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Abstract

In the past, a multitude of studies have been conducted that examine the importance of arts education for both social and academic reasons. However, arts programs are still facing many challenges and numerous arts classes are being cut from schools. My thesis will briefly discuss some previous studies on the importance of the arts, as well as challenges facing arts education today. These obstacles have created a need for policies to protect arts education.

From the studies previously conducted, it has been found that there is a correlation between student involvement in the arts and high academic performance. Students who participate in the arts are also given an outlet in which to express themselves and gain a social identity. Arts education is important not only for the sake of the arts, but also because of the positive impact it has on the lives of students overall.

Some of the policy challenges that will be examined include the focus on testing, No Child Left Behind, college admissions standards, and state graduation standards. Such factors have led to many arts programs being cut, which is why protective policies must be implemented so there is a concrete reason and defense for arts education programs.

One specific policy that is in place is the Comprehensive Arts Planning Program (CAPP) in Minnesota. This two year program helps eligible schools create and enact long-range plans for developing their arts education programs. It is funded by the Minnesota legislature and gives schools a clear plan for enhancing their art programs. An in-depth examination of CAPP and its results will determine if more programs like this should be implemented nationwide, or if other policies will be more effective in preserving arts education programs in schools.
Introduction

Why do people even care about arts education? When the math and science scores of students in the United States are falling well behind other countries why should any time be spent worrying about the state of arts education programs? As a product of a rigorous music education, I have a wealth of personal experience that supports why the arts have been beneficial to my own individual development. However, saying the arts are important is simply not enough to build a substantial argument on. In order for arts education advocates to make any progress, they must learn how to translate their arguments into the language of policy. This means providing qualitative and evidential proof that the arts have something to offer other than just teaching a child how to paint. This has resulted in many writings regarding the numerous instrumental benefits of the arts. There is an increasing amount of focus on the economic importance of the arts – how they can create jobs and can be used to revitalize cities – as well as how the arts benefit academic performance. Arts organizations are facing serious budget cuts and reduced donations. Amongst the general outcry, there seems to be a disproportionately low amount of time spent on advocating for arts education funding. Without trained students, the arts organizations in question would have no performers or artists to sustain them. Arts education programs are also in danger of facing extreme budget cuts and many are being removed from schools entirely.

These programs are in jeopardy, in part, due to the reactive nature of current arts education policy. Arts policy has come about almost entirely as a reaction to general education policies. General standards for arts education and assessment programs for the arts came to be only when those things were developed by core subject areas. The arts react to current education policy in an attempt to remain relevant in the minds of policy makers. Very rarely is policy
developed for the sole purpose of serving the arts. My research sought to determine the current challenges facing arts education and how policies are either helping or hurting arts programs. I also examined a specific program in Minnesota, a rare example of policy designed specifically for arts education, to find if this type of policy could be implemented nationwide. Research tactics included an in-depth look at current writings regarding the importance of arts education and the challenges facing arts programs, as well as an analysis of the Comprehensive Arts Planning Program in Minnesota.

**Literature Review**

There are currently very few writings or studies that specifically examine arts education policies. Much has been written about how the arts react to education policies like assessments and standardized testing, but the area of policy created specifically for arts education has yet to be examined. Currently, the major trend in arts writing is the effort to demonstrate concrete proof of the importance of arts education. In 2004, the RAND Corporation published a report titled “Gifts of the Muse: Reframing the Debate about the Benefits of the Arts.” The preface of the document states that it was published in order for the public and policy makers reach informed decisions regarding the development of the arts (McCarthy iii). This report examines five instrumental benefits of the arts – cognitive benefits, attitudinal and behavioral, health, community-level, and economic benefits. The report also touches on an area often overlooked when discussing arts policy – the intrinsic, fundamental benefits of the arts. The ultimate recommendation of the report is to focus on creating more of a demand for the arts instead of simply maintaining the current supply. They state that this type of argument should be able to
gather a wide base of support because it focuses on an individual’s experience with the arts as opposed to focusing on specific arts organizations (McCarthy 69). They suggest that a large percentage of parents feel that the arts are just as important as core subjects. This report was created to be used as a starting point to develop an arts advocacy argument, so it offers little in the way of strong recommendations or evidence that these arguments can be truly effective in crafting policy.

