

# Dance as Core Content in U.S. Education: New Standards for a New Century\*

Bashaw, Barbara\*\*

- |  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| I. Introduction  | IV. Current Core     |
| II. History of Arts as Core Content<br>Designation in Education  | Bibliography<br>국문초록 |
| III. Writing the National Core Arts Standards<br>(NCAS) in Dance |                      |

## I. Introduction

Within the past one-hundred years in the United States, great strides have been made in establishing the arts as core content in education. Most recently these strides have included the development of a new set of learning standards that will implicitly establish a foothold for the arts as core content in education in the new century. The new 2014 National Core Arts Standards (NCAS) replace the first trail-blazing set of national standards that had been published 20 years earlier in 1994. This article will review the brief history of the arts as core content claim, citing key events in the development of arts in education and specifically, dance education in the U.S. It will then shift to describing the process of developing the 2014 NCAS learning standards, where the questioning of what might comprise core learning in the arts was prevalent throughout the creation process. In this sense this article presents both an external view of core content as a reoccurring arts-in-education issue in the U.S. as well as an internal view establishing core learning that could be viable on a national level and in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

As a member of 2014 NCAS national task force, the author reveals her lived experience and recollections of developing the National Core Arts Standards as a qualitative case example. The NCAS required five years of systematic, comprehensive and collaborative development by a dedicated team of voluntary professionals from across the nation in the U.S. Therefore, it is assumed that the NCAS project itself was scholarly in nature as it actively addressed layered criteria, including

\* An earlier version of this paper was presented at 21st KRSDS' Conference, 'Academic Discourse on Dance'.

\*\* Professor of Rutgers University, [bbashaw@rci.rutgers.edu](mailto:bbashaw@rci.rutgers.edu)

the identification of clear goals, preparation through research and analyses; application of rigorous methods; review and reflective critique; presentation of significant results, including the publication of the NCAS website, presentation at conferences and professional development workshops.<sup>1)</sup> In so describing this case, it is intended that readers may be able to compare the arts education policies of their own regions to developments in the U.S.

## II. History of Arts as Core Content Designation in Education

Over the past one-hundred years there has been a concerted effort to establish the arts as *core content* within the U.S. educational system, including PK-12 school systems and the universities. By *core content*, it is meant the arts as central to, essential to and foundational to the goals of education and as well as a democratic right to learn for all individuals within their compulsory education.<sup>2)</sup> But while dance was a crucial part of indigenous cultures in the Americas, the virtues of dance activity were only irregularly lauded during the early colonization of the United States. The puritanical religious beliefs of the first European settlers in the 1600's and part of the 1700's permeated the values of the newly forming nation. As such, dance was largely rejected dance as a social convention or performing art.<sup>3)</sup>

However, as the nation populated with immigrants from other regions of the world, values toward dance also began to shift. During the late 1800's, a "rediscovery of the body" as well as an appreciation for "the thought and emotion as expressed through the body," began to occur as a result of burgeoning changes of belief brought on by the natural sciences and the discoveries of ancient civilizations that captured the imaginations of many Europeans and Americans.<sup>4)</sup> With this new appreciation for the body, Delsarte methods were pioneered within physical education teacher preparation programs in the U.S. by the 1880's and in this same vein, Dalcroze Eurythmics were incorporated by the early 1900's.<sup>5)</sup> But it was not until the 1920's that dance found its place solidly within education.

This achievement would begin quite serendipitously in 1916 when Margaret H'Doubler, a

---

1) L. Y. Overby(2015), *Public Scholarship in Dance: Teaching, Choreography, Research, Service and Assessment for Community Engagement*(Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics).

2) J. Bonbright(2000), National Agenda for Dance Arts Education: The Evolution of Dance as an Art Form Intersects with the Evolution of Federal Interest in, and Support of, Arts Education. *Dancing in the Millennium Conference*, Washington, DC.

3) T. K. Hagood(2000), *A History of Dance in American Higher Education: Dance and the American University*(Lewiston, NY: E. Mellen Press). p.36.

4) Ibid., p.39.

