a slide with Latinx museum visitors

³³⁰ Ibid., 78–79.

³³¹ Ibid., 127.

captioned “*your* museum. *tu* museo.” and an image of an Occupy Museums projection of “1% MUSEUM” onto the Guggenheim Museum facade.

Simon’s use of imagery of people of color and activist rhetoric appears to suggest a substantive view of inclusion, but contrasts with her actual practice. Her discussion of homeless volunteers at the Santa Cruz Museum of Art and History in her 2015 “State of the MAH” letter states:

“We matchmake these 2,000 unlikely partners from across the County year-round: folkloric dancers and engineers presenting at monthly 3rd Friday Festivals. Artists and activists exhibiting their work. Homeless adults and history buffs cleaning up Evergreen Cemetery. Business leaders and street performers designing a new community plaza in Abbott Square.”³³²

Simon justifies the use of the unwaged labor of homeless adults to clean up the Evergreen Cemetery—which is owned by the MAH—as “fulfilling volunteer requirements as part of their residency at a local shelter.”³³³ Although there is nothing inherently undignified about the manual labor these volunteers performed, they are clearly in a position of subservience to the institution here: while “business leaders and street performers” are given creative agency in the design of a new community plaza, the homeless volunteers merely serve to maintain a pre-existing institutional space they had no role in shaping. By laying claim to the cultural capital of participation while simultaneously benefiting from the unpaid labor of a less-privileged group and failing to make them genuine stakeholders, the museum only reinforces the power differential between its paid staff and its community “partners.” This program does precisely what Simon claims not to do in *The Art of Relevance*: “Splashing a superficial coat of paint over museum traditions to

³³² Nina Simon, “State of the MAH from Executive Director Nina Simon,” November 10, 2015, <http://www.santacruzmah.org/2015/state-of-the-mah-from-executive-director-nina-simon/>.

³³³ Simon, “Untitled Comment.”

motivate people to attend.”³³⁴ She promises change – but her prescription for change falls short of shifting museums away from power dynamics that maintain privilege.

However, privilege is exactly what must be dismantled – what museums most need to change. Her section on whiteness, from which I quoted above, ends with a series of questions: “When we enter these spaces, we have to decide: is this relevant to me? Do I see people like me here? Do I see myself here? And if not, is it worth the effort to make a place for myself here?”³³⁵ Here, Simon misses something critical about white supremacy: it is far more than optics (i.e. how many white people are in the room) but about unequal institutional power dynamics reinforcing disparity in privilege. Crucially, unlike what Simon implies here, undoing the effect of whiteness – in other words, dismantling white supremacy – requires much more than deciding to do so and individual effort.

Throughout *The Art of Relevance*, Simon pays insufficient attention to power dynamics between museum staff and visitors. She introduces Sangye Hawke, a museum visitor at the MAH. Simon explains:

“Sangye first came to the MAH as a visitor through the front door. She added a personal memory to a participatory exhibit, and it unlocked a slice of meaning for her. Next, she visited the historical archive to make a research inquiry about genealogy. Our archivist, Marla Novo, invited Sangye in deeper. Marla invited her to participate in local research projects. To join a committee. To become a volunteer. Sangye has become one of our most valued participants at the museum and at a historical cemetery we manage. She donates time. She donates money. She donates snacks. She got her whole family involved as volunteers.”³³⁶

This anecdote makes visible how participatory museum projects maintain and reinforce the separation between museum staff and visitors. Though Sangye performs labor for the

³³⁴ Simon, *The Art of Relevance*, 22.

³³⁵ Ibid., 67.

³³⁶ Ibid., 55.

museum – research, committee work, outreach work – Simon does not present her as a skilled worker, as she does for Marla Novo, the archivist. Simon does not describe Sangye in terms of the knowledge she possesses, but in terms of the unwaged labor she performs. This distancing, this clear division of roles, between Sangye and museum staff re-inscribes the insider and outsider dynamic Simon describes.

Though Simon recommends an asset-based approach, she consistently employs a deficit mindset – which also traces back to the insider and outsider dynamic. She is lucid about the pitfalls of a deficit mindset:

“While addressing needs is important, this service model can sometimes be demeaning and disempowering. It implies that the institution has all the answers. It suggests that the people served are passive consumers. It doesn’t invite participants to be active agents in their own experience.”³³⁷

Her definition of the deficit mindset coherently outlines how museum power dynamics can demean and disempower visitors. Instead, Simon recommends an asset-based approach:

“Instead of emphasizing deficits – lack of education, culture, artistic ability – asset-based programs emphasize the cultural and creative skills that make people proud. These assets may be the languages people speak, the stories they know, the art they create.”³³⁸

Ironically, the deficits Simon mentions – “lack of education, culture, artistic ability” – are commonly held biases that museum professionals use to exert authority over visitors.

And the assets that Simon identifies can also be read as forms of unwaged labor -- translation, storytelling, art-making -- performed by community members that museums like the MAH benefit from. Museums’ reliance on unwaged labor of community members does not destabilize the unequal power dynamics, but rather reinforces them.

³³⁷ Ibid., 95.

³³⁸ Ibid., 95–96.

The remedy for the deficit mindset is not to value community members' *labor* but to value community members' *knowledge*.

Many instances in Simon's writing on relevance belie an inattention to power dynamics and an undervaluing of community members' knowledge. Early in the book, in describing how she arrived at her beliefs on relevance, she asks, "Were we pandering at my museum when we offered people content related to their own experiences?"³³⁹ Her use of the term "pandering" is telling. If "to pander" is to gratify or indulge an immoral or distasteful desire or taste, by buying into the idea of the existence of pandering, she is implicitly endorsing the idea that certain kinds of content do not belong in museums -- buying into a hierarchy of knowledge that favors white privileged ways of knowing.

The concept of tokenism helps illuminate this distinction. Tokenism, a symbolic effort to be inclusive and appear to be diverse by hiring a small number of people with marginalized identities, is a widespread practice in the museum field. Simon defines "inside-outsiders" this way: "Inside every room, there are outsiders who have found their way in the door. They may not look like the others in the room, but they are often just as passionate about what it offers as everyone else."³⁴⁰ She continues,

"Insiders often look to inside-outsiders to be representatives of their communities. If you're the only Asian person on the committee or the only teenager in the room, people expect you to speak up for your experience. You may be asked to be an ambassador for the room, forging new doors for more people like you. ... Frequently, inside-outsiders are alone. The only person of color on the board, the only conservative on the liberal staff, the only artist in the room. They may be tokenized or marginalized, intentionally or unintentionally."³⁴¹

However, Simon's definition of "inside-outsiders" is not potentially tokenizing, but is the very definition of tokenizing. This power dynamic between "insiders" and "inside-

³³⁹ Ibid., 22.

³⁴⁰ Ibid., 71.

³⁴¹ Ibid., 72.

outsiders” essentially maintains the power of insiders over outsiders. This approach puts the onus on the “inside-outsiders” to *do the work* of creating social value, and takes the pressure and expectation off the white privileged staff. The “inside-outsiders” on museum staffs should have the agency to change the status quo, and not be made to feel as the other or as a threat to the status quo. Instead, the “inside-outsiders” and “insiders” should be replaced with a heterogeneous staff, where all members have agency and carry the responsibility for creating change.

Despite her claims of adopting an asset-based mindset, Simon unintentionally employs a deficit-based mindset, revealing a lack of awareness of white supremacy and power dynamics. In an anecdote about Betty Reid Soskin, an “inside-outsider” who encounters a fellow grocery store customer who mistakes her National Park Service uniform for that of a prison guard, Simon -- through Soskin’s voice -- bemoans a missed opportunity for the customer to engage with history and nature. Yet Simon does not consider or value the *knowledge* possessed by the customer, unknown to herself or to Soskin. This approach is emblematic of the deficit-based mindset.

Homelessness emerges again towards the end of Simon’s book, in a case study of a theater company called Ten Thousand Things that performs in prisons, homeless shelters, and soup kitchens.³⁴² Simon explained that through watching a fairy tale play performed at a women’s shelter, audience members could “explore their feelings around loss, protected by the distancing strangeness of the world and words.”³⁴³ Simon’s book does not address whether these performances were requested by the residents of shelters or prisons, and she does not include quotes from any of the audience members about what

³⁴² Ibid., 144.

³⁴³ Ibid., 145.

the performances mean to them. This case study raises questions of power and of ethics. To what extent does this project serve to support marginalized people through theater, or to make white, privileged people feel good-hearted and charitable? Supporting marginalized people through theater is commendable, but doing so without challenging institutionalized racism serves to maintain the power dynamics that create incarceration and homelessness. These performances do nothing to undermine the structural racism that creates mass incarceration and homelessness. White, privileged people are happy to support this work. And in so doing, they maintain power structures from which they benefit. This light activism benefits marginalized people enough for white, privileged people to feel good, but maintains the status quo enough not to threaten them.

Simon does urge her readers towards institutional transformational change – what she calls “transformative relevance”³⁴⁴ – but not necessarily motivated by social justice concerns. She does not advocate for destabilizing entrenched power dynamics and white supremacy, which are critically missing. Rather, she advocates for change for reasons that are self-serving to the museum field, but not for social good. In the most extensive case study of her book, Simon addresses the repatriation of sacred medicine bundles from the Glenbow Museum in Alberta, Canada to the Blackfoot people of the First Nations. She describes a multi-year process beginning with museums’ acquisitions of sacred medicine bundles in the 1960s, attempts by the Blackfoot to reclaim the bundles in the 1970s and 1980s, museum-led initiatives to negotiate loans in the 1990s, and ultimately a meeting between a partnership of museum and Blackfoot leaders with the premier of

³⁴⁴ Ibid., 173.

Alberta resulting in the passing of the First Nations Sacred Ceremonial Objects

Repatriation Act in 2000.³⁴⁵ In her analysis, Simon explains:

“At its heart, the story of the Blackfoot repatriation is the story of two communities—that of the Blackfoot people and that of the Glenbow Museum—becoming deeply relevant to each other. ... As the museum staff understood more about what mattered to their Blackfoot partners, it came to matter to them too.”³⁴⁶

Simon frames the stakes of this repatriation project in terms of the *museum* – how the museum changed, how repatriating the sacred medicine bundles came to matter to the museum staff as well as to the Blackfoot people. However, repatriating the bundles mattered to the Blackfoot people mattered *before* it mattered to the museum staff. Action only happened once the museum staff decided it mattered to them, too. Simon frames these results not as justice for the Blackfoot people, but as a museum’s successful effort for relevance.

“But the conviction to change was just the beginning of the repatriation process. The museum had to change long-held perceptions of what the bundles were, who they belonged to, and how and why they should be used. This was a broad institutional learning effort in building cultural competency.”³⁴⁷

In other words, she frames the goals of repatriation as institutional-change-as-cultural-competency, the museum shifting its priorities to care about this cause. I argue that this framing illustrates how, for Simon, “transformative relevance” is oriented towards museums’ self-serving goals rather than towards social change.

However, in her book, Simon *does* describe a model of “transformative relevance” oriented towards social change – but she misses the chance to name it as such. She shares the example of The Dream Unfinished, an activist orchestra that joined the #BlackLivesMatter movement by performing a concert series combining speeches

³⁴⁵ Ibid., 173–78.

³⁴⁶ Ibid., 178.

