Summer 2014

Peer critique in the secondary art classroom: Strategies for best practices

Krista Nicole Castrodale
James Madison University

Peer Critique in the Secondary Art Classroom:

Strategies for Best Practices

Krista Castrodale

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY

In

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

In Art Education

August 2014

Dedication

This thesis project is dedicated to Granny for believing in me. I will forever strive to emulate your positivity.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the following individuals for their contribution to the completion of this thesis: Dr. Karin Tollefson-Hall, for her inspiring display of absolute excellence in teaching and mentorship; Dr. Katherine Schwartz for her support and encouragement throughout my art education experiences at James Madison; Dr. Mary Beth Cancienne for her reassurance in beginning the thesis experience; Dr. William Wightman for inspiring me to deeply consider the role of criticism in my teaching; Hannah Sions and Laura Thompson for their constant kinship; Adam Freeman for his unfailing consolation; Melissa Cobb for her reinforcement and thoughtfulness; Ben Frey for his clever insight and inspiration; my friends and family for their love, and most importantly my parents, Neil and Susie Castrodale, to whom I owe any success because of their remarkable parenting. Thank you for always unconditionally supporting the pursuit of my passions. I am deeply thankful for all of you. Thank you.

Table of Contents

Abstract

The Virginia Standards of Learning and National Visual Arts standards require that art criticism and student peer critique are present in the secondary art curriculum. The standards set minimum requirements and serve as a starting point for comprehensive art education. Additional guidance for art teachers is necessary to ensure that peer critiques become a crucial component of their secondary art curriculum. Art teachers rely on their own experiences with critique for instruction. However, traditional models of art criticism do not seem to utilize the varied strengths of students. Contemporary student peer critique strategies are needed for teachers in secondary art education. Through a review of literature, this study explored the role of art criticism and student peer critiques in secondary art education. The goal of the research was to find the best practices for creating strategies for student peer critique. Findings suggest that art criticism and student peer critiques play a fundamental role in educating visually literate students. Strategies were created for each level of secondary art (Art I, Art II, Art III, Art IV) that align with state and national standards, in addition to a list of student peer critique strategies that can be implemented into any existing curriculum. Recommendations include the need for teachers to plan for and incorporate effective peer critique strategies into their existing curricula.

Chapter I

Introduction

Background of the Study

According to the goals of the Virginia Standards of Learning for Visual students should strive to: "1) interpret, reflect on, and evaluate the characteristics, purposes, and merits of personal work and the work of others and 2) identify, analyze, and apply criteria for making visual aesthetic judgments of personal work and the work of others." (Virginia Department of Education June 2013) In the standards for Art I: Foundations, students will "develop constructive approaches to critique (formative, peer-to-peer, self-reflective, summative) that are supportive in intent and that offer alternative points of view." (AI.18). By Art II: Intermediate, students will "use constructive critical approaches to critique (formative, peer-to-peer, self-reflective, summative)." (AII.21). Aside from suggesting models for Art Criticism, such as Broudy (1951) and Feldman (1987), little instruction is given to teachers for the most effective ways to conduct critiques within the secondary art classroom within the state standards.

The National Visual Arts Standards (2014) require students to practice both student peer critique and art criticism, suggesting "people gain insights into meanings of artworks by engaging in the process of art criticism." Students are to develop criteria for examining artwork, create logical arguments to support evaluations of works of art, participate in peer and in-process critiques, and analyze the historical context of a work of art as it relates to meaning. Though the standards serve as guidelines for teachers to understand the goals of art criticism and peer critiques, suggestions for activities that engage students in these forms of criticism are left to the individual teacher. Teachers are

then left to rely on the traditional describe, analyze, and interpret models of art criticism. Because teachers have been given little guidance as how to best conduct class critiques, teachers rely on traditional models and their own experiences, while teaching methods and curricula have changed to meet the diverse needs of students today (Waters-Eller& Basile, 2013, p. 11). It has been my observation that outdated critique practices often do not suffice in contemporary classroom settings.