5) Ibid., pp.38-40.

women's physical education instructor with a background in biology and no background in dance, took her sabbatical at Columbia University, Teacher's College in New York City. Here, H'Doubler encountered John Dewey and other progressive philosophers who were re-thinking education.<sup>6)</sup> Dewey, along with his fellow progressives, had recently upturned educational tradition with new thoughts as to what constituted learning.<sup>7)</sup> Dewey recognized the unity of body-mind and condemned the mind over body dualism so prevalent in Western philosophy. For Dewey, students are active knowledge makers. He believed that the body and mind were integrated during action and experience. He considered experience as coupled with reflective thought to be central to learning.<sup>8)</sup> The teacher's role therefore was to carefully organize opportunities for learning experiences and then to guide students' experiential process. This was in direct conflict with the traditional educational approaches at the time, which understood the teacher as the transmitter of knowledge and students as passive learners. It was into this philosophical landscape that H'Doubler tread.

During her sabbatical stay in New York City, H'Doubler's supervisor at the University of Wisconsin tasked her with discovering a type of dance that would be "worth a college woman's time".<sup>9)</sup> To her disappointment, H'Doubler, who had no experience in dance, learned that she would be responsible for teaching a women's dance course upon her return to the university. With the imminence of this in mind, H'Doubler set out to visit numerous dance classes offered throughout the city. Armed with knowledge of anatomical and other scientific principles from her undergraduate study and new ideas about learning she gathered from Dewey and the other progressives, H'Doubler was appalled by what she observed.<sup>10)</sup> Returning to the University of Wisconsin in 1917, H'Doubler was eager to find a new way to approach dance – dance as an educative process. She began to examine the role of proprioception as a body-mind mechanism and from this, developed a radical, new and creative approach to dance that was arguable from both humanistic as well as scientific perspectives.<sup>11)</sup> H'Doubler began to experiment with and perfect her approach. In 1926, she was able to establish dance as a major within the physical education department at the University of Wisconsin – the first dance major in U.S higher education. This was a primary step in designating dance as a valid

---

6) J. Ross(2000), *Moving Lessons: Margaret H'Doubler and the Beginning of Dance in American Education*(Madison: University of Wisconsin Press); J. M. Wilson, T. K. Hagood & M. A. Brennan(2006), *Margaret H'Doubler: The Legacy of America's Dance Education Pioneer: An Anthology*(Youngstown, N.Y: Cambria Press).

7) T. K. Hagood(2000); J. Ross(2000).

8) R. Shusterman(2008), *Body Consciousness: A Philosophy of Mindfulness and Somaesthetics*(Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press).

9) J. Ross(2000).

10) T. K. Hagood(2000); J. Ross(2000).

11) B. Bashaw(2011), *Young Choreographers: An Ethno Phenomenological Study of Developmental and Socio-Cultural Influences during Untutored Dance Making* (New York: Columbia University, Teachers College), 369 pages; ProQuest, AAT 3484341.

educative practice. By the 1930's dance programs had blossomed all over the U.S. in both universities and PK-12 education. H'Doubler's protégés headed those programs efforts<sup>12)</sup> as well as started a policy-generating infrastructure by developing the first professional dance education organization within the auspices of the American Physical Education Association.<sup>13)</sup>

Although dance was growing within education, it was not until the mid-1960's that federal legislation began to strengthen the position of dance and the other arts within U.S. education. The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) was established and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), passed in 1965, spurred partnerships between education and the arts and enabled federal funding for the research and development of arts education.<sup>14)</sup> In 1969, the NEA funded the Artists-in-Schools program. In 1973, by means of the first congressional mandate for support of the arts, the Alliance for Arts Education (AAE) was established.<sup>15)</sup>

These initiatives, along with the resultant research and literature being produced about arts education paved the way for perhaps the most important achievement thus far in the recognition of arts, and as such dance, in education – the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*. Signed into legislation by the U.S. Congress in 1994, recognized the arts as academic study. Dance was specifically articulated as a discipline within this law. All the arts, dance included, were furthermore declared as core content of equal importance to subjects such as science, math, language and history.<sup>16)</sup>

As a part of the Goals 2000 Act, a National Education Standards and Improvement Council was established to initiate the development of learning outcomes that were rigorous and reflective of best practices in education. A consortium of organizations representing teachers in the arts (dance, music, theater and visual arts) obtained funding from the U.S Department of Education, the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment of the Humanities, to develop the first set of learning standards in the arts. Published in 1994, the *National Standards for Arts Education*, although not mandated, was widely adopted across individual states within the U.S.