³⁴⁷ Ibid., 176.

against racial violence with classical music (mostly by composers of color) performed by diverse musicians.³⁴⁸ According to Simon, “The Dream Unfinished challenged the hypocrisy they perceived in mainstream classical music institutions which invite urban people of color to buy tickets but ignore their greater community interests.”³⁴⁹ For Simon, The Dream Unfinished is a lesson in being relevant not on their own institutional terms, but on those of their “chosen community.”³⁵⁰ However, I argue that that assessment undersells the impact of The Dream Unfinished. This project is not exemplary because it represents a classical institution shifting its institutional status quo towards the interests of Black audiences, but because it’s shifting towards supporting social change by standing up against police violence against Black people. Again, like the difference Simon describes in terms of social difference, there are power dynamics implicit within difference. Black people do not *choose* to be targeted by police violence, #BlackLivesMatter is not a matter of taste but literally a matter of life and death. The #BlackLivesMatter movement does not only benefit Black people – eradicating police violence against Black people would benefit our entire society. Simon concludes,

“Perhaps when it is politically expedient or attractive to funders or plays well to their market, those traditional orchestras will wave the flag of civil rights. But that’s not what relevance requires. Relevance means waving the flag when it is needed, not when it is convenient.”³⁵¹

For Simon, “needed” refers not to the urgency of civil rights but to the meaningfulness of racial justice for people of color. However, the significance of The Dream Unfinished is that it is “transformative relevance” oriented not towards self-serving institutional goals but towards social change.

³⁴⁸ Ibid., 138–39.

³⁴⁹ Ibid., 139.

³⁵⁰ Ibid.

³⁵¹ Ibid.

Attending to how structural power dynamics shape pedagogy is critical for transformative participatory pedagogy – an ingredient that is missing from Simon’s recipe for institutional practice that cultivates social value. For Arts Awareness, drawing attention to structural power dynamics was an essential component of its pedagogy. Simon’s book documents museum practices that perpetuate and re-inscribe institutional hidden curriculum and social hierarchies – such as giving creative agency to business leaders and street performers but not homeless volunteers, or placing the expectation to create social value on tokenized “inside-outsiders” on staff but not white-privileged museum workers. In contrast, Arts Awareness directly challenges and re-negotiates these dynamics by leveraging embodied learning and affective experience towards re-thinking the relationship between individual and institution. Arts Awareness treated participants’ lived experiences as a meaningful kind of historical context, whereas the knowledge held by grocery store customer in Simon’s vignette was not valued. The museum as an institution can be a laboratory for challenging social power dynamics, but only if white supremacy, colonialism, and other forms of oppression are directly confronted.

Museum Hack

Museum Hack, founded by Nick Gray, is a company of museum outsiders who have re-imagined contemporary museum education. Their “outsider status” is a key element of their brand.³⁵² As a for-profit business separate from any museum, they offer “highly interactive, subversive, fun, non-traditional museum tours” at museums in New York City, Washington D.C., San Francisco, and Chicago. Titles of their tours at the Met

³⁵² Ethan Angelica, “Making the Met Mine: How Museum Hack Develops New Audiences for Museums,” *Museum Hack*, March 16, 2016, <https://museumhack.com/making-the-met-mine-how-museum-hack-develops-new-audiences-for-museums/>.

include the “Un-Highlights Tour,” “Badass Bitches Tour of the Met,” and “Big Gay Met” – all of which are steeply priced at \$59.00 and up per visitor.

On a blog post written by museum educator and (then) Museum Hack staff member Jen Olenziak in 2013, Rachel Ropiek, a New York City-based museum educator, commented:

“I think one of the risks Museum Hack runs is defensive museums and defensive educators. Jen, your comments above are spot on about how many museums’ adult tour experiences are some of their least creative offerings. However, that’s definitely not true for all institutions, and it definitely leaves a bad taste in museum education staff mouths to admit to it. No one wants to admit that what they do isn’t terribly interesting, and I imagine a lot of institutions and educators/programmers might not be best pleased at the idea of someone independent and unaffiliated coming in and doing something new and more exciting.”³⁵³

Ropiek summarized a concern shared by many museum educators: they are uncomfortable with Museum Hack because its significant popularity among visitors indicates that traditional museum educators’ offerings are falling short in comparison. Visitors who might have signed up for a traditional museum education experience in the past are opting for Museum Hack tours instead, and Museum Hack is also attracting new visitors. For traditional museum educators, Museum Hack may indicate that their work lacks relevance, and even that their employment may be jeopardized. As an employer, Museum Hack is emblematic of the contemporary gig economy, in which short-term contracts and freelance work replace permanent employment. Just as ride-sharing apps like Uber and Lyft have shifted the taxi industry and Airbnb has impacted the hotel business, the rise of Museum Hack threatens the existence of steady, full-time employment of museum educators.

³⁵³ Jen Oleniczak, “What Is Museum Hack?,” *Art Museum Teaching*, December 12, 2013, <https://artmuseumteaching.com/2013/12/12/what-is-museum-hack/>.

Museum educators *should* scrutinize Museum Hack – to learn from its successes, and its shortcomings as well. Like *This Progress* and Arts Awareness, Museum Hack experiments with *who* performs gallery teaching. Most of its museum educators fit the mold of the typical museum educator today – white, privileged, millennial, with an extroverted, charismatic personality. Philip Yenawine spoke of museum visitors’ distrust of museum educators who they stereotyped as “whitey” and similarly, this persona may be appealing to a particular set of white, privileged museum visitors but alienating to non-traditional museum audiences.

***This Progress* (2010) by Tino Sehgal**

In Berlin-based artist Tino Sehgal’s 2010 socially-engaged artwork *This Progress*, trained interpreters facilitate inquiry-based dialogue with visitors while ascending the Guggenheim’s iconic ramps. This project demonstrates the phenomenon of positioning “outsiders” as art museum educators as a socially-engaged art project. Critic Lauren Collins described the selection process for interpreters:

“Sehgal had spent months recruiting the interpreters. A producer found one in the locker room of the Midtown Tennis Center. Another was chosen after being overheard talking on the Hampton Jitney. The kids were selected largely on the basis of their ability to carry out instructions. But for the adults the criterion was more of a je-ne-sais-quoi thing—interestingness, basically, as defined by Sehgal. At the party, the interpreters included a translator of Herodotus, a discoverer of plate tectonics, and an upper-middle-aged couple with matching tattoos, on their wrists, of cells undergoing meiosis. They were alike in their fluency, forming a sort of superclass of articulates. It might have been nice to have some truckers in the mix. But the same can be said of New York.”³⁵⁴

Significantly, Sehgal was not selecting for a cross-section of New Yorkers – “it might have been nice to have some truckers in the mix” hints at the class privilege from which the interpreters benefit – but for educational attainment and “interestingness.” On the

³⁵⁴ Lauren Collins, “Primal Schmooze,” *The New Yorker*, March 22, 2010, http://www.newyorker.com/talk/2010/03/22/100322ta_talk_collins.

surface, it may seem that Sehgal's selection criteria resemble those for the docents that predated the Arts Awareness artist-educators at the Met – educational attainment in the form of art-historical content knowledge. Instead, I suggest that Sehgal's criteria more closely resemble Yenawine's – hiring for attainment in other areas (artists, in the case of Arts Awareness) and for personality fit. In both *This Progress* and Arts Awareness, hiring outside of the typical pool had a transformative effect on the museum facilitation experience.

Both *This Progress* and Arts Awareness indicate the transformative possibilities of broadening the hiring pipeline of art museum educators. Shifting *who* occupies the role of art museum educator shifts *what* art museum education can be.

Institutional critique is implicit within *This Progress*. Pablo Helguera, artist and Director of Adult and Academic Programs at MoMA, describes a backlash to the educational turn in reference to *This Progress*. He writes, "Can you keep a secret? ... the work is not really a performance art piece, and not so much of an artwork either: it is an education program ... but to say something is educational is the kiss of death in art."³⁵⁵ By dismissing the Guggenheim's entire existing educational apparatus – its museum educators, its curriculum – and replacing it with Sehgal's trained interpreters, *This Progress* is a re-imagining of museum education. The practice codified by *This Progress* would be unrecognizable within the framing of an education program, requiring the framework of a socially-engaged art project to be intelligible to participants. Thus, *This Progress* is simultaneously a critique of the constraints within the field of museum education, and of the highbrow norms of the art world in which the educational is taboo.

³⁵⁵ Michelle Millar Fisher, "Museum Education and the Pedagogic Turn," *Artwrit* VIII (Summer 2011).

Conclusion

In this final chapter, I compare the motivations, objectives and methods of Arts Awareness with those of contemporary practitioners of participatory and social-justice-oriented pedagogy through the lens of their respective approaches to the question of the “outsider.” Despite its brief lifespan at the Met, I argue that Arts Awareness provides a crucially important model of educational practice driven by critical reflection on the relationship between pedagogy and institutional power dynamics – a reflection that any museum education program that aspires to the mantles of “inclusion” or “social justice” as they are predominantly articulated today must undertake. In Arts Awareness, hiring artists as museum educators had the effect of destabilizing the institutional status quo of the museum. However, hiring outsiders as museum educators in and of itself does not produce this destabilizing effect – it is why the outsiders are hired, and what they do in the museum, that matters. Museum Hack and Tino Sehgal’s *This Progress* positioning outsiders as museum educators may be interpreted as institutional critique, but this work does not destabilize the institutional status quo of museums. Jettisoning the conventions of museum education does not necessarily constitute an improvement in pedagogy. By contrasting Arts Awareness against Museum Hack or Tino Sehgal’s *This Progress*, the difference between institutional critique leveraged towards social justice versus institutional critique oriented towards art world navel-gazing.

Conclusion

Summary

An earlier quotation from Rika Burnham bears repeating here: “Museum education as a whole is under-studied, under-theorized, and under-historicized.”³⁵⁶ The low rate of research, the relative lack of theory, and the dearth of publications on the history of this field are all serious detriments to the field of museum education. Unfortunately, this context results in only a small body of knowledge that is shared among practitioners and scholars of museum education. VTS and participatory practice are at the forefront of this shared body of knowledge. Additionally, the gap in scholarship and theory creates conditions under which new practices are created and implemented without sufficient research and rigor. As a result, for example, within the practice of participatory pedagogy in museums there often lies a discrepancy between social-justice-oriented stated objectives and the programs’ actual results. The contemporary museum field’s emphasis on participation, and the movement of the field towards social justice, have been collapsed together without sufficient analysis about the implications of this conflation. In order to understand and analyze the current moment in service of a methodologically rigorous and politically and ethically committed approach to participation, it is critical to understand the longer history of participatory engagement in museums. This dissertation represents one step towards narrowing this gap, by contributing research, theory, and historical analysis to the field of art museum education.

³⁵⁶ Burnham, Interview with Rika Burnham, October 7, 2015.

This dissertation project is a close analysis of Arts Awareness, considering the program's historical and cultural context, analyzing its pedagogy, and interpreting the perspectives of Yenawine and several artist-educators. However, I have aimed to make the case that a study of Arts Awareness is valuable not merely as a historical excavation, but as an example of participatory pedagogy that provides important lessons for the contemporary moment. In particular, the interest in participatory *pedagogy* as the site of social justice work in museums links Arts Awareness with today's practitioners.