Tina Beveridge wrote an article that outlines the basic problems created for arts classes as a result of No Child Left Behind. This article, “No Child Left Behind and Fine Arts Classes,” lays out the basic structure of NCLB and why it has not been conducive to the proliferation of arts classes. The emphasis of the act is on testing and getting measurable results. The arts are not a tested subject and have therefore become increasingly marginalized and cut from schools in order to focus solely on tested subjects. Schools lose funding if they do not meet NCLB’s standards of Adequate Yearly Progress and that is why schools cut arts classes in order to devote more time to core subjects. Beveridge also covers how class scheduling practices are being affected by NCLB, which is another reason students have less access to arts classes (Beveridge 5). Beveridge offers very little in terms of solutions or recommendations going forward. She offers a circular argument regarding the assessment of music programs (assessment being yet another policy obstacle for arts classes) saying that assessments for music programs should be crafted better for a truer evaluation of the subject, but that there are too many discrepancies between programs for music to be objectively assessed and therefore cannot become a tested subject. This article is useful for learning about the basic problems created by NCLB, but does not provide much insight about steps to take in the future.
Anne Grey also wrote an article addressing the effects of No Child Left Behind on arts education entitled “No Child Left Behind in Art Education Policy: A Review of Key Recommendations for Arts Language Revisionists.” This article does cover the heavily discussed area of the effects NCLB has had on arts education, but what sets it apart from the sea of writings on the subject is that it provides three sets of recommendations from education and arts advocacy groups for arts policy and the possible revision of NCLB in the future. Grey goes on to say that arts advocacy groups should join together to create a cohesive set of recommendations and revisions for NCLB to ensure the broadest and most effective outcome (Grey 13). This article is useful because it observes the problem from a policy perspective instead of simply an advocacy perspective. The author still mentions the importance of using arguments of the intrinsic benefits, which many writers are ignoring. What this article does not provide is evidence of effective arts policies that are not a part of general education policies. This area still has yet to be explored, but articles like this hint that trends in arts writing could be heading that way soon.

**Benefits of Arts Education**

There have been multitude of studies done that examine the importance of arts education. Arts education programs are being forced to provide concrete evidence as to why they are beneficial to overall student performance because this has become the most effective way to preserve arts programs in schools, regardless of the unique skills and concepts that are developed solely through the arts.

These studies demonstrate how arts programs create educational, economic, and even health benefits. These instrumental benefits of the arts have become a primary tool in advocacy
for funding and support of the arts. Investing in arts and culture is justified by culture’s ability to promote public policy objectives. If current trends in education policy call for accountability and measurable results, then arts classes must respond to this to prove their worth. High school students who study the arts have been shown to have higher standardized test scores, improved basic math and reading skills, as well as a higher capacity for critical and creative thinking, and improved attitudes that promote the learning process itself. These students developed greater self-discipline and increased motivation to do well in school. At-risk youth were also deemed to have better self-esteem and developed pro-social attitudes and behaviors (McCarthy, 11). More studies are being done that examine how art classes teach critical and creative thinking skills that are not developed through other core subjects. Students in visual arts classes gain great observational skills and all art classes develop a student’s ability to self-criticize and help students learn to persevere, learn through experimentation and from making mistakes (Winner, Hetland 29-30)

Many studies have shown that the arts have great economic benefits in addition to encouraging strong academic performance from arts students. Few people dispute that something that encourages economic growth provides public benefits. The arts create direct benefits to the economy in the form of employment, tax revenues, and spending in communities. Arts can also provide indirect benefits by attracting people and other businesses to the area. The first step taken in arts advocacy is usually an argument demonstrating the economic importance of the arts, as opposed to the educational or intrinsic benefits. Though, without fostering arts education, there will be no future artists to support creative industries and the economic benefits they produce (McCarthy, 17).
These added benefits of the arts are certainly beneficial for arts advocacy purposes, but they do ignore the principle reason that people become involved in the arts in the first place. An individual’s participation in the arts has very little to do with the instrumental benefits of the arts and is instead primarily driven by the intrinsic benefits. The arts provide a distinctive type of pleasure and emotional stimulation that is a unique and personal experience (McCarthy 37). Discussing the intrinsic benefits focuses on how the arts specifically affect an individual, but these arguments can still be extremely helpful for arts advocates. People become involved with the arts for a variety of reasons and one of the ways to demonstrate the importance of the arts is to draw examples from the wealth of personal experience that is available. Participation in the arts is motivated by the intrinsic benefits through which the instrumental benefits are achieved as well (McCarthy 70).