While Goals 2000 recognized the arts as core content, each individual state in the U.S. may interpret policies individually within state legislatures. As such there remains variety in the “quality and availability”<sup>17)</sup> of arts learning in U.S. schools dependent on individual state legislatures. One state may be quite different from another in how federal legislation is interpreted and ultimately applied. For example, the state of New Jersey decided not to adopt the National standards directly, but to adjust them in accordance with local interests. New Jersey arts advocates insured that that the educational

---

12) J. Ross(2000).

13) T. K. Hagoood(2000), p.159.

14) J. Bonbright(2000), p.3.

15) Ibid., p.4.

16) Ibid., pp.5-6.

17) NCCAS. (2014). *National Core Arts Standards: A Conceptual Framework for Arts Learning*(Alexandria, VA: NCCAS.), p.4.

administrative code (education laws) specifically stated that the arts were to have core content status. Furthermore, that code specified that equitable access to the arts is equivalent to offering four arts disciplines (dance, music, theater and visual arts) as a sequential and comprehensive education in PK-12 schools.<sup>18)</sup>

In 2001, a Highly Qualified Teacher provision was added to the *Goals 2000: No Child Left Behind Act*. This provision encouraged states to apply for funding to improve and maintain teacher quality.<sup>19)</sup> As a result, many states began to improve teacher certification qualifications and to instill mandates restricting educators from teaching content they did not hold licenses for. In an indirect way, this further advantaged an “arts as core content” position as many states required significant evidence of artistic practice experience in order to be able to teach the arts, either on a college transcript or evidence of professional employment depending on the type of licensure.

Finally, in 2011, nearly 20 years after the first set of national standards had been adopted across the U.S., a consortium of arts education organizations joined forces once again to re-envision and develop a new set of voluntary, national “core arts” standards reflective of current and projected educational practice. This group, known as the National Coalition of Core Arts Standards (NCCAS) was comprised of key personnel from the National Dance Education Organization (NDEO), National Association of Music Education (NAME), Educational Theatre Association (ETA), National Art Education Association (NAEA) as well as the State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education (SEADAE) amongst others. As such, it is important to distinguish that core content and learning arts in the U.S. are nationally defined and not federal in nature,<sup>20)</sup> as the standards were not initiated by federal government, but rather were designed by the public, specifically a national consortium of experts made up of PK-12 arts educators, university faculty, teaching-artists, and arts advocates. Published in 2014, an overview of the process of developing the national core arts standards in dance is the next discussion in this paper.

### III. Writing the National Core Arts Standards (NCAS) in Dance

In this next section, the author shares with readers her personal account of the development of the 2014 National Core Arts Standards as one of eight, dance writing task force members selected nationally to serve on the project. The purpose is to shift the view from external to internal. The

---

18) NJAEP. (2012), *New Jersey Arts Census: Keeping the Promise: Arts education for Every Child: The Distance Traveled –The Journey Remaining*(Indianapolis, IN: Music for All), p.4.

19) 20 U.S.C. (2001), *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, Article 1119.

20) M. McCaffrey(2015), *Using Standards at the Core. Focus on Dance Education Collaborations –A Mosaic of Possibilities, National Dance Education Organization National Conference*. November 5. Hyatt Regency McCormick Place, Chicago, IL.

previous section traced the ways the arts have been contextualized as core content in education. This section will elucidate how the NCCAS task force went about determining core content learning internal to the arts.

Beginning in 2011, the leadership team partnered with the College Board to engage in critical research that could help inform the standards framework and the individual achievement standards. Readers may best recognize the College Board as the organization that developed and implements Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) college readiness exams. Resultant research and reports conducted with resources from the College Board included:

- 1) An investigation of international learning standards in the arts across fifteen different countries;
- 2) Analysis of college standards;
- 3) Cross-comparisons of existent state standards;
- 4) Meta-analyses on child development in the arts;
- 5) Connections to the new 2010 English and Math standards known as the “common core standards.”

An additional analysis involved the comparison of the 1994 *National Standards in the Arts to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills Map* developed by the Partnership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills.<sup>21)</sup> These research reports not only guided the development of the framework for the new standards, but also guided the standards writing task force as they wrote and refined the standards.