Because it has been my experience that the step-by-step, sequential models provided ineffectively engage students, creative ways to conduct art critiques within the classroom setting are needed to reach all students in a way that challenges a generation immersed in digital imagery.

I am a high school art teacher in a rural school district in Virginia. In my third year of teaching, I continue to struggle to foster meaningful discussion among students regarding their own artwork and the artwork of their peers. Students become uncomfortable in class critiques following the completion of their artwork. I find that students are willing to chat with their peers about their work while in production, and write insightful artist statements, but then do not fully participate in oral class critiques. In my opinion, an environment that fosters open discussion of artwork and multiple strategies for facilitating meaningful critiques is necessary to create successful student critiques. I have found that the same few students within each class are willing to discuss their images openly, while most are hesitant or blatantly refuse to talk. My students are generally unwilling to voice opinions about peer artwork. I am not providing my students with positive critique experiences, which I view as one of the most essential parts of art education. One of my goals as an art educator is to promote visual literacy. I believe that

positive interaction with images inside the classroom setting can encourage curiosity and interest in deciphering images outside the classroom.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to develop a set of critique strategies that are effective in engaging all high school art students in the interpretation and evaluation of peer images in the classroom setting. Despite my efforts to facilitate discussion of images, students seem disinterested and often apathetic towards art critiques. I plan to develop a set of art critique strategies that could be used in any high school art classroom within existing lesson plans/curriculum that are effective in actively interesting students in a variety of ways.

The purposes of this study are to:

1. Investigate the role of student peer art critiques in secondary art education;

2. Identify effective strategies for student peer critique in the secondary classroom and;

3. Create student peer critique strategies that can be incorporated into any secondary art curriculum.

Statement of Need

Art critiques are best conducted in interactive and varying ways. With schools placing emphasis on differentiation and reaching students with multiple interests, skill levels, and learning strengths, classroom art critiques should be considered when planning for diverse populations. A variety of approaches to reading, interpreting, and making meaning of images can be incorporated into the curriculum, shifting focus from teacher-centered critiques to active student participation.

Images are becoming increasingly accessible and increasingly disposable with the advancement of technology. Often students interact with images only long enough for them to flash on an advertisement, scroll a finger across a screen, or flip a page in a magazine. Students are bombarded by imagery that often they become immune to them. The challenge that art teachers are presented with is to get them to spend time and see meaning in images. Students should also learn to interpret images in both individual and collaborative situations so that a personal connection is established with the images (namely, their own artwork and the artwork of their peers). Students can start to notice what it is they find valuable and develop their own personal criteria for judging these images. Outdated criticism practices will not suffice in a classroom full of image over-stimulated teens with entertainment constantly at their fingertips. Innovative and interactive art critiques that are practical and usable by any art teacher could help students to become more engaged in and more aware of the world around them, while involving a variety of learners.

Research Questions

This research project will be guided by the following questions:

1. What is the role of student peer critique in secondary art education?

2. What strategies are effective for conducting student peer critiques that align with state and national standards in the secondary art classroom?

Assumptions

The assumptions about art criticism and secondary art education for this study include:

1. Art criticism is necessary in holistic secondary art education.

2. More emphasis should be placed on accommodating for all students in art criticism.

3. Students will become more interested in art critiques when interesting, effective activities are incorporated into secondary art curriculum.