In this final section, I share questions and recommendations for contemporary practitioners that critically consider the relationship between pedagogy and institutional power dynamics, inspired by both Arts Awareness as well as contemporary practitioners who are leaders in social-justice-oriented museum practice. As Porchia Moore wrote in her definition of the Inclusive Museum Movement, these best practices are rooted in “the principles of social justice, history-based radical traditions, and anti-oppression frameworks.”³⁵⁷

Questions for contemporary practitioners

In their article “Multicultural Critical Reflective Practice and Contemporary Art,” scholars and museum educators Melissa Crum and Keonna Hendrick share an analytical approach to art museum pedagogy that centers critical consciousness, creating opportunities for critical thinking and challenging unequal power relationships rooted in race, class and gender. Crum and Hendrick's four-part Multicultural Critical Reflective Practice (MCRP) contains four approaches:

- “Forming an educators' critical self-assessment.

³⁵⁷ Moore, “The Inclusive Museum Movement: Creating a More Inclusive, Equitable, and Culturally Responsible Museum Field,” 18.

- Forming a critical reflective practice with peers.
- Forming a critical reflective practice *in* teaching.
- Forming a critical reflective practice *on* teaching.”³⁵⁸

Crum and Hendrick walk art museum educators through these four approaches, using the artwork of Mickalene Thomas as a case study alongside reflections from Hendrick’s museum education practice and detailed sample exercises for students and educators. For art museum educators interested in advancing their social-justice-oriented pedagogy, Crum and Hendrick’s text is an incomparable resource. Here, I have developed a set of reflection questions for art museum educators that attend to the facilitator’s identity as well as institutional power dynamics, influenced by Arts Awareness and Crum and Hendrick:

- Are there connections between the type of art I select (or do not select) for facilitating museum education experiences and my personal culture or identity markers?³⁵⁹ If so, what are they?
- When selecting artworks to juxtapose, what criteria do I use to determine a relevant comparison? What am I attempting to highlight in each artwork? What might I be implying about race, gender, or class through this comparison?
- What values or assumptions underlie my descriptions of the artist, the artist’s purpose of the work, or the artwork’s subject? What are those values or assumptions?
- How might my racial, gender, and sexual identity and authority impact students’ perceptions of the artwork and the museum?

³⁵⁸ Keonna Hendrick and Melissa Crum, “Multicultural Critical Reflective Practice and Contemporary Art,” in *Multiculturalism in Art Museums Today*, ed. Joni Boyd Acuff and Laura Evans (Rowman & Littlefield, 2014), 276.

³⁵⁹ Culture and identity markers are terms we use to describe and define who we are. They may address ethnicity, race, religion, sexuality, ability, region of birth, language(s), hobbies, skills, education level, socioeconomic status, and other parts of our identity.

- How might the museum's institutional hidden curriculum impact students' perceptions of the artwork and the museum?
- Do elements of this museum education experience challenge or subvert the museum's institutional hidden curriculum?
- In what ways did students demonstrate that the museum experience was personally relevant to their lives? In what ways did students demonstrate critical thinking?
- What forms of knowledge does this museum experience value? Who possesses authority and knowledge?
- What are my goals for this museum education experience? On whose interests were these goals based? Were these goals met?
- Even after an intersectional analysis of your pedagogy, what can you, as a practitioner, still not yet see?

Recommendations for contemporary practitioners

Today, over 45 years after the initiation of Arts Awareness, museum audiences are still predominantly white. According to a 2010 study commissioned by AAM, only 9% of core museum visitors are people of color.³⁶⁰ Though Arts Awareness had an impact on students of color who participated, it did not diversify museum audiences on an institutional or field-wide level.

Museum practitioners are still grappling with the question of how to expand audiences in museums today.³⁶¹ In this final section, I draw out insights from Arts Awareness that I believe contemporary museum practitioners can use to work towards

³⁶⁰ Betty Farrell and Maria Medvedeva, "Demographic Transformation and the Future of Museums," 5.

³⁶¹ Betty Farrell and Maria Medvedeva, "Demographic Transformation and the Future of Museums."

democratizing the museum. Many of these strategies align with initiatives created by contemporary museum activists, and I incorporate examples of these when possible. These strategies include embedding institutional critique into museum work, responding to current events, cultivating agency of visitors of color, attending to working conditions in museums, attending to power dynamics in community engagement, and listening to artists and activists.

Embedding institutional critique into museum work

The most radical element of Arts Awareness was the way that it critiques the museum as an institution, models an approach to museum pedagogy with institutional critique built in, and engages visitors in institutional critique as well. As Rika Burnham said in a 2011 interview,

“There was an extremely radical edge to [Arts Awareness]. While Victor D’Amico at MoMA was part of the institution ... Philip Yenawine took the attitude that The People were going to take over the fucking museum, an attitude of entitlement within the institution that would never happen today.”³⁶²

Understanding the critique embedded within Arts Awareness is fundamental to understanding Arts Awareness. By contrasting Yenawine against Victor D’Amico at MoMA, whose art museum education was in line with the museum’s identity, Yenawine’s pedagogy was a conscious effort to *change* the museum’s identity. Implicit within his vision of “The People tak[ing] over the fucking museum” is a criticism of the museum as space in which The People do not exert any agency. Yenawine’s strategy was not aligned with the museum’s overall identity – it was a challenge to it.

The artist Andrea Fraser’s reflections on institutional critique adds nuance to Burnham’s distinction. She writes, “Every time we speak of the ‘institution’ as other than

³⁶² Michelle Millar Fisher, “Museum Education and the Pedagogic Turn,” *Artwrit* VIII (Summer 2011).

‘us’ we disavow our role in the creation and perpetuation of its conditions ... It’s not a question of being against the institution: We are the institution. It’s a question of what kind of institution we are.”³⁶³ So even though D’Amico acts in line with his institution, Yenawine too is acting as part of an institution. But for Yenawine, he is enacting critique and changing the institution from within. For Fraser, museum professionals are in a position to perform institutional critique. She continues, “Because the institution of art is internalized, embodied, and performed by individuals, these are the questions that institutional critique demands we ask, above all, of ourselves.”³⁶⁴

Cooks argues that by “push[ing] for the acknowledgement of Black artists, their visibility within White [sic] mainstream museums, and the accessibility of artwork by Black artists within Black communities,” the BECC “provid[ed] a model for institutional critique and activism in the American art world.”³⁶⁵ Similarly, Arts Awareness modeled institutional critique by counteracting the white supremacy embedded within the Met’s curriculum and pedagogy with re-imagined curriculum and pedagogy. They did so by *making visible* these inherent problems within the museum: as Yenawine said, “I just want to get [Arts Awareness participants] to be aware that there is an environment.”³⁶⁶ The first step was to make students aware that there was an institution as a potential object of critique, and the next step was to do the critiquing.

Looking back at Arts Awareness, Burnham pointed out to me the flaws – and potential – of this approach. When I asked her about her “The People were going to take over the fucking museum” quote, she said that “everybody had that idea” and that though

³⁶³ Andrea Fraser, “From the Critique of Institutions to an Institution of Critique,” *Artforum* 44, no. 1 (2005): 105.

³⁶⁴ Ibid.

³⁶⁵ Cooks, “Black Artists and Activism,” 32.

³⁶⁶ Yenawine, Oral history interview with Philip Yenawine, [ca. 1971.], 17.

there was a shared “political consciousness that it was time for the old guard to yield to the new,” “nowhere did it really happen.”³⁶⁷ What is salient here is that this particular critique of the museum – that the public is not represented at the museum, that the public must exert agency over the museum – was a shared mindset behind the Arts Awareness pedagogy and curriculum.

Though this effort was unsuccessful in Arts Awareness – the people did *not* take over the museum, and Arts Awareness lasted only a few years in its original form and ceased once Yenawine left the Met – I argue that this mindset can, and should, be re-applied in museum practice today. Burnham agrees: “We were so profoundly convinced that museums were for the people. I still feel that way although we’re not doing a good job taking them back.”³⁶⁸ Holding on to this conviction is an important step in cultivating social-justice-oriented museum education practice.

Responding to current events

Cooks has pointed out that producing a socio-documentary exhibition about Harlem was an unexpected move – because of the Met’s reputation as a fine arts institution, and because taking an active role in contemporary social politics was unprecedented.³⁶⁹ In a similar way, Arts Awareness leveraged the artwork on display in the galleries to take an active role in contemporary social politics. Arts Awareness did so through pedagogy and curriculum that engaged students of color as well as white students, that challenged traditional hierarchies of knowledge by privileging students’ own interpretations and lived experiences above traditional art history.

³⁶⁷ Burnham, Interview with Rika Burnham, October 7, 2015.

³⁶⁸ Ibid.

³⁶⁹ Cooks, “Black Artists and Activism,” 8.

Today, activist museum professionals are advocating for museums to institutionalize the practice of being responsive to pressing social issues. The #MuseumsRespondToFerguson movement, co-created by activist museum professionals Aleia Brown and Adrienne Russell, claims that “any movement toward greater cultural and racial understanding must be supported by our country’s cultural and educational infrastructure. Museums are a part of this educational and cultural network.”³⁷⁰ They ask, “What should be our role(s)?”³⁷¹ A collective of activist museum professionals called the Empathetic Museum, led by museum leader Gretchen Jennings, developed a resource called “The Empathetic Museum Maturity Model: A Metric for Institutional Transformation in Museums,” which was a rubric for museum workers to use to self-assess their institutions. Their intention is to guide museums towards being more empathetic institutions: “Just as empathetic individuals must have a clear sense of their own identities in order to perceive and respond effectively to the experience of others, the empathetic museum must have a clear vision of its role as a public institution within its community.”³⁷² They developed a list of five characteristics of an Empathetic Museum: two of which are Community Resonance (“an empathetic museum is so connected with its community that it is keenly aware of its values, needs, and challenges”) and Timeliness and Sustainability (“it is able to assess and respond to particular events or crises that affect its community (and beyond) in a timely and sustainable way”).³⁷³ For #MuseumsRespondToFerguson and the Empathetic Museum, being responsive to

³⁷⁰ Gretchen Jennings et al., “Joint Statement from Museum Bloggers and Colleagues on Ferguson and Related Events,” *The Inluseum*, December 22, 2014, <http://inluseum.com/2014/12/22/joint-statement-from-museum-bloggers-colleagues-on-ferguson-related-events/>.

³⁷¹ Ibid.

³⁷² Gretchen Jennings et al., “The Empathetic Museum Maturity Model: A Metric for Institutional Transformation in Museums” (The Empathetic Museum, May 2016).

³⁷³ Ibid.

contemporary social issues is a necessary shift in museum practice that shifts museums away from only representing an elitist, white experience.

Cultivating agency of visitors of color

Arts Awareness was oriented towards broadening the Met's audience to be more inclusive of visitors of color. Yenawine explained,

“I was hired to be part of the people who change the audience ... the thought was, in the education arena, if we could build the habits of going to museums, introduce them to the museum in ways they found interesting and engaging and worth it, we could develop the audience of tomorrow to reflect the demographics of our cities.”³⁷⁴

Yenawine's strategy for expanding the Met's audience of color was to cultivate agency and authority in young people of color, and hope that they become “the audience of tomorrow” as they age into adulthood. Significantly, he describes the education staff's responsibility to facilitate programming in a way that visitors of color find “interesting and engaging and worth it,” rather than attempt to change those visitors' interests or values.

Today, the Visitors of Color Tumblr, co-created by museum activists nikhil trivedi and Porchia Moore, is also driven by the desire to cultivate authority and agency for visitors of color. This Tumblr is “a space for museum folks to be able to learn from the perspectives of marginalized people” through first-person narratives from museum visitors with marginalized identities including along lines of race, ability, gender, sexual orientation, and class.³⁷⁵ This project is explicitly tied to agency: “We also see this as a form of activism--giving folks who may not feel safe or welcome in our institutions a

³⁷⁴ Yenawine, Interview with Philip Yenawine, March 2016.