The leadership team next worked to identify and form consensus around the philosophical foundations for the new standards. Here again, questioning how the arts are central to society and education was important. As a result, five foundations were identified: 1) The arts as communication, 2) The arts as creative personal realization, 3) The arts as Culture, History and Connectors, 4) Arts as a means to wellbeing, 5) The arts as community engagement. Each philosophical pillar was developed into a life-long goal statement.

The NCCAS leadership team furthermore aimed to build a framework for the new National Core Arts Standards that could be parallel amongst the five arts disciplines: dance, music, theater, visual arts, and media arts. Central to this was questioning what artistic processes were central to and also common across all the arts. In other words, what were the core artistic processes? Creating, Performing, Responding and Connection were identified. The leadership team felt it was critical to frame the standards around active gerunds such as creating, performing, responding and connecting, (titles based on verbs) so as to represent the “hands-on” and “minds-on” learning experiences of the

---

21) Partnership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills(2015). *Framework for 21<sup>st</sup> century learning*. Washington, DC. Partnership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills. <<http://www.p21.org/our-work/p21-framework>, 2016. 8. 1.>.

arts. In this we see the imprint of Dewey and H'Doubler. The leadership team then devised several “anchor standards” shared across all the arts for a total of 11 anchor standards (See Table 1).

<Table 1> NCAS Framework<sup>22)</sup>

Artistic Process (All Arts)	Anchor Standards (All Arts)	Process Component (Dance)	Enduring Understandings and Essential Questions (Dance)
CREATING	<b>Anchor Standard 1:</b> Generate and conceptualize artistic ideas and work.	<b>Explore</b>	<b>Enduring Understanding:</b> Choreographers use a variety of sources as inspiration and transform concepts and ideas into movement for artistic expression.  <b>Essential Question:</b> Where do choreographers get ideas for dances?
	<b>Anchor Standard 2:</b> Organize and develop artistic ideas and work.	<b>Plan</b>	<b>Enduring Understanding:</b> The elements of dance, dance structures, and choreographic devices serve as both a foundation and a departure point for choreographers.  <b>Essential Question:</b> What influences choice-making in creating choreography?
	<b>Anchor Standard 3:</b> Refine and complete artistic work.	<b>Revise</b>	<b>Enduring Understanding:</b> Choreographers analyze, evaluate, refine, and document their work to communicate meaning.  <b>Essential Question:</b> How do choreographers use self-reflection, feedback from others, and documentation to improve the quality of their work?
PERFORMING OR PRESENTING	<b>Anchor Standard 4:</b> Select, analyze and interpret artistic work for presentation.	<b>Express</b>	<b>Enduring Understanding:</b> Space, time, and energy are basic elements of dance.  <b>Essential Question:</b> How do dancers work with space, time and energy to communicate artistic expression
	<b>Anchor Standard 5:</b> Develop and refine artistic technique and work for presentation.	<b>Embody</b>	<b>Enduring Understanding:</b> Dancers use the mind-body connection and develop the body as an instrument for artistry and artistic expression.  <b>Essential Question:</b> What must a dancer do to prepare the mind and body for artistic expression?
	<b>Anchor Standard 6:</b> Convey meaning through presentation of artistic work.	<b>Present</b>	<b>Enduring Understanding:</b> Dance performance is an interaction between performer, production elements, and audience that heightens and amplifies artistic expression.  <b>Essential Question:</b> How does a dancer heighten artistry in a public performance?

22) Copyright permission from: State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education. (2014). *National Core Arts Standards*(Dover, DE: State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education). <<http://nationalartsstandards.org>>.