4. Students are engaged in meaningful art making.

Limitations

This study is limited to the following:

1. Art critique strategies that can be conducted in the secondary classroom setting.

2. Art critique strategies that can be conducted within a 90-minute class period.

3. Art critique strategies that can be incorporated into existing lessons/curriculum.

Definition of Terms

Aesthetic Argument- according to Smith, an aesthetic argument is a "critical communication carried on in behalf of a given critique," including an aesthetic experience with the work and an evaluation of the work (Barrett, 1988)

Art critic- a person who evaluates an interprets works of art, typically with intent to publish

Art criticism- describing and evaluating the media, processes, and meaning of works of visual art, and making comparative judgments (from the NAEA National Standards)

Digital images- images students see through technology sources such as phones, computers, or tablets

Evaluate- assessing the success or value of an artwork based on established criteria

Interpret- coming to an understanding of the meaning of a work of art

Judge- forming a conclusion about a work of art based on personal opinion and established criteria

Student peer critique-also called "art critique," organized discussion within the classroom setting regarding student artwork

Visual literacy- the ability to read one's visual environment

Procedural Overview

This study investigates the role of art criticism and student peer critique in secondary art education and the strategies that can be used to incorporate effective student peer critique strategies into existing lessons/curriculum for high school art classes. These topics will be explored through a thorough investigation of art education literature. The methodology also includes creating a set of student peer critique strategies that can be incorporated into art lessons from all levels: Art I, Art II, Art III, and Art IV. One detailed interactive peer critique strategy will be provided for each level of art, provided in a template. In addition, a list of strategies will be provided for teacher implementation into existing lesson plans. Strategies will comply with the National Standards for Art Education and the Virginia Standards of Learning. General strategies and suggestions for teacher implementation from the literature will be described and four strategies will be developed in the template.

Chapter II

Review of Literature

The review of literature related to this study is separated into four sections 1) art criticism 2) student peer critique 3) differences in art criticism and student peer critique, and 4) improving student peer critique.

Art Criticism

Definition of art criticism. Feldman (1973), in his essay *The Teacher as Model Critic* (1973), defines art criticism as "talk about art" and "sharing of discoveries about art and the human condition" (p. 50). Similarly, Garber (1990) claims,

> Art is understood as a carrier of ideas, values, and beliefs, and must be taught and discussed with the larger world in mind. Critical talk about art is a primary means through which these ideas, values, and beliefs are conveyed (p. 18).

Art criticism provides an opportunity for meanings to be shared and discussed. For those familiar with art criticism, it is "understood in that positive sense; as informing and expanding perceptions," but to the majority, art criticism can be thought of as a negative activity, or "the phrase art criticism is understood in its pejorative sense; to criticize means to find fault" (Feinstein, 1989, p. 43). Barrett (1989) discusses the negative connotations of the word "criticism" when it comes to the arts. Criticism and appreciation are not often equated because of the broadly accepted negative definition of criticism as the act of making negative judgments. Barrett defines criticism "as a means of better understanding critical activities and how they can aid in appreciating works of art" (p. 23). Often outside and even within the discipline of art education, art criticism has been used and abused to create negative feelings associated with the discipline, rather than appreciation for it. Barrett (1989) states,

> Possible and imagined antagonisms between the critic and the artist become less sharp when one also realizes that criticism is much more than the negative judgment of art. This point is easily forgotten because in art studios, in schools of art, and in art classrooms criticism is often understood solely as judgment, and it is often negative (p. 30).

Barrett suggests that the point of school art criticism is "narrowly" seen as the improvement of student artwork, and that little emphasis is placed on interpretation and the question of what art is or is not. Barrett argues, "Thus students of art tend to think wrongly that published professional criticism is judgment and judgment for the artist and the improvement of art making" (p. 30). With exposure to a variety of art criticism strategies, better understandings of the definition of art criticism and all it encompasses, and an acknowledgement of the need of art criticism, ideas about art criticism can change.

In the DBAE Handbook, Dobbs (1992) defines criticism as "responding to and making judgments about the properties and qualities that exist in visual forms" (p.9). Dobbs further describes the steps taken to do art criticism and all that it entails. Art criticism is broadly defined to include student observations about art. Dobbs claims,

> Art criticism focuses upon the perception, description, analysis, interpretation, and evaluation of works of art. It includes the basic observation, scrutiny, and report by artists, viewers, scholars, and others who encounter works of art to help them know and understand what is presented by the visual form. The art critic asks fundamental questions about what is there (perception and description), what it means (analysis and interpretation), and what its worth or value is (judgment)" (p. 84).