³⁷⁵ “Visitors of Color,” accessed January 3, 2017, <http://visitorsofcolor.tumblr.com/?og=1>.

little bit of agency in their relationships with museums.”³⁷⁶ As the editors of the Inluseum blog note, conversations in the museum field about expanding and diversifying museum audiences often lack the voices of those potential visitors – and Visitors of Color centers these voices.³⁷⁷ Visitors of Color is not oriented towards building new audiences for museums, but rather, about amplifying narratives about what kinds of experiences visitors with marginalized identities are having in museums today. Both Yenawine’s approach and the Visitors of Color Tumblr model an approach to museum practices that are structured around cultivating agency and authority for visitors who are typically excluded or marginalized.

Attending to working conditions in museums

In response to *Harlem on My Mind*, one of the core demands of the BECC was to change the structure of the museum by hiring more Black staff members.³⁷⁸ For Yenawine, hiring a diverse staff was aligned with “sixties values” which he summarized as, “Let’s open up the museum in such a way that there are audiences and staff and boards more reflective of the city we live in.”³⁷⁹ When Yenawine was recruiting staff to facilitate Arts Awareness programming, he made an intentional choice to hire artists of color. Though most of the Arts Awareness staff was white, Yenawine sought out artists of color to hire including painter Randy Williams and harpsichordist Frances Cole.

Critically, a majority-white staff with a handful of artists of color was not his preference – that would have amounted to tokenism. Sara Ahmed warns that tokenism has the effect of reproducing whiteness: “Diversity becomes about *changing perceptions*

³⁷⁶ Ibid.

³⁷⁷ “Announcing the Visitors of Color Tumblr,” *The Inluseum*, December 3, 2015, <https://inluseum.com/2015/12/03/visitors-of-color-tumblr/>.

³⁷⁸ Cooks, “Black Artists and Activism,” 25.

³⁷⁹ Yenawine, Interview with Philip Yenawine, March 2016.

of whiteness rather than changing the whiteness of our organizations. Changing perceptions of whiteness can be how an institution can reproduce whiteness, as that which exists but is no longer perceived.”³⁸⁰ For Ahmed, hiring a diverse staff without cultivating institutional change results in re-inscribing white supremacy. Rather, hiring a diverse staff is only part of institutional change, which requires changing institutional power dynamics. For Yenawine, who was interested in cultivating institutional change – changing the whiteness of the institution – hiring artists of color was a priority.

Rather, he wanted to hire as many artists of color as he could. He found it difficult to hire artists of color not because there were not many artists of color working in New York City at the time, but because Black artists willing to work for white institutions (as he phrased it, “willing to play the game”) were in “big demand,” and that “every museum wants them.”³⁸¹ Yenawine’s comment suggests that while museums were highly motivated to be perceived as having a diverse staff (for example, Williams and Cole, the two Black artist-educators on staff, were featured prominently in the first Arts Awareness film) museums had not cultivated workplace environments that were appealing to Black artists. (Though, conversely, he also noted that harpsichordist Cole, “playing a white man’s instrument,” could not earn a living as a classical musician because of her race).³⁸²

This call that diversity in staffing matters has been amplified and expanded by activist museum workers today including Chris Taylor, Chief Inclusion Officer at the Minnesota Historical Society and Makeba Clay, who leads a management consulting firm. As members of a team convened by MASS Action at the Minneapolis Institute of Art in October 2016, Taylor, Clay, and I (along with many others) are collaborating on a

³⁸⁰ Ahmed, *On Being Included*, 34.

³⁸¹ Yenawine, Interview with Philip Yenawine, November 2016.

³⁸² Ibid.

project designed to transform internal working culture in museums. One of our key strategies is to focus on “talent development” and “talent cultivation” in museums – an approach to hiring that emphasizes applicants’ skills, lifting barriers for qualified candidates who had previously been shut out by academic credentials being used as an arbitrary gatekeeper. This approach steps away from a common term in the discourse around museum staffing: “pipelines,” which connotes passivity, and underplays stakeholders’ own agency in shifting norms. In contrast, our assets-based approach centers the talents of museum workers at all levels, and considers how museums can support their staff members’ growth and retain them in the museum field. Our underlying belief is the same as the Arts Awareness and BECC approaches – that museums can best engage with diverse audiences if their staff makeup reflects that diversity. And, most critically, if their diverse staff has opportunities for agency and decision-making.

Attending to power dynamics in community engagement

As argued in the introduction to this dissertation, contemporary museum educators must become more attentive to power dynamics in community engagement. Even well-intentioned community engagement programs in museums can reproduce problematic social hierarchies. As Yenawine explained to me,

“Museums do not care particularly about the skills that people bring to museums, they just want them in there, and as soon as they’re in there, they think, ‘well here’s what we can do for them, we can really entertain them with all these wonderful facts we know about our collection.’ People have been trained to believe that’s what they deserve.”³⁸³

Yenawine’s perspective reveals the shortcomings of a deficit-based mindset, that envisions museum visitors as lacking in education and culture, without considering their

³⁸³ Ibid.

assets and experiences. Arts Awareness' connection to pedagogy and power dynamics is a powerful example for contemporary practitioners.

As I argue with the examples of the homeless volunteers at the MAH, museum professionals must take steps to limit the effects of social inequity within our work. Community partnerships must be about challenging and disrupting power dynamics and are problematic if we just reinforce social inequality through our work.

Listening to artists and activists

One of Cooks' central arguments is that it was not *Harlem on My Mind* that created change. It was artists and activists who protested against *Harlem on My Mind* that created change.³⁸⁴ An important legacy of the protests against *Harlem on My Mind* is the opportunities it opened for Black workers to enter the museum field. These opportunities extended beyond the hiring of Randy Williams – whose career as an artist-educator at the Met continues today – and of Frances Cole for Arts Awareness. Lowery Stokes Sims, who was a curator of Twentieth-Century Art at the Met from 1972 to 1999, said:

“As a result of the demonstrations against *Harlem on My Mind*, the MMA (Metropolitan Museum of Art) instituted the Community Programs Department under the directorship of Susan Coppel (later Badden), who hired me in 1972. After she left, Cathy Chance took over and became perhaps the first black [sic] administrator in the MMA's history.”³⁸⁵

In 1997, Thelma Golden, then curator at the Whitney Museum of American Art and now Director and Chief Curator of The Studio Museum in Harlem elaborated:

“The reason I have my job is because of *Harlem on My Mind*. Lowery Sims often says she got her job at the Met specifically in 1973 because of the controversy. Had the protests not happened, I'm not sure the Whitney or other institutions in this city would have changed. It galvanized most

³⁸⁴ Cooks, “Black Artists and Activism,” 33–34.

³⁸⁵ Ibid., 33; Lowery Stokes Sims, “Discrete Encounters: A Personal Recollection of The Black Art Scene of the 1970s,” in *Energy/Experimentation: Black Artists and Abstraction, 1964-1980*, by Kellie Jones (New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 2006), 50.

museums to get to the place where in 1990 I could work here and do the things I do. But it took twenty years.”³⁸⁶

Though *Harlem on My Mind* was an exhibition organized by the museum, it was the protests orchestrated by artists and activists that advocated for and created change in the museum field, including creating opportunities for Black museum professionals to advance their careers.

Today, artists and activists – and museum educators – continue to be the catalysts and advocates for more inclusive practices in museums. One such example is the protests against “Kimono Wednesdays” at the MFA organized by Decolonize our Museums, discussed in Chapter 1, resulted in public programming at the museum addressing systemic racism. Another recent example is in September 2016, three Black museum educators at the Contemporary Art Museum in St. Louis (CAM) circulated an open letter to the CAM Senior Directors protesting artist Kelley Walker’s exhibition *Direct Drive*, which featured images of Black celebrities smeared with chocolate and toothpaste, explaining that it “triggers a retraumatization of racial and regional pain” in the aftermath of the unrest in Ferguson, Missouri following the shooting death of unarmed Black teen Michael Brown by white police officer Darren Wilson in 2014.³⁸⁷ The open letter contained a series of demands, including an apology and resignation by Curator Jeffrey Usli and “new immediate and lasting institutional and curational [sic] policies that will reduce the intolerable racial and cultural insensitivity that has been displayed.”³⁸⁸ This

³⁸⁶ Cooks, “Black Artists and Activism,” 33; Steven C. Dubin, *Displays of Power: Controversy in the American Museum from the Enola Gay to Sensation* (NYU Press, 2001), 54.

³⁸⁷ De Andrea Nichols, Lyndon Barrois Jr., and Victoria Donaldson, “Open Letter to CAM Senior Directors,” Open letter, (September 18, 2016); Jenny Simeone and Willis Ryder Arnold, “CAM’s Latest Exhibit Leads Employees to Call for Curator’s Resignation” (St. Louis, Missouri: St. Louis Public Radio KWMU-1, September 22, 2016), <http://news.stlpublicradio.org/post/cams-latest-exhibit-leads-employees-call-curators-resignation>.

³⁸⁸ Nichols, Barrois Jr., and Donaldson, “Open Letter to CAM Senior Directors.”

protest was echoed by artists who attended a public program called “Critical Conversations: Art and the Black Body” hosted by CAM. Photographer Kat Reynolds said, “The fact that this rates as being OK for curation is more than problematic. It is disheartening. ... That’s the issue — a lack of awareness and appreciation for black [sic] bodies.”³⁸⁹ CAM announced Usip’s resignation in October 2016, and hopefully the protesters’ other demands including institutional change will be implemented as well. At the MFA and the CAM, artists and activists are protesting and advocating for inclusive museum practices – and museums ought to pay attention.

Conclusion

At the end of one of our interviews, Yenawine shared the following thoughts on institutional change:

“At the moment I’ve become less interested in museum education than I am in *using* art. I’m less interested in museums because I don’t think they function well. Period. I think they’re unchangeable. I think they’re not worth my effort. I’ve got limited time and energy. I’ve worked very, very hard to change institutions. I did not change [the Met]. I had already given up the thinking that you could change a major institution. I was trying to do everything I did by consensus so at least people would agree that what we were trying to do in education was worth doing for the museum. I’m not even sure that was accomplished at [the Met] because they were so entrenched in their ways. And that’s hardly unusual.”³⁹⁰

While I empathize with Yenawine’s frustration, I am not resigned to losing hope for museums. I am committed to the Inclusive Museum Movement’s vision for implementing social-justice-oriented museum practice rooted in transformative and systemic change.

Activist initiatives like #MuseumsRespondToFerguson have already changed the museum discourse, and professional organizations like AAM are relying on museum activists as thought leaders. Though Yenawine felt defeated in his individual efforts to

³⁸⁹ Simeone and Arnold, “CAM’s Latest Exhibit Leads Employees to Call for Curator’s Resignation.”

³⁹⁰ Yenawine, Interview with Philip Yenawine, November 2016.

create change, the Inclusive Museum Movement can do so collectively. If we truly believe in the power of cultural institutions to shape our communities and transform our world, then we must also believe that our choices as practitioners have an impact, and must act according to the changes we seek.