RESPONDING	<b>Anchor Standard 7:</b> Perceive and analyze artistic work.	Analyze	<b>Enduring Understanding:</b> Dance is perceived and analyzed to comprehend its meaning. <b>Essential Question:</b> How is a dance understood?
	<b>Anchor Standard 8:</b> Interpret intent and meaning in artistic work.	Interpret	<b>Enduring Understanding:</b> Dance is interpreted by considering intent, meaning, and artistic expression as communicated through the use of the body, elements of dance, dance technique, dance structure, and context. <b>Essential Question:</b> How is dance interpreted?
	<b>Anchor Standard 9:</b> Apply criteria to evaluate artistic work.	Critique	<b>Enduring Understanding:</b> Criteria for evaluating dance vary across genres, styles, and cultures. <b>Essential Question:</b> What criteria are used to evaluate dance?
CONNECTING	<b>Anchor Standard 10:</b> Synthesize and relate knowledge and personal experience to make art.	Synthesize	<b>Enduring Understanding:</b> As dance is experienced, all personal experiences, knowledge, and contexts are integrated and synthesized to interpret meaning. <b>Essential Question:</b> How does dance deepen our understanding of ourselves, other knowledge, and events around us?
	<b>Anchor Standard 11:</b> Relate artistic ideas and works with societal, cultural and historical context to deepen understanding.	Relate	<b>Enduring Understanding:</b> Dance literacy includes deep knowledge and perspectives about societal, cultural, historical, and community contexts. <b>Essential Question:</b> How does knowing about societal, cultural, historical and community experiences expand dance literacy?

The life-long learning goals developed from the five philosophical pillars, permeate the anchor standards. The anchor standards “...describe the general knowledge and skill that teachers [in all arts] expect students to demonstrate...and serve as the tangible educational expression of artistic literacy,”<sup>23)</sup> or core learning content in the arts. For example, within the artistic process of Performing, Anchor Standard 5, is: “Develop and refine artistic work for presentation.” This anchor standard is exactly the same for every art form because this learning outcome is authentic to artistic practice and literacy in all the various arts. The anchor standards are only the first level of standards, however. A comprehensive set of discipline-based, performance-level standards were developed by disciplinary writing task forces as well. The specific performance standards are available on the NCAS website<sup>24)</sup> and will be discussed further ahead.

23) State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education(2014), *National Core Arts Standards*(Dover, DE: State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education), p.12.

24) <[www.nationalartsstandards.org](http://www.nationalartsstandards.org)>.

The leadership team also decided to base the new standards within the *Understanding by Design* model at the forefront of educational practice in U.S. schools, as developed by Wiggins and McTighe (2011). This model is based on cognitive research supporting that transfer of knowledge has the potential to occur when information is arranged around frameworks, central ideas, enduring understandings and essential, guiding questions within a discipline (p. 14). As such, inquiry leading to overarching disciplinary concepts is a central tenet. Leadership, with collaboration from disciplinary writing teams, developed discipline-based statements of enduring learning as well as essential questions to complement each anchor standard based on the five philosophical pillars (See Table 1).

The NCCAS leadership also determined to improve benchmarks. One of the less effective aspects of the 1994 national standards was that they were benchmarked with outcomes at grades 2, 4, 8 and 12 only. This became particularly problematic on the high school level because the focus of programs in secondary education can range from elective classes for novice dancers to a comprehensive major for students attending audition-based or conservatory-style secondary schools. As such, the NCCAS leadership determined to organize the new standards grade-by-grade, PK through grade 8. For high school, three benchmark levels were conceived: High School Proficient, High School Accomplished, and High School Advanced, resolving the issue of the “one-size-fits all” aspect of the old 1994 standards. It was determined that grade-band organization of the new standards was one way to demonstrate the importance of a sequential and comprehensive arts education experience. As mentioned earlier, the new NCAS standards are voluntary, and individual states may adapt, adopt or ignore them. In this sense, the grade-band organization is aspirational as will be demonstrated later.

Disciplinary writing task forces in each art were established to craft the performance standards in alignment with the standards framework (See Table 1). Calls for writing team members were publicized across the nation and interested individuals submitted applications. Cohesive groups of experts ranging from certified PK-12 arts educators, teaching-artists, university professors and arts education organization personnel, were selected to serve on the writing task force. All the writing task force members worked voluntarily between 2011 and 2014 to develop the performance standards for each art form.

In dance, the writing task force was comprised of eight professionals from across the nation. The first meeting was held through a web-conferencing system, the operation of which was the first learning curve. During this first meeting each writing task force member was given the assignment to read the research reports and also to complete an independent gap analysis of the 1994 National Standards for Arts Education dance standards to determine the presence and scope of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills.<sup>25)</sup> These findings were later cross-compared by the task force members. This gap analysis was strategic in that not only did each member’s separate analysis provide inter-rater reliability for the

---

25) Partnership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills(2015).

larger investigation, but the task also actively familiarized the writing task force members intimately with some of the issues they would need to resolve through their writing process. As such, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills were a part of defining core arts learning.