Dobbs explains that art criticism involves an understanding of the context in which the work of art was created. Discipline-based education in the arts relies on criticism as a fundamental principle. Dobbs explains, "Art criticism involves careful observation of

works of art, comparing and contrasting works to one another, and consideration of the social and other contexts in which the works are produced" (p. 85).

Purpose of art criticism. If for no other reason aside from the inclusion of Art Criticism in the Virginia Standards of Learning or because art criticism is a vital component of Discipline-Based Art Education (Feinstein 1989 p. 43), art educators generally agree on a need for art criticism in art curricula. In the DBAE Handbook, Dobbs (1992) explains, "People look at artworks and experience the impact of visual properties and qualities in the works. Those who cultivate this ability to look at art, analyze the forms, offer multiple interpretations of meaning, make critical judgments, and talk or write about what they see, think, and feel about art are doing art criticism" (p. 21). This broadly defines art criticism to include students, and emphasizes the value of art criticism in a variety of situations.

The importance of art criticism's place in art curriculum can be argued from a variety of standpoints. Barrett (1991) states,

> Unless we understand it, art cannot contribute to new knowledge of the world and alternative ways of experiencing it. If people sufficiently understand a work of art, its judgment is implied or is relatively easy to derive. When people do not understand art they become intimidated by it and eventually indifferent or even hostile toward it (p. 66).

In most cases, coming to an understanding of a work of art does not happen by merely glancing at it. Feinstein (1989) argues, "Because having eyes does not mean knowing how to see. We need to reeducate in order to enable students to construct meaning in visual forms" (p. 44). Teaching students how to look at art can increase their understanding and ultimately help them to become more visually literate. Lankford (1984) similarly argues,

Art educators may place importance upon art criticism for many reasons, among them that art criticism may act as a constructive culminating phase for those involved in art making processes; that art criticism aids in the development of visual literacy, helping individuals to better understand and arrange the visual environment; that art criticism broadens the base of knowledge and experience for those who use it; that art criticism may encourage the exercise of cognitive and affective processes that otherwise might be infrequently stimulated; and that art criticism offers high potential for gaining self-and-other awareness by providing systematic approaches for deriving significance of meaning and feeling from that most revealingly human of enterprises, art (p. 151).

Feldman (1973) also argues that teaching visual literacy must begin at an early age, so that students can begin to understand their visual environment, particularly as electronics and technology become "persuasive forces" (p. 52). Aside from becoming visually literate, students can more fully appreciate art through art criticism. Barrett (1991) claims, "Through critical discussion of works of art, people increase their understanding and appreciation of art" (p. 66). There are many benefits of art criticism in the art education curriculum. However, there are differences between "art criticism" and classroom "critiques."

Chapman (1978) describes the need for perceptual skills, claiming that they are "essential for a number of tasks, including reading, writing, and scientific observation" (p. 64). She explains that the ability to respond to the visual is not merely a matter of "decoding symbols and of noting the observable properties of things," but is rather a "predisposition, cultivated by instruction, to search for expressive meaning in visual forms" (p. 64).

Smith (1973) argues that the purpose of art criticism is the "furtherance of humane values" (p. 38). Within education, Smith believes that criticism should be "framed" to "connect with ultimate aims after schooling" (p. 39).

Models of art criticism. Art criticism became a method of bringing about understanding and appreciation of art to art education in the 1950's and 60's. Early art critics such as Harold Osborne, Jerome Stolnitz, and Morris Weitz focused on linguistic tasks in the discipline of art criticism (Geahigan, 1999, p. 7). Most early philosophies regarding art criticism focused on description, interpretation, and evaluation. Geahigan claims, "In basing their models of criticism on mid-century aesthetics, theorists have constructed typologies of statements that are important in critical discourse, to be sure, but hardly comprehensive" (p. 11). Many proposed models of art criticism emerged in the second half of the 20th century.