**Policy Challenges Facing Arts Education**

However, many proponents of the arts feel that arguments for instrumental benefits can become obstacles for true arts advocacy because the statistics are often exaggerated and supported by correlations instead of causation. Weak arguments in support of the arts are just one of many challenges arts programs face in the struggle to get funding. Studies on arts education in particular often have no proof of direct causation and rely on strong correlations. There are simply too many variables in student backgrounds and demographics to determine if the arts are a direct cause of better academic performance. There are even holes in arguments provided by seemingly reliable studies on the economic benefits of the arts. These studies assume that spending on the arts is done in a vacuum - that if the arts were not consumed then that money
would not be spent elsewhere, which is simply not the case. If arguments for the instrumental benefits of the arts cannot be made, then arts advocacy groups can only rely on long-standing arguments that stress the intrinsic value of the arts. Policy makers may not be interested in hearing why the arts make people feel good, but to remove the language of intrinsic benefits from arguments in favor of arts policy is to ignore the basic, fundamental appeal of the arts (DeVereaux, 172).

In addition to weak arguments in support of the arts, there are many educational policies that have suppressed the development of arts education. One of these factors is the adoption of state and national standards for education. Arts education joined in with other primary subjects by adopting standards so as not to be disregarded in the field of education. This, however, lead to a uniform evaluation of a subject that by its very definition is not meant to be standardized. Arts programs reacted to the trends in general education policy and established criteria for a subject area that is extremely difficult to evaluate and regulate. These standards can be harmful to arts programs if they fail meet them because they can still face the possibility of funding cuts regardless of following suit and establishing standards in the first place. Having these standards in place can be beneficial if they require schools to have arts programs in the first place, but they do create another set of complications for arts education.

Another trend in current education policy is using assessments to determine if standards are being met. Assessments differ from standardized testing in that they are often low stakes and are simply used to measure academic progress. One of the major assessments for arts programs is the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). The NAEP is a low stakes assessment because it does not report any individual scores – its major function is to provide reliable information about the overall knowledge, skills, and abilities of the nation’s students. For visual
arts, the 1997 revision of NAEP sought to measure students’ ability to create and respond to works of art. They defined creating as “expressing ideas and feelings in the form of an original work of art,” and responding as “observing, describing, analyzing, and evaluating works of art,” (Myford, 641).

One of the problems with this assessment is that the time used to assess was quite limited, therefore making it difficult to obtain accurate information on a student’s ability to produce a work of art. The 1997 NAEP for visual arts had students spend 70% of the assessment working on creating exercises and 30% was spent on responding exercises. One of the major critiques of this assessment is that it uses a very small sample size and that undermines the validity of the findings (Myford, 650). In 2008, the NAEP did an assessment of music programs. The National Association of Music Education (MENC) felt that the 2008 assessment was flawed in several ways. This assessment did not evaluate students’ ability to perform or create music, which is a hallmark of music standards across the country. They too felt that the sample size was too small to be a valid measurement of student performance. Also, because the format of the test has changed since 1997 it is very difficult to compare the results of the assessments to determine if any progress was made (Morrison, 2). If these assessments can be structured in such a way that accurately reflects the progress of arts programs then they can become an extremely beneficial tool in advocating for arts programs. Until that time, however, they continue to be another obstacle for arts education programs to overcome.

Another policy factor that has had an effect on arts education programs is the widespread use of standardized testing. Performance on these tests is what schools and the public use to determine the quality of education that students receive. These tests drive the curriculum and because arts are often not a tested subject they can easily be disregarded and put aside for
subjects that are deemed more important. Student performance must be evaluated and measured, but the arts are not subjects that lend themselves to assessment. High stakes testing can even affect scheduling practices. Students who fail to pass a section of a test might lose any elective hours they have in order to take remedial classes pertaining to tested subjects and will therefore be unable to participate in arts classes (Beveridge, 5).