Appendix I: Curriculum Vitae

Alyssa Greenberg

agreen34@uic.edu

Education

- 2017 **PhD**, Department of Art History, University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC)
Dissertation: “Arts Awareness at The Metropolitan Museum of Art: Art Museum Education as Artistic and Political Practice”
- 2011 **MA**, Bard Graduate Center, New York, NY
- 2009 **BA**, Oberlin College, Oberlin, OH

Professional Experience

The UIC Dialogue Initiative

Chicago, IL, August 2016-May 2017

Graduate Assistant

- Designed and facilitated educational programming on social justice, diversity, and identity that activated dialogue as a site for collaborative knowledge production for the UIC First-Year Dialogue Seminar
- Trained dialogue facilitators in best practices including establishing collective agreements, co-participating, and crafting open-ended questions
- Facilitated diversity and identity training for new faculty and staff
- Consulted for academic and administrative departments seeking to identify, analyze, and challenge the cultural beliefs, values, and assumptions that influence their interactions and experiences on campus
- Developed an observation-based rubric for evaluating dialogue-based educational programming
- Supervised outreach and marketing for UIC Dialogue Initiative programming

The Jane Addams Hull-House Museum

Chicago, IL, July 2011-August 2014

Education Assistant, September 2012-August 2014

Museum Educator, July 2011-August 2012

- Wrote curriculum for and facilitated museum education programming including tours, dialogues, and workshops to engage museum’s broad and diverse audiences including K-12, university students and faculty, teachers, tourists, professional groups, activists, and seniors
- Co-created new strategic models for community engagement in educational programs including *Love and Labor: Domestic Workers as Community Docents* (2013) and *Activating Art for Peace and Justice: A Summer Teacher Institute* (2014)
- Co-wrote successful grants for community engagement program *Cities of Peace: Chicago and Phnom Penh* to effectively convey program’s innovative vision and plan for implementation
 - Museums for America Grant, Institute of Museum and Library Services, \$125,000

- Museums Connect: Building Global Communities Grant, American Alliance of Museums, \$95,000
- Trained museum educators in best practices including object-based gallery teaching and facilitated dialogue
- Contributed curatorial and research support to enhance impact of exhibitions including “*The House Seems All Upset... Exploring Critical Whiteness at the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum*” (2014)

The Bard Graduate Center Gallery

New York, NY September 2009-May 2011

Museum Educator

- Wrote curriculum to enhance temporary exhibitions on diverse themes including “Cloisonné: Chinese Enamels from the Yuan, Ming and Qing Dynasties” and “Dutch New York Between East and West”
- Facilitated museum education programming including gallery teaching and “suitcase tours” in schools to engage museum’s broad and diverse audiences including K-12, family, professionals, and seniors

The Brooklyn Children’s Museum

Brooklyn, NY January 2010-June 2010

Museum Educator

- Created museum education programming including gallery teaching and studio activities to engage early childhood and elementary school audiences and their caregivers
- Mentored 6th-8th grade youth leaders in the “Museum Team” program, trained them as museum educators

Allen Memorial Art Museum

Oberlin, OH, January 2008-May 2009

Museum Educator

- Developed museum education programming including tours and craft activities to engage museum’s broad and diverse audiences including K-12, college students and faculty, out-of-town visitors, and seniors
- Facilitated a Sunday Object Talk on Romare Bearden's *Conjur Woman* (1975), recorded a podcast on Yayoi Kusama's *Baby Carriage* (1964), and researched the museum's collection of Rookwood pottery

Peer-Reviewed Publications

Greenberg, Alyssa, Wendy Ng, and Syrus Marcus Ware. “Activating Diversity and Inclusion: A Blueprint for Museum Educators as Allies and Change Makers,” *Racism in Museum Education*, Spec. issue of *Journal of Museum Education* (May 2017).

Greenberg, Alyssa. “The Opportunities and Risks of Community Docent Training as Adult Learning: Love and Labor at the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum.” In *Adult Education, Museums, and Art Galleries: Aesthetic, Social and Cultural Animation for Change*, edited by Darlene E. Clover, Kathy Sanford, Lorraine Bell, and Kay Johnson, 203-214. Rotterdam: Sense Publishing, 2016.

Greenberg, Alyssa et al. "Collective Memory and Engaged Storytelling: A Collaborative Response to Doug Shipman's Keynote Address." *Public: A Journal of Imagining America* 3.1 (Spring 2015). [<http://public.imaginingamerica.org/blog/article/collective-memory-and-engaged-storytelling-a-collaborative-response-to-doug-shipmans-imagining-america-keynote-address/>]

Greenberg, Alyssa et al. "Occupy Museums as Public Pedagogy and Justice Work." *Justice Work In and Out of Schools*, Spec. issue of *Journal for Curriculum Theorizing* 29.2 (2013): 230-239.

Selected Additional Publications

Greenberg, Alyssa and Nina Pelaez. "Unsafe Ideas: Building Museum Worker Solidarity for Social Justice, Inside and Out." In *The Museum Blog Book*, edited by Graeme Farnell, 100-109. Edinburgh: Museums Etc., 2017.

Greenberg, Alyssa, Adrienne Russell, Kate Swisher, and Nina Pelaez. "Refracting the Social Justice Lens: An Intersectional Approach to Labor Equity in Museums." *Center for the Future of Museums Blog*. American Alliance of Museums, 12 May 2016. [<http://futureofmuseums.blogspot.com/2016/05/refracting-social-justice-lens.html>]

Jennings, Gretchen, Stacey Mann, Janeen Bryant, Matt Kirchman, Rainey Tisdale, Elissa Frankle, Jim Cullen, Jessica Konigsberg, Alyssa Greenberg, Dominique Brouhard, Jennifer Keim, and Mariela Rossel-Pritikin. "The Empathetic Museum Maturity Model: A Metric for Institutional Transformation in Museums." *The Empathetic Museum*, May 2016. [<http://empatheticmuseum.weebly.com/maturity-model.html>]

Greenberg, Alyssa and Nina Pelaez. "Unsafe Ideas: Building Museum Worker Solidarity for Social Justice, Inside and Out." *Center for the Future of Museums Blog*. American Alliance of Museums, 2 June 2015. [<http://futureofmuseums.blogspot.com/2015/06/unsafe-ideas-building-museum-worker.html>]

Greenberg, Alyssa, Monica O. Montgomery, Jillian Reese, and Nina Pelaez. "Museum Workers Speak." Interview by Carol Bossert. *The Museum Life* podcast, 29 May 2015. [<http://www.voiceamerica.com/episode/85606/museum-workers-speak>]

Greenberg, Alyssa. "How Every Museum Can Respond to Ferguson Part II." *Publicly Active Graduate Education (PAGE) 2 Ferguson Blog Salon*. Imagining America, 27 April 2015. [<http://imaginingamerica.org/blog/2015/04/27/how-every-museum-can-respond-to-ferguson-part-ii/>]

Greenberg, Alyssa. "How Every Museum Can Respond to Ferguson." *Publicly Active Graduate Education (PAGE) 2 Ferguson Blog Salon*. Imagining America, 16 Feb. 2015. [<http://imaginingamerica.org/blog/2015/02/16/how-every-museum-can-respond-to-ferguson/>]

Greenberg, Alyssa. "The Labor Organizer in the Museum." *Publicly Active Graduate Education (PAGE) Blog Salon*. Imagining America, 25 Sept. 2014.
[<http://imaginingamerica.org/blog/2014/09/25/the-labor-organizer-in-the-museum/>]

Selected Presentations

- 2017 **"Let's Create Our Own Space: Participatory Pedagogy and Institutional Power in the Art Museum, 1970-Present,"** 2017 American Studies Association Annual Meeting: Pedagogies of Dissent, Chicago, IL
- 2017 **"Making #BlackLivesMatter in Museums,"** co-facilitated with La Tanya Autry, Aleia Brown, and Adrienne Russell, American Alliance of Museums 2017 Annual Meeting, St. Louis, MO
- 2017 **"Enacting Equity and Inclusion: Allyship as Lived Practice,"** co-facilitated with Wendy Ng, Keonna Hendrick, and Syrus Marcus Ware, American Alliance of Museums 2017 Annual Meeting, St. Louis, MO
- 2017 **Student Commencement Speaker,** UIC College of Architecture, Design, and the Arts Spring 2017 Commencement Ceremony, Chicago, IL
- 2017 **"Building MASS Action: Museum As Site for Social Action,"** co-facilitated with Elisabeth Calihan, Therese Quinn, nikhil trivedi, and PJ Gubatina Policarpio, Open Engagement 2017: Justice, Chicago, IL
- 2017 **"Let's Create Our Own Space: Participatory Pedagogy and Institutional Power in the Art Museum, 1970-Present,"** 2017 Graduate Student Symposium, Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago, IL
- 2017 **Invited Presenter,** Diversifying Museum Studies – A Symposium, Museum Studies program of the George Washington University, Washington D.C.
- 2016 **"Museum Workers Speak: One Year Later,"** co-facilitated with Monica O. Montgomery, Nina Pelaez, Jillian Reese, and Adrienne Russell, American Alliance of Museums 2016 Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.
- 2016 **"Museum Workers Speak: One Year Later,"** co-facilitated with Margaret Middleton, Grace Torres, and Elissa Frankle, New York City Museum Educators Roundtable 2016 Annual Conference, New York, NY
- 2016 **"Museum Workers Speak: One Year Later,"** co-facilitated with Lena Guerrero Reynolds, Mutual Interpretation, School of Art and Art History at the University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL
- 2016 **"When Do I Sit Down, Stand Up, or Lean In? 'Lead' as an Ally,"** co-facilitated with Wendy Ng, Keonna Hendrick, and Syrus Marcus Ware, 2016 National Art Education Association National Convention, Chicago, IL
- 2016 **"Arts Awareness at the Metropolitan Museum of Art: Art Museum Education as Artistic and Political Practice,"** the Institutionalization of Social Practice, College Art Association 104th Annual Conference, Washington, D.C.
- 2015 **"How Do We Turn the Social Justice Lens Inward? A Conversation About Internal Museum Labor Practices,"** with Museum Workers Speak, Ger-Art Gallery, Atlanta, GA

- 2015 **Emerging Innovators Forum**, American Alliance of Museums 2015 Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA
- 2015 **Graduate Colloquium Presentation**, 19th Annual Museums and the Web Conference, Chicago, IL
- 2015 **“Facilitated Dialogue Workshop for the 21st Century Museum Professional”** co-facilitated with Lena Guerrero Reynolds, Museum Education in the 21st Century, Historical Administration Program Association at Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, IL
- 2015 Work-in-Progress Presentation, Mutual Interpretation, School of Art and Art History at the University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL
- 2014 **“2014-2015 PAGE Fellows: Fellowship, Mentorship, and Collective Action,”** Imagining America National Conference 2014: Organizing/Culture/Change, Atlanta, GA
- 2014 **“Community Partnership Roundtable Discussion: Domestic Workers as Community Docents at the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum,”** Seventh International Conference on the Inclusive Museum: Shared Visions and Shared Histories, The Autry National Center of the American West, Los Angeles, CA
- 2013, 2014 **Panelist on Museum Education**, Chicago Curriculum Studies Symposium, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL
- 2013 **“Inclusivity and Economic Justice: A Study of Occupy Museums,”** Sixth International Conference on the Inclusive Museum: Museums and Active Citizenship, National Art Gallery of Denmark, Copenhagen, Denmark
- 2012 **“Examining Museums and the 1%, Then and Now: Institutional Critique and Occupy Museums,”** Art and Social Justice, Ben Gurion University, Beer Sheva, Israel
- 2012 **“The Mail Art and Artist Stamps of Michael Hernandez de Luna: Mail Art, Collaboration and Institutional Critique,”** Art and Exchange, Art History Graduate Students Conference, Tufts University, Medford, MA
- 2011 **“Exploring the Rhetorics of American Photographic Christmas Cards, 1920s–1950s,”** Picture This: Postcards and Letters Beyond Text, University of Sussex, Brighton, England
- 2011 **“Kids Crew and Museum Team at the Brooklyn Children’s Museum: Strengthening the Relationship between Institution and Community,”** 27th Annual Small Museum Association Conference, Ocean City, MD
- 2010 **“Fetishist Identity and Yayoi Kusama’s *Baby Carriage* (1964),”** The National Popular Culture & American Culture Association’s Annual Conference, St. Louis, MO
- 2009 **“The Brooklyn Bridge as Anti-Monument: Alexander Calder’s *View of Brooklyn Bridge* (c.1923–6),”** New Perspectives in Visual Culture: 3rd Annual Undergraduate Symposium in Art History at Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH

Selected Public Humanities Work

- 2017 **Co-facilitator** with Keonna Hendrick, Breakout Session on Racism and Equity in Museums, NAEA Museum Education Preconference - Diversity & Inclusion: Art Museum Educators as Levers of Change, 2017 National Art Education Association National Convention, New York, NY
- 2017 **Co-facilitator** with Steve Whitley, “#SanctuaryCampus Dialogue,” UIC Dialogue Initiative
- 2016-2017 **Co-facilitator**, Words Matter!, UIC Dialogue Initiative
- 2016 **Co-facilitator** with Devin Malone, “Advocacy Through Art: Drawings by David Leggett and #BlackLivesMatter,” UIC Dialogue Initiative and Gallery 400
- 2016 **Co-facilitator** with Lena Guerrero Reynolds, “Advocacy Through Art: *El Despertar de las Américas Mural* (1996) by Maestro Hector Duarte and Immigration,” UIC Dialogue Initiative and the Rafael Cintrón Ortiz Latino Cultural Center
- 2016-present **Founding Member**, MASS Action (Museum as Site for Social Action), Minneapolis Institute of Art
- 2016 **Co-facilitator**, discussion of Arts Awareness, Teaching Institute in Museum Education (TIME) 2016, School of the Art Institute of Chicago
- 2016 **Fellow**, Humanities Without Walls Consortium Pre-Doctoral Summer Workshop
- 2016 **Facilitator**, “#BlackLivesMatter at the Art Museum” at Art21 Educators 2016 Summer Institute
- 2016 **Participant**, National Intergroup Dialogue Institute, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor
- 2016 **Co-facilitator**, “Institutional Self-Reflection in Museum Practice,” Museums & Race 2016: Gathering for Transformation and Justice, adjacent to American Alliance of Museums 2016 Annual Meeting
- 2016 **Co-facilitator**, “Roundtable on Internships and Wage Equity,” Center for the Future of Museums Demo on Museums and Labor, American Alliance of Museums 2016 Annual Meeting
- 2015-present **Founding Member**, Museum Workers Speak
- 2015-present **Co-director**, Publicly Active Graduate Education (PAGE) working group, Imagining America
- 2015 **Participant**, Teaching Institute in Museum Education (TIME) 2015, School of the Art Institute of Chicago
- 2015 **Co-facilitator**, “Making the Most of Museums” at Art21 Educators 2015 Summer Institute
- 2015 **Facilitator**, “Synthesis Reactions” at Creative Chemistries: Radical Practices for Art and Education, a symposium organized by Art21 at the Park Avenue Armory, New York, NY
- 2014-2015 **Fellow**, Publicly Active Graduate Education (PAGE) working group, Imagining America
- 2014 **Co-coordinator**, *Activating Art for Peace and Justice: A Summer Teacher Institute*, Jane Addams Hull-House Museum

- 2014 **Curatorial Assistant**, “*The House Seems All Upset...* Exploring Critical Whiteness at the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum,” Jane Addams Hull-House Museum
- 2014 **Research Assistant**, Tania Rempert Museum Evaluation Services
- 2013-present **Art21 Educator**, Art21 Educators professional development initiative and learning community
- 2013-2014 **Co-coordinator**, *Love and Labor: Domestic Workers as Community Docents*, Jane Addams Hull-House Museum
- 2012 **Curatorial Assistant**, “*Could not bear the site of it...* Exploring Critical Whiteness at the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum,” “Report to the Public: An Untold Story of the Conservative Vice Lords,” and “Unfinished Business: 21st Century Home Economics,” Jane Addams Hull-House Museum
- 2011 **Research Assistant**, “Knoll Textiles, 1945–2010,” Bard Graduate Center
- 2010-2011 **Co-Curator**, “Christmas Cards in America, 1875–1975,” Bard Graduate Center
- 2010 **Mail Art Cataloguer and Research Assistant**, Clarence Ward Art Library, Oberlin College
- 2009 **Co-Editor-in-Chief**, Oberlin College Senior Studio Exhibition Catalogue, Oberlin College
- 2009 **Teaching Assistant**, Margin/Release: The New Media Lecture Series, Oberlin College
- 2008-2009 **Research Assistant and Registrar’s Assistant**, Allen Memorial Art Museum
- 2005-2009 **Photography Editor**, *The Grape* (alternative student publication), Oberlin College

Teaching

- 2016-2017 Guest Lecture: “**Museums and Labor**,” Art History 180: Introduction to Museum and Exhibition Studies, undergraduate course led by Rebecca Bivens and Pinar Uner
- Fall 2015 Guest Lecture: “**Museums and Labor**,” Art History 545: Museum Genres, Practices and Institutions, graduate seminar led by Therese Quinn
- Fall 2012 Guest Lecture: “**Introduction to Occupy Museums**,” Art History 560: Century of “Chaos:” John Cage, Fluxus, Occupy, graduate seminar led by Hannah Higgins
- Spring 2012 Guest Lecture: “**Introduction to Museum Studies**,” Art History 100: Introduction to Art and Art History, undergraduate course led by Juan Carlos Arias and Khristin Landry

Grants, Honors, and Awards

- 2016 **President's Research in Diversity Travel Award**, University of Illinois
- 2016 **Graduate College Student Presenter Award**, University of Illinois at Chicago
- 2016 **Department of Art History Graduate Travel Grant**, University of Illinois at Chicago

2016	Graduate Student Council Travel Award , University of Illinois at Chicago
2015-2016	Dean's Scholar Award Dissertation Fellowship , University of Illinois at Chicago
2015	Top Ten Most Popular Posts of 2015 on the Center for the Future of Museums Blog for "Unsafe Ideas: Building Museum Worker Solidarity for Social Justice, Inside and Out"
2015	The Alumni/ae Travel and Research Grant , Bard Graduate Center
2014-2015	University Fellowship , University of Illinois at Chicago
2014	Museums for America Grant for <i>Cities of Peace: Chicago and Phnom Penh</i> , a community engagement program at the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum (coauthor), Institute of Museum and Library Services, \$125,000
2014	Museums Connect: Building Global Communities Grant for <i>Cities of Peace: Chicago and Phnom Penh</i> , a community engagement program at the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum (coauthor), American Alliance of Museums, \$95,000
2014	Chicago K-12 Education Program Grant for <i>Activating Art for Peace and Justice</i> , a summer teacher institute at the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum (coauthor), Terra Foundation for American Art, \$25,000
2013	Community Project Grant for <i>Love and Labor: Domestic Workers as Community Docents</i> , an education program at the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum (coauthor), Illinois Humanities Council, \$5,000
2013	Professional Development Grant , Illinois Art Education Association
2013, 2014	Graduate Scholar Award , The Inclusive Museum Conference
2012	Department of Art History Graduate Travel Grant , University of Illinois at Chicago
2011-2012	University Fellowship , University of Illinois at Chicago
2011	Student scholarship , New York City Museum Educators Roundtable Annual Conference
2010, 2011	The Alumni/ae Travel and Research Grant , Bard Graduate Center
2009-2011	Decorative Arts Fellowship , Bard Graduate Center

Selected Service

2015-present	Member , Art21 Educators Advisory Committee
2015-2016	Leadership Committee Member , Chicago Emerging Museum Professionals
2015-2016	Steering Committee Member , University of Illinois at Chicago Graduate Employees Organization
2014-2015	Co-Coordinator , Discipline and Doctrine, Graduate Student Symposium, University of Illinois at Chicago
2013-2014	Member , Gallery 400 Advisory Committee, University of Illinois at Chicago
2013-2014	Steering Committee Member , University of Illinois at Chicago Graduate Employees Organization

- 2012 **Co-Coordinator and Session Chair**, In Sight/On View: The Museum as Site of Inquiry, Graduate Student Symposium, University of Illinois at Chicago
- 2011 **Co-Coordinator**, Material Networks, Graduate Student Symposium, Bard Graduate Center
- 2010 **Co-Coordinator**, The Materials of Persuasion, Graduate Student Symposium, Bard Graduate Center

Professional Affiliations

American Alliance of Museums
 Art21
 College Art Association
 Emerging Museum Professionals Network
 Illinois Art Education Association
 Imagining America
 The Inclusive Museum
 Museum Educators Roundtable
 National Art Education Association
 Art History Graduate Students Association (UIC)
 University of Illinois at Chicago Graduate Employees Organization

Appendix II: Archival Sources

Oral History

Audio files available upon request.

Burnham, Rika. Interview with Rika Burnham. Interview by Alyssa Greenberg. Audio file, October 7, 2015.

Levy, Howard. Interview with Howard Levy. Interview by Alyssa Greenberg. Audio file, October 7, 2015.

Williams, Randy. Interview with Randy Williams. Interview by Alyssa Greenberg. Audio file, October 8, 2015.

Yenawine, Philip. Interview with Philip Yenawine, March 2016. Interview by Alyssa Greenberg. Audio file, March 10, 2016.

———. Interview with Philip Yenawine, November 2016. Interview by Alyssa Greenberg. Audio file, November 1, 2016.

Metropolitan Museum of Art Archives

Tschaka Tonge. *Arts Awareness: Approaches to Seeing: Line*. Instructional. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1973.

———. *Arts Awareness: Approaches to Seeing: Sound; Space; Color*. Instructional. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1973.

Wardenburg, Fred, and Davis Bernstein. *Arts Awareness*. Instructional. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1972.

Museum Education files

Thomas Hoving records, 1935-1977 (bulk 1967-1977), 43.0 Linear feet (99 full-size document cases, 2 half-size document cases, 1 oversize box)

Smithsonian Archives of American Art

Kreitman, Marcia. Oral history interview with Marcia Kreitman, [circa 1971]. Interview by Kathy Rosenbloom. Transcript, ca 1971. Smithsonian Archives of American Art.

Yenawine, Philip. Oral history interview with Philip Yenawine, [ca. 1971.]. Interview by Kathy Rosenbloom. Transcript, ca 1971. Smithsonian Archives of American Art.