The Feldman Model (1970) suggests description, analysis, interpretation, and judgment. Barrett (1988) suggests that these steps prevent "premature judgment" (p.23). Chapman (1978) and Smith (1973) also propose models for art criticism in art education. Chapman suggests inductive, deductive, empathetic, and interactive approaches to art criticism. Chapman describes the inductive approach as a gathering of facts and taking an inventory of visual qualities in a work. After thoroughly taking in the visual elements, the relationships among these visual elements must be compiled into a summary of the impressions that "captures the essence of what we have seen" (p. 80). Chapman also warns against premature judgment and emotional reactions. Only after one has described each part of the work, analyzed the relationship among parts, interpreted these relationships, and summarized the recurrent ideas, can one move onto the judgment by citing the information gathered before the judgment stage.

According to Geahigan and Wolff (1997), Broudy argued for a substantive role for arts in schools and for the "reconceptualization" of art education, particularly at the

secondary level. According to Broudy (1951) the most important ways that arts

contributed to education are shaping values in youth and providing aesthetic education.

(Geahigan & Wolff p. 138). Broudy (1987) claims,

> On virtually all learning occasions concepts, words, images, things, and
> feelings are likely to be intermingled. Images can be conjured up by
> words, things, events, and feelings and accordingly one could say that
> imagery is involved in all forms of learning, i.e. in all forms of learning in
> which sense perception or the images that result from such perception
> plays a role (p. 199).

Chapman's (1978) deductive approach involves choosing "definite criteria" for

judging the artwork, examining the work to see if it presents the facts that may or may

not meet the criteria, and judging the artwork based on the criteria. Such criteria could be

aesthetic theories on mimeticism, instrumentalism, expressionism, and formalism.

Chapman suggests evaluating works of art more than once using different criteria each

time. Chapman's empathetic approach is based on feeling or emotional reactions.

Chapman claims, "When we empathize with a work of art we attribute feelings and

capacities to it as if it had life and vitality" (p. 85). Chapman offers suggestions for

developing empathy. Paying attention to the obvious, noticing visual qualities, utilizing

analogies and metaphors to relate feelings, using one's own experience and knowledge to

draw comparisons, persistence, becoming involved with the work through imagination,

and judging the work can allow for more involvement in a work of art.

The interactive approach suggested by Chapman (1978) is also inductive, but

involves reaching a mutual agreement on the interpretation of a work of art in a group

setting, rather than a purely descriptive approach (p. 87). The discussion follows that of

the inductive approach, and then hypotheses regarding the meaning of the work are

formulated and given credibility through the features that affirm the suggested meaning. Consensus in the group can be met through research, discussion, and questioning.

Smith offers two separate methods, which are exploratory aesthetic criticism and argumentative aesthetic criticism. Smith's goal for art criticism is the "furtherance of humane values" (Barrett 23). Smith believes that we should not expect students to be professional critics, but to achieve "intelligent interpretive perspective" and to "perceive, understand, and appreciate works of art" (p. 39). Smith divides art criticism into two categories- exploratory aesthetic criticism and argumentative aesthetic criticism. He defines exploratory criticism as "an aid to and a means of sustaining aesthetic experience" (p. 39). Exploratory criticism does not include judgment, but rather a comprehensive investigation of aesthetic qualities in the work. During the exploratory criticism stage, description, analysis, characterization, and interpretation happen in overlapping phases. Interpretation happens as a "summary judgment" based on the previous steps, and "delivers the meaning of the work of art" (p. 43). Evaluation is not directly included, but according to Smith, is not completely absent. Students may have to make evaluative decisions with regards to what to give critical importance to (p. 40). After interpretation, Smith suggests an evaluation and aesthetic argument, which have already been made through the previous steps, but not asserted up until this point. There is a persuasive element to the evaluation, as the critic wants the viewer to see the artwork in the same way. In regards to aesthetic development, Smith claims, "The secondary grades (7-12) and the years afterward are the ideal time for the kind of aesthetic education I have discussed in this paper" (p. 48). Criticism in the secondary art classroom is of particular importance.