Perhaps the most well known policy that has been damaging to arts education recently is the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). This act was signed into law in 2002 and does include the arts as a core subject but provides very little in means of assistance and support for arts education. In 2003, arts funds were cut from the act and only $30 million was allocated for programs that integrated arts into the regular curriculum. NCLB tests math, reading, and writing each year to ensure that schools are making “Adequate Yearly Progress,” which determines the amount of federal funding the schools will receive. If a school fails to meet its benchmarks for AYP then they are put on a one-year probationary status, during which they are required to use their own resources to reformulate their strategies in order to bring failing students up to the benchmark level. If they fail to meet Adequate Yearly Progress again, the school will lose funding. The arts are not assessed to determine AYP, which is the greatest source of concern for arts education programs. More and more schools are focusing time and resources on tested subjects by limiting arts instruction time, relegating the arts to sole extracurricular status, or cutting arts programs altogether. Some arts teachers are being required to incorporate tested subjects into their curricula. This is dangerous for the arts because it means that they are not being recognized as their own distinct subject areas with skills and concepts specific to them (Beveridge, 4-5). Schools simply have no incentive to fund subjects that are not tested. As of 2007, 71% of schools had reduced instruction time for arts, history, and music to focus on
reading and math. The extreme focus on testing and measurable results has created a generally toxic environment for teaching and has created many more problems in the realm of education beyond those of the arts (Grey, 10).

Some feel that the designation of the arts as a core subject in No Child Left Behind is actually a victory of sorts for arts education programs. The Department of Education’s Doug Herbertt noted in 2007 that “the department is not giving districts permission to disregard the arts as a core subject area under NCLB. To the contrary…the act encourages them to find ways to make arts a priority,” (Grey, 10). This statement hardly seems true considering that so many arts programs are feeling the effects of cuts from both time and funding, in addition to the fact that many states’ education standards do not recognize the arts as a core subject area. Some people feel that the limiting of school arts programs has been beneficial for community arts organizations that have education outreach programs. Organizations with weekend or after school educational programs can see an increase in participants who are not getting an arts education at school. However, in a struggling economy, it is highly doubtful that families can afford any type of after school program that might have a fee attached to it. There is no doubt that the effect that NCLB has had on arts education has been mostly negative, but it can also be said that the elimination of arts programs has generally increased attention and awareness of arts education in general (Grey, 10-11).

The number of policies for standards, testing, and funding for the arts is simply staggering, and yet none seem to provide a real solution for how arts education should be addressed in schools today. If the existing policies have yet to be beneficial for arts education then it seems ridiculous to argue in favor of more policy. However, most of the issues that were just discussed have arisen from trends in general education policy that the arts have attempted to
adapt to. Rarely is any education policy designed specifically around arts education. In order for policy in this field to be beneficial for arts programs it needs to be specifically tailored for arts education and the unique challenges that come with it.

**Minnesota’s Comprehensive Arts Planning Program**

One policy that was created for the sole purpose of promoting arts education is Minnesota’s Comprehensive Arts Planning Program (CAPP). This program was initiated in 1983 and is funded by the state legislature and managed by the Perpich Center for Arts Education. It is a two year program that helps schools develop a five year plan for improving arts education in the district and assists the schools in implementing the plan during the second year of the program.

The Perpich Center for Arts Education is the organization that manages the distribution and training for the CAPP program. This Center houses a professional development and research group as well as a tuition-free arts high school. The Center was founded by Governor Rudy Perpich who, after an extended stay in Europe, was inspired by the seamless integration of the arts and education there. The Center was established as a state agency in 1985 when it was expanded to include a professional development center and a statewide arts resource library. The Center is a part of the Executive Branch of government in Minnesota and reports directly to the governor. In 2009, Governor Tim Pawlenty proposed that the school be converted to a charter school and state funding be cut; however, his proposition failed and the Center still remains a state agency. The state currently provides the Perpich Center with about six million dollars annually (Teske, 25)
The Perpich Center is the primary body that selects CAPP recipients. They designate sites after consulting with the Minnesota Alliance for Arts Education and the Minnesota State Arts Board. The program is available to all Minnesota public school districts, including consolidated, combined, or paired districts, which have not been involved with CAPP during the past five years. A district that has been involved within five years may reapply if it has joined a new group of districts. Up to 30 sites are selected every two years. There are six required criteria the Comprehensive Arts Planning Program State Steering Committee and the Perpich Center must use to select CAPP recipients. These criteria are: a willingness by the selected site to designate a program chair for comprehensive planning with sufficient authority to implement the program; a willingness by the site to establish a committee comprised of people from the school district and community to promote comprehensive arts education in the district; a commitment by the committee to take part in training offered by the state Department of Education; commitment to assess the need of arts education; commitment by the committee to assess its involvement in the program; willingness of the site to adopt a long-range arts education plan for the district; and the distribution of the location of the sites should be an even representation of urban, suburban, and rural districts. The Steering Committee and the Center may also develop additional criteria as they see fit (Minn. Statute § 129C.26).