Bibliography

- Ahmed, Sara. *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Duke University Press, 2012.
- Aldridge, Cathy. "'Harlem on My Mind': A Boxed in Feeling." *New York Amsterdam News*. February 1, 1969.
- American Alliance of Museums. "2016 AAM Annual Meeting Theme: Power, Influence and Responsibility." *American Alliance of Museums Website*, 2016. <http://aam-us.org/events/annual-meeting/2016-annual-meeting-theme>.
- . "2017 AAM Annual Meeting Theme: Gateways for Understanding: Diversity, Equity, Accessibility, and Inclusion in Museums." *American Alliance of Museums Website*, 2017. http://annualmeeting.aam-us.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/AAM2017_theme-final_pdf_ACC.pdf.
- . "About Museums." *American Alliance of Museums Website*, 2016. <http://www.aam-us.org/about-museums>.
- American Alliance of Museums, and New Knowledge Organization Ltd. "2014 National Comparative Museum Salary." Washington, D.C.: American Alliance of Museums, 2014.
- American Association of Museums. "Museums for a New Century: A Report of the Commission on Museums for a New Century." Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums, 1984.
- Angelica, Ethan. "Making the Met Mine: How Museum Hack Develops New Audiences for Museums." *Museum Hack*, March 16, 2016. <https://museumhack.com/making-the-met-mine-how-museum-hack-develops-new-audiences-for-museums/>.
- "Announcing the Visitors of Color Tumblr." *The Inluseum*, December 3, 2015. <https://inluseum.com/2015/12/03/visitors-of-color-tumblr/>.
- Association of Art Museum Directors. "Next Practices in Art Museum Education." Association of Art Museum Directors, April 28, 2014. <https://aamd.org/sites/default/files/document/AAMD%20Next%20Practices%20in%20Art%20Museum%20Education.pdf>.
- Back, Kurt W. "Varieties of Sensitivity Training." *Sociological Inquiry* 41, no. 2 (1971): 133–137.
- Bearden, Romare. Letter to Allon Schoener. "Letter from Romare Bearden to Allon [Schoener]," June 6, 1968. Box 42 -- Harlem on My Mind Folders. John Henrik Clarke Papers.
- . Letter to Thomas Hoving. "Letters from Romare Bearden to Thomas Hoving," September 6, 1968. Box 42 -- Harlem on My Mind Folders. John Henrik Clarke Papers.
- Beauboeuf-Lafontant, Tamara. "A Movement against and beyond Boundaries: Politically Relevant Teaching among African-American Teachers." *The Teachers College Record* 100, no. 4 (1999): 702–723.
- Betty Farrell, and Maria Medvedeva. "Demographic Transformation and the Future of Museums." American Alliance of Museums Press, 2010.

- Boostrom, R., and Craig Kridel. "Hidden Curriculum." *Encyclopedia of Curriculum Studies* 2 (2010).
- Burnham, Rika. Interview with Rika Burnham. Interview by Alyssa Greenberg. Audio file, October 7, 2015.
- . Interview with Rika Burnham. Interview by Alyssa Greenberg, August 10, 2016.
- Burnham, Rika, and Elliott Kai-Kee. *Teaching in the Art Museum: Interpretation as Experience*. J. Paul Getty Museum, 2011.
- Burton, Judith M., Arlene Lederman, and Peter London. *Beyond DBAE: The Case for Multiple Visions of Art Education*. Peter London, 1988.
- Cahan, Susan. *Mounting Frustration: The Art Museum in the Age of Black Power*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2016.
- Carter, Rodney GS. "Of Things Said and Unsaid: Power, Archival Silences, and Power in Silence." *Archivaria* 61, no. 61 (2006).
<http://journals.sfu.ca/archivar/index.php/archivaria/article/viewArticle/12541>.
- Chapman, Laura H. "The Future and Museum Education." *Museum News* 60, no. 6 (1982): 48–56.
- Cohen, Jodi S. "University of Illinois OKs \$875,000 Settlement to End Steven Salaita Dispute." *Chicago Tribune*. November 12, 2015.
<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/breaking/ct-steven-salaita-settlement-met-20151112-story.html>.
- Cole, Johnnetta Betsch. "Museums, Diversity, & Social Value." presented at the 2015 American Alliance of Museums Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia, April 27, 2015. <https://aamd.org/our-members/from-the-field/johnnetta-cole-museums-diversity-social-value>.
- Collins, Lauren. "Primal Schmooze." *The New Yorker*, March 22, 2010.
http://www.newyorker.com/talk/2010/03/22/100322ta_talk_collins.
- Comstock, Donald. "A Method for Critical Research." In *Knowledge and Values in Social and Educational Research*, edited by Eric Bredo and Walter Feinberg, 370–390. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982.
- Conant, Howard. "An Evaluation of the 1973 Arts Awareness Program of the Metropolitan Museum of Art." New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, August 1, 1973.
- Cooks, Bridget R. "Black Artists and Activism: Harlem on My Mind (1969)." *American Studies* 48, no. 1 (2007): 5–39.
- Dana, John Cotton. *The Gloom of the Museum*. University of Michigan Library, 1917.
- Davies, Maurice. "The Tomorrow People: Entry to the Museum Workforce." *Report to the Museums Association and the University of East Anglia* [Http://Www.Museumsassociation.Org/Careers/13582](http://www.museumsassociation.org/Careers/13582), 2007.
http://www.museumsassociation.org/asset_arena/8/17/13718/v0_master.pdf.
- "Decolonize Our Museums Tumblr." *Decolonize Our Museums*. Accessed December 20, 2016. <http://decolonizeourmuseums.tumblr.com/>.
- Dewey, John. *Art as Experience*. New York: Berkley Pub. Group, 2005.
- . "Preface." In *Experience And Education*. Simon and Schuster, 2007.
- Dewhurst, Marit. *Social Justice Art: A Framework for Activist Art Pedagogy*. Harvard Education, 2014.

- Dill, Bonnie Thornton, and Marla H. Kohlman. "Intersectionality: A Transformative Paradigm in Feminist Theory and Social Justice." In *Handbook of Feminist Research: Theory and Praxis*, edited by Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber, 154–74. Sage Publications, 2012.
- Dobbs, Stephen Mark. *The DBAE Handbook: An Overview of Discipline-Based Art Education*. Santa Monica, CA: The Getty Institute for the Arts, 1992.
<http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED349253>.
- Doucet, Andrea, and Natasha Mauthner. "Feminist Methodologies and Epistemology." In *Handbook of 21st Century Sociology*, 36–42. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2006. http://http-server.carleton.ca/~adoucet/pdfs/Doucet_Mauthner_Feminist_Methods_2006.pdf.
- Dubin, Steven C. *Displays of Power: Controversy in the American Museum from the Enola Gay to Sensation*. NYU Press, 2001.
- Duncan, Carol. *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*. Taylor & Francis, 1995.
- Duncan, Isadora. *My Life (Revised and Updated)*. W. W. Norton & Company, 2013.
- Eatman, Timothy K. "Engaged Scholarship and Faculty Rewards: A National Conversation." *Diversity and Democracy* 12, no. 1 (2009): 18–9.
- "Excellence and Equity: Education and the Public Dimension of Museums." Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums, 1992.
- Fisher, Michelle Millar. "Museum Education and the Pedagogic Turn." *Artwrit* VIII (Summer 2011).
- . "Museum Education and the Pedagogic Turn." *Artwrit* VIII (Summer 2011).
- Fraser, Andrea. "From the Critique of Institutions to an Institution of Critique." *Artforum* 44, no. 1 (2005): 100–106.
- Friedberg, Bernard. *Arts Awareness, a Project of the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1972.
- . *Arts Awareness II*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1973.
- Giroux, Henry A. *Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition*. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey, 1983.
- Gonzales, Elena. "Museums Working for Social Justice: Resonance and Wonder." Doctoral dissertation, Brown University, 2015.
- Greene, Maxine. *Releasing the Imagination: Essays on Education, the Arts, and Social Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1995.
- Grimes, Justin, C. Arturo Manjarrez, Kim A. Miller, and Deanne W. Swan. "Museum Universe Data File." *Institute of Museum and Library Services*, 2014.
[http://imls.gov-devel.com/sites/default/files/legacy/assets/1/AssetManager/MUDF_Documentation_2015q1.pdf](http://imls.gov/devel.com/sites/default/files/legacy/assets/1/AssetManager/MUDF_Documentation_2015q1.pdf).
- Gruber, J. Richard, and Benny Andrews. *American Icons: From Madison to Manhattan, the Art of Benny Andrews, 1948-1997*. Univ. Press of Mississippi, 1997.
- Gude, Olivia. "Postmodern Principles: In Search of a 21st Century Art Education." *Art Education* 57, no. 1 (2004): 6–14.
- Hamilton, George Heard. "Education and Scholarship in the American Museum." In *On Understanding Art Museums*, edited by Sherman E. Lee. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

- Hendrick, Keonna, and Melissa Crum. "Multicultural Critical Reflective Practice and Contemporary Art." In *Multiculturalism in Art Museums Today*, edited by Joni Boyd Acuff and Laura Evans. Rowman & Littlefield, 2014.
- Hendrick, Keonna, and Marit Dewhurst. "Journal of Museum Education Special Edition on Racism in Museum Education," December 8, 2015.
- Hesse-Biber, Sharlene Nagy. "Feminist Research: Exploring, Interrogating, and Transforming the Interconnections of Epistemology, Methodology, and Method." In *Handbook of Feminist Research: Theory and Praxis*, by Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber, 2–26. Sage Publications, 2012.
- Hobbel, Nikola, and Thandeka K Chapman. "Writing in Academic Genres: Is Social Justice a Learning Outcome?" In *Social Justice Pedagogy across the Curriculum: The Practice of Freedom*, edited by Thandeka K Chapman and Nikola Hobbel, 236–49. New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Hoving, Thomas. "Introduction." *Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 27, no. 5 (January 1969): 243–44.
- . *Making the Mummies Dance: Inside the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. Simon & Schuster, 1993.
- . "Preface." In *Harlem on My Mind: Cultural Capital of Black America, 1900–1968*, edited by Allon Schoener, unpaginated. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Hubard, Olga M. "Complete Engagement: Embodied Response in Art Museum Education." *Art Education* 60, no. 6 (2007): 46–56.
- International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. "Designing the Arc of Dialogue," n.d.
- Iyengar, Sunil. "How a Nation Engages with Art: Highlights from the 2012 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts." Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts, September 2013. <https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/highlights-from-2012-sppa-revised-oct-2015.pdf>.
- Jackson, Philip W. "The Consequences of Schooling." *The Unstudied Curriculum*, Ed. Norman V. Overly, 1970, 1–15.
- Jackson, Philip Wesley. *Life in Classrooms*. Teachers College Press, 1990.
- Jennings, Gretchen, Stacey Mann, Janeen Bryant, Matt Kirchman, Rainey Tisdale, Elissa Frankle, Jim Cullen, et al. "The Empathetic Museum Maturity Model: A Metric for Institutional Transformation in Museums." *The Empathetic Museum*, May 2016.
- Jennings, Gretchen, Aletheia Wittman, Rose Paquet Kinsley, Aleia Brown, Steven Lubar, Mike Murawski, Linda Norris, et al. "Joint Statement from Museum Bloggers and Colleagues on Ferguson and Related Events." *The Inluseum*, December 22, 2014. <http://inluseum.com/2014/12/22/joint-statement-from-museum-bloggers-colleagues-on-ferguson-related-events/>.
- Kahne, J., and E. Middaugh. "Is Patriotism Good for Democracy?" In *Pledging Allegiance: The Politics of Patriotism in America's Schools*, edited by Joel Westheimer, 115–26. New York: Teachers College Press, 2007.
- Kai-Kee, Elliott. "A Brief History of Teaching in the Art Museum." In *Teaching in the Art Museum: Interpretation as Experience*, by Rika Burnham and Elliott Kai-Kee, 19–58. J. Paul Getty Museum, 2011.
- "Kimono Wednesdays: A Conversation." *Boston Museum of Fine Arts*, February 7, 2016. <http://www.mfa.org/programs/lecture/kimono-wednesdays-a-conversation>.