Dividing into “process pairs,” the task of writing the standards was divided up. Two writers each teamed up to write the performance standards for each of the four artistic processes: Creating, Performing, Responding and Connecting. Each “process pair” was given the standards framework and a set of distinct “process components” or guiding concepts (See Table 1) around which to formulate the learning standards they would devise. For example, the “process components” for Performing were originally set as: 1) Expressing, 2) Practicing/ Refining [later changed to Embodying] and 3) Enacting/Producing.

The author of the present article chose to work on the Performing process standards because she saw it as an opportunity to address pervasive dualisms within dance education in the U.S. that stem back to H'Doubler's time. There is a common bias in some sectors of the educational dance community that lauds creative process as “higher-order learning” and demeans technical and skill-based learning as “lower-order” or rote in nature. Smith-Autard<sup>26)</sup> effectively describes this as a dualism between the “educational” and “professional” pedagogical worlds. While Smith-Autard traces this dualism back to the legacy of Laban's Modern Educational Dance methods in the United Kingdom, in the U.S. this same trace can be made back to H'Doubler.<sup>27)</sup>

Specifically, H'Doubler rejected replicative teaching methods common to the study of most forms of dance. She believed that a student's dance movement vocabulary should be generated by the individual by engaging in a creative, guided improvisational process backed by sound anatomical knowledge coupled with proprioceptive awareness and metacognitive reflection. It was through a process that she called “kinesthetic tuning,” that she believed an individual could come to know and express their individualism.<sup>28)</sup> Although proprioception, motor learning and body-mind connectivity were central tenets in H'Doubler's work, she was not interested in how this applied within traditional approaches to teaching dance in which the students' replicate the teacher's movement or traditions in dance. H'Doubler was instead interested in developing a “creative dance” approach. Radical at its time and important in its own right, this philosophical preference had none-the-less established chasms in the field that ought to be grappled with given the opportunity of the standards.

Discussing this at length over the course of several years of the writing process, the author and her standards writing partner aimed to satisfy both the “educational” and “professional” oriented dance sectors and to find a “midway” solution.<sup>29)</sup> We wanted to address both generative and replicative

---

26) J. M. Smith-Autard(2002), *The Art of Dance in Education*(2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.)(London: A. & C. Black).

27) B. Bashaw(2011).

28) J. Ross(2000).

29) J. M. Smith-Autard(2002).

approaches as we developed our section, particularly since it was our experience that PK-12 dance educators in pre-service and in-service training had confusion about the divisions and intersections between generative and replicative modes. As we worked, we brought a range of literature to bear on our conversations. Assuming a constructive approach to technical learning and performance over time, we evolved core experiences that informed our work, including: noticing and perception, experimentation, analysis, problem-solving, practice, and critical evaluation. Yet we also had the challenge to write a set of standards that expressed foundational technical principles common to a wide array of genres and styles of dance without preference to any; to keep childhood developmental growth in mind as we wrote across 12 different grade bands; to consider a wide variety of contexts in which the standards would be implemented; and to write in parallel with the Creating, Responding and Connecting process teams so that all the artistic processes interfaced authentically. This challenge would occupy us over the course of several years.

By 2013 the author and her writing partner had developed and refined a total of 156 prospective learning standards for the Performing artistic process. In April of 2013 all of the prospective standards underwent an initial “friends and family” review conducted by select professionals in the field. The review results were returned to the dance writing process pairs for revision. Following this, in July 2013 the revised standards underwent a national, open review. Over 6000 individual reviews were submitted and received. The reviewers included PK-12 arts and classroom teachers, artists, teaching artists, arts advocacy groups, parents and school administrators from across the nation.<sup>30)</sup> The writing pairs then used the results from this larger, open review to engage in additional revisions to the performance standards.

In early 2014, the leadership team conducted the final edits of the all the arts standards. This process included reducing any redundancies across the different sections. For example, the social aspects of motor learning, such as receptivity to feedback, better fit in with the Responding process section of the standards rather than the Performing process standards. In this manner, some of the content began to shift. Structurally, the Practicing/Refining component in the Performing section was broadened to Embodying and individual standards were regrouped. The number of standards was also reduced for the purpose of improving the user-friendly interface and in consideration of the feasibility of achieving standards in a variety of contexts with wide variability of constraints. In this, many standards were generalized or reduced. For example, the 156 standards that the author of this article and her partner had written were collapsed into 96 across PK-12, or eight standards per grade band.