The first year of the program focuses on providing assistance and support for the school district’s planning team in creating a district-wide, five-year plan to address programs, partnerships, and arts education policies. These planning teams meet three times a year to take part in training, as well as exchange information and strategies. During these meetings, they primarily examine and discuss six areas: school arts curricula and assessment, professional development and leadership, arts education facilities, equipment, supplies, and materials,
partnerships with artists/arts organizations, arts in the community, and local CAPP committee operation/arts policies (CAPP).

According to the 2011 Minnesota state statues, selected schools will receive $1,250 each year for two years if 30 sites are selected. If less than 30 are chosen, each district will receive an additional proportionate share of money. The five-year long-range plan must be submitted to the Perpich Center to receive funding for the second year of the program in which the implementation of the five-year plan will begin. Funding can only be spent for the purpose of arts education programs. CAPP funds can be used for awareness and advocacy, marketing and public relations, resources and memberships in professional organizations for the committee, conferences and consultants, registration fees for related conferences and workshops, as well as release time for teachers to attend state sponsored meetings or meetings within the district for CAPP work. Schools are allowed to receive additional funding for the program from private sources and other governmental agencies, including state and federal funds allotted for arts education (Minn. Statute § 129C.26).

Past CAPP sites have used the funds for a wide array of purposes. The first CAPP site used the funds to build and renovate its arts facility. Other sites have created dance festivals, built electronic music labs, developed permanent art displays in their schools, and established partnerships with professional arts organizations for annual performances with CAPP funding. The Minneapolis Public Schools district was selected to receive CAPP funding in 2006. They were able to create an extremely detailed long-range plan for the school district that outlined future actions, outcomes, responsible parties, sources of funding/resources, and a timeline for each stage of the plan (Past CAPP Sites).
The Minneapolis Public Schools District outlined three main goals in its Comprehensive Arts Plan. Each goal had a general desired outcome, and strategic levels and targets that specifically detailed the actions and desired results for each main goal. The first objective outlined by the Minneapolis’ Comprehensive Arts Plan was to ensure district wide equity of arts programs for students so that all school sites could provide consistent, sequential arts education and integrate arts in the regular curricula from kindergarten through the twelfth grade. One of the actions they took to achieve that goal was to reinstate instrumental music programs throughout the district so that students could have access to music education in order to work towards achieving the state’s arts standards, which are required for graduation. Responsible parties for this action included the schools’ fine arts coordinators, school administration, and CAPP leadership teams. Resources for this stage were provided by an outside charity and money from the Minneapolis Public Schools system. The timeline to achieve this goal was over the course of four years, from 2006-2011. The other two main goals of the Minneapolis district CAPP plan were ensuring excellence in and through the arts for all students, and maintaining accountability throughout the comprehensive arts plan (Comprehensive Arts Plan, 20-32).

Not all districts have the means to develop a plan as detailed as the Minneapolis district, but it can still serve as an excellent model for future CAPP sites to observe. One of the most important features of the Minneapolis plan is the commitment to maintaining accountability throughout the process of implementing the plan. This is something that all CAPP sites need to be committed to in order to ensure that their arts programs will have continued success. One factor that has made CAPP so vital to Minnesota is that students are required to graduate with one arts credit if they wish to go to a Minnesota college or university. High schools are required to offer at least three art areas from media arts, theater, dance, music, and visual arts. Elementary
schools require that children study two of four arts areas. Those four areas are defined as dance, music, theater, and visual arts. These standards make arts education a necessity in the state and mean that the CAPP program will continue to be needed by schools so that they can fulfill the requirements set by the state (Teske, 25-26).

The Comprehensive Arts Planning Program, along with the Perpich Center for Arts Education, has become an ingrained part of arts education in Minnesota. Both have been a presence in education policy for almost 30 years proving that they are successful entities. School districts have recognized the importance of arts education, the need for school and community awareness, and administrative support for these programs. CAPP is an invaluable resource for schools that are committed to developing and strengthening their arts programs. The fact that this program has been around for so long speaks volumes of its success, making it a model for other states to examine. However, CAPP’s long history could also mean that even though it has been successful in Minnesota, it may be extremely difficult for other states to develop similar programs today. Overall, Minnesota’s Comprehensive Arts Planning Program does provide other states with an example of a successful arts education policy.