- Kreitman, Marcia. Oral history interview with Marcia Kreitman, [circa 1971]. Interview by Kathy Rosenbloom. Transcript, ca 1971. Smithsonian Archives of American Art.
- Kusin, David. Letter to Stephanie Singer. "Ref.: Grant #A 40-51-72," April 1, 1975. Metropolitan Museum of Art Archives.
- Levin, Irina, and Igor Levin. *Working on the Play and the Role: The Stanislavsky Method for Analyzing the Characters in a Drama*. Ivan R. Dee, 1992.
- Levy, Howard. Interview with Howard Levy. Interview by Alyssa Greenberg. Audio file, October 7, 2015.
- Lipman, Pauline. *High Stakes Education : Inequality, Globalization, and Urban School Reform* /. New York : RoutledgeFalmer, 2004.
- Lott, Laura. AAM President, Laura Lott: Museums Are the Classrooms of the Future, October 17, 2016. <http://blooloop.com/feature/aam-president-laura-lott-museums-are-the-classrooms-of-the-future/>.
- Marstine, Janet C., ed. *The Routledge Companion to Museum Ethics: Redefining Ethics for the Twenty-First Century Museum*. 1st ed. Routledge, 2011.
- Mayer, Susan Jean. "The Early Evolution of Jean Piaget's Clinical Method." *History of Psychology* 8, no. 4 (2005): 362.
- Mayer, Susan M. "Alternatives in Me-You-Zeums." *Art Education* 31, no. 3 (1978): 18–22.
- McCauley, Mary Carole. "After Time Cover, Devin Allen Opens First Solo Show at Lewis Museum." *The Baltimore Sun*. July 3, 2015. <http://www.baltimoresun.com/entertainment/bs-ae-allen-lewis-20150704-story.html>.
- McLaren, Peter. *Life in Schools: An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education*. New York: Longman, 1989.
- "Mindfulness Meditation | Rubin Museum of Art," July 13, 2016. <http://rubinmuseum.org/events/event/mindfulness-meditation-07-13-2016>.
- "MINOM-ICOM | About Us." Accessed January 5, 2017. <http://www.minom-icom.net/about-us>.
- Moore, Porchia. "The Inclusive Museum Movement: Creating a More Inclusive, Equitable, and Culturally Responsible Museum Field." *Museum Magazine*, December 2016.
- Moreno, Jonathan D. "What You Didn't Know About That Mad Men Encounter Group." *Psychology Today*. *Impromptu Man*, May 21, 2015. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/impromptu-man/201505/what-you-didnt-know-about-mad-men-encounter-group>.
- Moscone, Jon. "Preface." In *The Art of Relevance*, by Nina Simon. Museum 2.0 (self-published), 2016.
- Murawski, Mike. "OpenThink: Visual Thinking Strategies (VTS) & Museums." *Art Museum Teaching*, April 29, 2014. <https://artmuseumteaching.com/2014/04/29/openthink-visual-thinking-strategies-vts-museums/>.
- Murphey, John T. "What You Can Do with Your Museum Education Department." *Museum News* 49, no. 2 (October 1970).

- Newsom, Barbara. "The Metropolitan Museum as an Educational Institution: A Study with Recommendations ('The Newsom Report')." New York, NY: Metropolitan Museum of Art, November 1970.
- Newsom, Barbara Y. "The Department of High School Programs and an Experiment in 'Arts Awareness' at the Metropolitan Museum of Art." In *The Art Museum as Educator: A Collection of Studies as Guides to Practice and Policy*, edited by Barbara Y. Newsom and Adele Z. Silver, 450–59. University of California Press, 1978.
- Newsom, Barbara Y., and Adele Z. Silver, eds. *The Art Museum as Educator: A Collection of Studies as Guides to Practice and Policy*. University of California Press, 1978.
- Ng, Wendy, and Syrus Marcus Ware. "Excellence and Equity?" *Multiculturalism in Art Museums Today*, 2014, 37.
- . "Excellence and Equity?" In *Multiculturalism in Art Museums Today*, edited by Joni Boyd Acuff and Laura Evans. Rowman & Littlefield, 2014.
- Nichols, De Andrea, Lyndon Barrois Jr., and Victoria Donaldson. Open letter. "Open Letter to CAM Senior Directors." Open letter, September 18, 2016.
- Nieto, Sonia, and Patty Bode. *Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural Education*. Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon, 2008.
- Oleniczak, Jen. "What Is Museum Hack?" *Art Museum Teaching*, December 12, 2013. <https://artmuseumteaching.com/2013/12/12/what-is-museum-hack/>.
- Parker III, Harry S. Interview with Harry S. Parker III in San Francisco, CA. Interview by Susan Cahan, July 19, 1999.
- . "The Art Museum and the Time of Change." *Art Education* 24, no. 9 (1971): 4–8.
- Piaget, Jean, Joan Tomlinson, and Andrew Tomlinson, eds. *The Child's Conception of the World*. London; New York: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd.; Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1929.
- Pinar, William F. *Understanding Curriculum: An Introduction to the Study of Historical and Contemporary Curriculum Discourses*. New York: P. Lang, 1995.
- Pinar, William F., William M. Reynolds, Patrick Slattery, and Peter M. Taubman. *Understanding Curriculum: An Introduction to the Study of Historical and Contemporary Curriculum Discourses*. 5 edition. New York: Peter Lang International Academic Publishers, 2006.
- Quinn, Therese. "Out of Cite, out of Mind: Social Justice and Art Education." *The Journal of Social Theory in Art Education* 26 (2006): 282–301.
- . "Social Justice and Arts Education." In *Social Justice Pedagogy across the Curriculum: The Practice of Freedom*, edited by Thandeka K Chapman and Nikola Hobbel, 223–35. New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Quinn, Therese, and William Ayers. "Foreword." In *See You When We Get There Teaching for Change in Urban Schools*, by Gregory Michie, vii–ix. New York: Teachers College Press, 2005.
- Quinn, Therese, Lisa Hochtritt, and John Ploof, eds. *Art and Social Justice Education: Culture as Commons*. Routledge, 2011.
- Radnor, Hilary A. *Researching Your Professional Practice: Doing Interpretive Research*. Open University Press, 2001.

- Roberts, Lisa C. "Affective Learning, Affective Experience: What Does It Have to Do with Museum Education." *Visitor Studies: Theory, Research, and Practice* 4 (1992): 162–168.
- . *From Knowledge to Narrative: Educators and the Changing Museum*. Smi, 1997.
- Roger Schonfeld, and Mariët Westermann. "The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Art Museum Staff Demographic Survey." The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, July 28, 2015. https://mellon.org/media/filer_public/ba/99/ba99e53a-48d5-4038-80e1-66f9ba1c020e/awmf_museum_diversity_report_aamd_7-28-15.pdf.
- Ruffins, Fath Davis. "Culture Wars Won and Lost: Ethnic Museums on the Mall, Part I: The National Holocaust Museum and the National Museum of the American Indian." *Radical History Review* 1997, no. 68 (1997): 79–100.
- . "Culture Wars Won and Lost, Part II: The National African-American Museum Project." *Radical History Review* 1998, no. 70 (1998): 78–101.
- Sandell, Richard. "On Ethics, Activism and Human Rights." In *The Routledge Companion to Museum Ethics: Redefining Ethics for the Twenty-First Century Museum*, edited by Janet C. Marstine, 1st ed. Routledge, 2011.
- Schmidt, Peter. "U. of Illinois Is Accused of Making Professor a Greek Sacrifice." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 24, 2016. <http://www.chronicle.com/article/U-of-Illinois-Is-Accused-of/235417?cid=rclink>.
- Schoener, Allon. "Editor's Foreword." In *Harlem on My Mind: Cultural Capital of Black America, 1900-1968*, edited by Allon Schoener. New York: New Press, 1995.
- . Interview with Allon Schoener in Grafton, VT. Interview by Susan Cahan, December 17, 1998.
- Shropshire, Corilyn. "Professor Says UIC Forced Him to Teach Statistics Because He Is Asian." *Chicago Tribune*. December 29, 2016. <http://www.chicagotribune.com/business/ct-uic-professor-sues-discrimination-1229-biz-20161228-story.html>.
- Simeone, Jenny, and Willis Ryder Arnold. "CAM's Latest Exhibit Leads Employees to Call for Curator's Resignation." St. Louis, Missouri: St. Louis Public Radio KWMU-1, September 22, 2016. <http://news.stlpublicradio.org/post/cams-latest-exhibit-leads-employees-call-curators-resignation>.
- Simon, Nina. "State of the MAH from Executive Director Nina Simon," November 10, 2015. <http://www.santacruzmah.org/2015/state-of-the-mah-from-executive-director-nina-simon/>.
- . *The Art of Relevance*. Museum 2.0 (self-published), 2016.
- . *The Participatory Museum*. Santa Cruz, CA: Museum 2.0 (self-published), 2010.
- . "Untitled Comment." Comment. *The Inluseum*, October 7, 2015. <http://inluseum.com/2015/10/07/two-takeaways-from-museumnext-2015/#comment-10639>.
- Sims, Lowery Stokes. "Discrete Encounters: A Personal Recollection of The Black Art Scene of the 1970s." In *Energy/Experimentation: Black Artists and Abstraction, 1964-1980*, by Kellie Jones. New York: The Studio Museum in Harlem, 2006.
- Solórzano, Daniel G., and Tara J. Yosso. "Critical Race Methodology: Counter-Storytelling as an Analytical Framework for Education Research." *Qualitative Inquiry* 8, no. 1 (2002): 23–44.

- Stuart, Jozefa. "How Hip Should a Museum Get?" *Life Magazine*, 1969, 14.
- Tharps, Lori L. "The Case for Black With a Capital B." *The New York Times*, November 18, 2014. <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/19/opinion/the-case-for-black-with-a-capital-b.html>.
- UNESCO, and ICOM. "The Santiago Declaration," 1972.
- Untitled (The Alps)*. Videocasette. Vol. 2. Choreographers Showcase. American Theatre Laboratory: Video D Studios, 1981.
- Vallance, Elizabeth. "The Public Curriculum of Orderly Images." *Educational Researcher* 24, no. 4 (March 1995): 4–13.
- "Visitors of Color." Accessed January 3, 2017. <http://visitorsofcolor.tumblr.com/?og=1>.
- Vygotskiĭ, L. S. *The Psychology of Art*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1971.
- Wardenburg, Fred, and Davis Bernstein. *Arts Awareness*. Instructional. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1972.
- Williams, Randy. Interview with Randy Williams. Interview by Alyssa Greenberg. Audio file, October 8, 2015.
- "Writer Jack Qu'emi Explains the Meaning of 'Latinx.'" *PRI's The World*. Public Radio International, June 21, 2016. <http://www.pri.org/stories/2016-06-21/writer-jack-quemi-explains-meaning-latinx>.
- Yenawine, Philip. "Curriculum Vitae," May 2008.
- . Interview with Philip Yenawine, March 2016. Interview by Alyssa Greenberg. Audio file, March 10, 2016.
- . Interview with Philip Yenawine, November 2016. Interview by Alyssa Greenberg. Audio file, November 1, 2016.
- . Oral history interview with Philip Yenawine, [ca. 1971.]. Interview by Kathy Rosenbloom. Transcript, ca 1971. Smithsonian Archives of American Art.
- . *Visual Thinking Strategies: Using Art to Deepen Learning across School Disciplines*, 2013.