Finally, in June 2014, the new National Core Arts Standards were published on a new website.<sup>31)</sup>

---

30) M. McCaffrey(2015), Using Standards at the Core. *Focus on Dance Education Collaborations –A Mosaic of Possibilities, National Dance Education Organization National Conference*. November 5. Hyatt Regency McCormick Place, Chicago, IL.

31) <[www.nationalartsstandards.org](http://www.nationalartsstandards.org)>.

On the home page, the 11 anchor standards that are shared across all the arts disciplines can be viewed. Tools embedded on the lower left and right corners of the homepage allow users to either bring up a matrix showing all of the discipline-specific performance standards for an individual art form, or to use selection boxes to customize a handbook. The 2014 NCAS is the first set of national standards in the U.S. to be published as a website with free access to all users. Past editions of national standards were print-based at a cost.

#### IV. Current Core

Since the publication of the NCAS, the State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education (SEADAE) and other arts advocacy organizations have begun to lobby state boards of education to adopt or adapt the new standards in their next scheduled revision cycle and various states. Numerous states, such as New Jersey have begun that process. The New Jersey Department of Education had its own set of arts learning standards that had most recently been enacted in 2009. State statutes require that learning standards be revisited cycles of five years. As such a task force of arts education stakeholders were convened in late 2014. It was determined that New Jersey would not adopt the new NCAS standards, but instead adapt them in the current state cycle. This determination was made for several reasons. First, the 2009 New Jersey standards were organized into benchmark grades: PK, 2, 5, 8 and 12. Many districts had developed their arts curriculums based on these benchmark grades. To adopt the NCAS would mean that districts could incur considerable expense to develop arts curriculum for each grade level instead of solely making benchmark revisions to existing curricula based on the NCAS. Secondly, it was determined that the content in the 2009 New Jersey standards should be merged with that of the NCAS to make an overall strong set of local standards representing local values.

As a part of the New Jersey task force, the author of this article conducted several gap analyses of the 2009 New Jersey dance learning standards. From this, distinct but unsurprising patterns emerged. For example, learning about performance venues, production elements and performance etiquette was missing from the elementary grades. Whereas exploring various stimuli and methods of generating movement (i.e. creative dance) were missing from the secondary grades. These gaps align with the aforementioned work of Smith-Autard<sup>32)</sup> in which the elementary programs tend to pursue “educational” approaches and secondary tend to pursue “professional” approaches. By adapting the NCAS, the New Jersey team has the opportunity to aim for more of a “midway” model.<sup>33)</sup>

---

32) J. M. Smith-Autard(2002).

33) Ibid.

Furthermore, it presents an opportunity to revisit some of the proposed NCAS Performing standards that were not selected for publication in the NCAS, such as some of the proposed standards associated with the practicing/refining component.

During 2015-2016 various arts organizations have also begun to provide professional development related to the National Core Arts Standards across the nation. The National Dance Education Organization (NDEO) for example, involved the dance writing task force in developing national webinars as well as workshops implemented at regional and national conferences. For these the national dance writing task force collaborates as a whole via web conferencing services to develop intensive workshops, then travels to meet in destinations to implement them. This has been supported with funding from the National Endowment for the Arts. What the team has learned from providing professional development is that there has been a long and existing need across the nation for dance educators at every level to understand better the nature of core content as well as the principles and processes of curriculum design. This is not something that is provided with consistency in dance teacher training or in the preparation of university faculty in the nation. It should not go without stating that preparing more curriculum savvy dance educators might also strengthen the position of dance as core curriculum within education.