**Policy Analysis**

The Comprehensive Arts Planning Program is a unique policy that was specifically designed and implemented for the sole purpose of furthering arts education. What makes it even more noteworthy is the fact that it has actually been quite successful. This program is important for arts education in the state for both symbolic and realistic purposes. It denotes the importance of arts education at a state level and also provides real assistance to schools that want to
supplement or develop their arts programs. The assistance CAPP provides for schools to help develop their plans is extremely important because most schools would not have the knowledge or resources to develop a realistic long-term plan otherwise. Every past CAPP site through 2006 has reported an accomplishment achieved with funding, therefore demonstrating that the CAPP program has been very successful in Minnesota.

However, as with every policy, there are aspects of CAPP that can be improved. Parts of the program are somewhat idealistic. The plans that schools develop set some lofty goals and the schools, who needed help with their arts programs in the first place, are solely responsible for maintaining the accountability to ensure that the plans are implemented. Though every site has reported a successful use of funding, some schools developed annual festivals that require much more funding and work than their five-year plan accounted for. After the hands-on help is no longer given to the schools, how many sites utilize the resources in the Perpich Center? The success of this program depends on the determination of the sites to see their plans through and to maintain a commitment to arts education even with the pressures of standardized testing.

Another factor that limits the effectiveness of CAPP is that schools are only provided with a meager $1,250 for two years if the maximum number of sites is selected. It is nice that the money comes from the state, but some schools would have no problem raising that money in a fundraiser. Minnesota should reduce the maximum number of sites each year so that selected recipients are guaranteed to receive more funding to achieve their goals.

This type of program would also be extremely difficult to implement in other states. The governing body of CAPP, the Perpich Center, has been a state agency since the 80s and is protected by Minnesota state statutes. It would be nearly impossible for a state to try to convince taxpayers to fund an establishment like the Perpich Center or even an arts planning program with
state funding today. If a state was truly determined to implement some form of arts education policy, it would be important to take into account the existing policies for arts education. A simple change like requiring an arts credit to graduate with a higher level high school diploma or as a college admission standard, like they do in Minnesota, could greatly increase the standing of a state’s arts education programs. There are national recommended standards that are set by arts organizations that states can take into account if they are trying set their own arts goals. The biggest factor that stands in the way of arts education today is the focus on standardized testing. Until No Child Left Behind is no longer a factor, tested subjects will continue to be the primary areas of focus and recipients of funding.

If high-stakes standardized testing ever becomes simply a measure of progress instead of a primary determinant of funding, arts programs may have a chance to develop once again. At that time, other states could look to the Comprehensive Arts Planning Program as a guide. Schools need more than funding to develop successful arts programs – they need plans, accountability, and resources to make them happen. A plan like CAPP would be extremely beneficial for schools that have had their arts programs cut entirely and are attempting to restart them. It is a model that could be implemented in other states if ever the circumstances for redeveloping arts education were right.

**Conclusion**

It is nearly impossible to determine one definitive solution for the multitude of problems facing arts policy today. It is clear that many people feel that the arts are important, which is why so many advocacy groups exist. This is certainly an encouraging sign, but the point at which
advocacy yields results in this field is yet to be determined. The arguments touting the positive benefits of the arts on student performance will continue to be made despite the growing evidence that these arguments are, in fact, not strongly supported. There is currently research being done that examines the relationship between success in adulthood and arts involvement in youth. This research has, so far, shown that there is a positive relationship between the achievements of the individuals involved and their amount of involvement in the arts. Further studies like this can be beneficial to the arts from both educational and economic advocacy positions. Demonstrating that the arts can lead to professional success in the future is certainly a compelling argument to keep arts classes in schools.

It is also difficult to determine whether or not more policy will actually be effective in promoting arts education. It is evident that current education policies have created problems for the evaluation of arts programs, but it can also be said that these policies have kept arts education in the conversation of education policy and that might be the best arts advocates can hope for at the moment. Perhaps the most realistic solution for arts education may be a few simple changes to the funding structure of No Child Left Behind. It takes years to gather data to determine if changes in education policy are effective or not, which makes evaluating and recommending entirely new policies extremely difficult. It would be interesting to see the results of other states implementing programs like CAPP, but it is extremely unlikely that policies like it will be put into practice elsewhere.
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