This brings us full circle back to the roots of establishing arts as core content in the U.S. Ironically, in December 2015, just as the new National Core Arts Standards began to take flight, the federal legislature ceased defining core academic subjects. The Every Child Succeeds Act passed by the U.S. Senate effectively ended the 1994 Goals 2000: No Child Left Behind act and terminated the usage of the term “core” when referring to academic subjects. Instead the act defines certain subjects as a part of a “well-rounded” education. Fortunately the arts were included in that definition,<sup>34)</sup> music specifically, but the other arts generally as well. While in theory the “well rounded” language might engender more inclusivity on a national policy level, it remains to be seen whether dance will be specifically interpreted as such on local levels. It will require local activism of dance educators, not unlike that of H'Doubler, to ensure that it endures as an important part of education.

---

34) <[www.americansforthearts.org](http://www.americansforthearts.org), 2015. 12. 5.>.

## ■ Bibliography

- Hagood, T. K. (2000). *A History of Dance in American Higher Education: Dance and the American University*. Lewiston, NY: E. Mellen Press.
- NCCAS. (2014). *National Core Arts Standards: A Conceptual Framework for Arts Learning*. Alexandria, VA: NCCAS.
- NJAEP. (2012). *New Jersey Arts Census: Keeping the Promise: Arts education for Every Child: The Distance Traveled – The Journey Remaining*. Indianapolis, IN: Music for All.
- Overby, L. Y. (2015). *Public Scholarship in Dance: Teaching, Choreography, Research, Service and Assessment for Community Engagement*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Shusterman, R. (2008). *Body Consciousness: A Philosophy of Mindfulness and Somaesthetics*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ross, J. (2000). *Moving Lessons: Margaret H'Doubler and the Beginning of Dance in American Education*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Smith-Autard, J. M. (2002). *The Art of Dance in Education*. 2nd Ed. London: A. & C. Black.
- Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2011). *The Understanding by Design Guide: Creating High Quality Units*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Wilson, J. M., Hagood, T. K., & Brennan, M. A. (2006). *Margaret H'Doubler: The Legacy of America's Dance Education Pioneer: An Anthology*. Youngstown, N.Y: Cambria Press.
- Bashaw, B. (2011). *Young Choreographers: An Ethno Phenomenological Study of Developmental and Socio-Cultural Influences during Untutored Dance Making*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, 369 pages; ProQuest, AAT 3484341.
- 20 U.S.C. (2001). *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, Article 1119.
- State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education. (2014). *National Core Arts Standards*. Dover, DE: State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education.
- Bonbright, J. (2000). National Agenda for Dance Arts Education: The Evolution of Dance as an Art Form Intersects with the Evolution of Federal Interest in, and Support of, Arts Education. *Dancing in the Millennium Conference*, Washington, DC.
- McCaffrey, M. (2015). Using Standards at the Core. *Focus on Dance Education Collaborations – A Mosaic of Possibilities, National Dance Education Organization National Conference*. November 5. Hyatt Regency McCormick Place, Chicago, IL.
- Americans for the Arts Homepage. <americansforthearts.org 2015. 8. 12.>.
- Partnership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills(2015). *Framework for 21<sup>st</sup> century learning*. Washington, DC. Partnership for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills. <<http://www.p21.org/our-work/p21-framework>, 2016. 8. 1.>.

논문투고일 2016. 5. 11.  
심사일 2016. 5. 22.  
심사완료일 2016. 5. 28.

www.kci.go.kr

## 미국 교육 안에서 핵심교과내용으로서의 무용: 새로운 시대를 위한 새로운 교육표준에 대한 제언

바바라 바셔  
렛거스 대학교 교수

본고는 예술 및 무용과목을 미국 교육 시스템하에서 핵심교과과목으로 도입하려고 하는 일련의 노력에 대한 역사를 서술하였다. 역사에 대한 서술 이후 21세기에 접어들어 새로운 국가학습교과표준 구상을 통해 예술/무용과목의 핵심교과 과목 편입을 위한 최근의 사례를 인용하였다. 저자는 2014년의 국가 핵심 예술 교육 표준 집필진의 일원으로 해당 기준을 편찬하는 과정에 대해 묘사한다. 본고는 미국에서 지속적으로 제기되고 있는 예술 교육 이슈로서 핵심 교과 과정에 대한 외부의 관점 및 국가 수준에서의 예술교육 내 핵심 교과과정에 대한 질의와 편찬 과정에 대한 내부의 관점에 대해 제시한다.

키워드: 예술(Arts), 핵심 교과내용(Core Content), 무용(Dance), 교육(Education), 학습 교육과정(Learning Standards)