Aesthetic argument is defined as "critical communication carried on in behalf of a given critique," which assumes an aesthetic experience with the work and an evaluation of the work (p. 39).

Anderson (1993) argues that structure is needed in art criticism, claiming,

> If the living substance of art criticism forms in that place where careful observation and the leap of the imagination come together, then the platform for such a leap should be carefully constructed, especially for pedagogical purposes (p. 29).

According to Anderson (1993), the teacher should act as the moderator between the student and the work of art. The model for art criticism should be flexible enough to suit the dynamics of a classroom, yet clear and specific. Anderson proposes a model for art criticism which begins with a reaction and a perceptual analysis based on both formal analysis and representation. Anderson's (1993) model for art criticism includes: 1) reaction; 2) perceptual analysis, which includes representation, formal analysis, and formal characterization; 3) personal interpretation; 4) contextual examination; and 5) synthesis, which includes resolution and evaluation. The model then allows for students to have a personal interpretation, a contextual examination, and then finally a resolution and evaluation of the work of art (p.204) Many models of art criticism stress the need to withhold judgment until the very end of the criticism activity. In contrast, Anderson argues that remaining neutral until the judgment step of criticism is against human nature, and that our reaction to artworks is tied into our personal set of values and beliefs. (p. 199) Anderson argues the inevitability of the inclusion of personal viewpoints in description, interpretation, and evaluation (p. 199).

In the representation stage of his model, Anderson calls for an articulation of "the work's most obvious thematic and formal qualities" (p. 31). During the formal analysis

stage, the student should examine the formal qualities and relationships between formal qualities in the work, emphasizing that an artwork is a composite of many parts that are all important to the meaning. In the formal characterization stage, students identify the work's style, or the expressive, aesthetic qualities of the work. During this stage, the student may characterize the work by category or genre, such as "realist," "formalist," or "expressionist." Then the student may transition into the interpretation stage, where the previous stages come together to derive meaning in the work. Anderson defines interpretation as "the application of creative insight to the assimilation of perceptual facts, the analysis of various technical processes involved, the awareness of relations and previous learning" (35). In the contextual examination stage, the students use the artwork's context to pull meaning from the work. The contexts could include common materials available during the time in which the artwork was created to the social, political, or cultural context from which the artwork was created. In the synthesis stage, students use their description, analysis, and personal interpretation to determine the aesthetic power of the artwork. Student interpretations are as valid as any other interpretation (p. 36). By this stage, students have earned the right to evaluate the work of art based on what they have gathered in previous steps. Anderson believes that this model of art criticism is helpful for art education; it allows students to be creative and intuitive while nurturing them with structure.

Anderson (1995) claims, "Today, the importance of contextual understanding as a critical component in understanding and valuing works of art is widely recognized. That art reflects larger social and cultural realities in addition to personal choices is well known" (p. 200). Anderson suggests that in addition to asking the questions "what is it?"

"what does it mean?," and "what is its value?,", we must also ask, "what does it do?"

Anderson suggests that inquiring what a work "does" gives a different direction and

structure to art criticism, a more cross-cultural approach. Anderson (1995) claims,

> It implies that we are not looking at a work or performance for its own
> sake, as an end in itself, but rather, examining it in its original and
> authentic context to determine what it can tell us, not so much about itself,
> but about the people who made and use(d) it (p. 201).

Anderson (1995) uses this fourth question in art criticism to create contextual

examination, which addresses the contextual origin of a work of art. Anderson defines

contextualism as "the study of art in its historical and social context with an eye to what it

tells us about life and how it serves extra-aesthetic functions" (p. 200).

Anderson alters his original model of art criticism for cross-cultural art criticism.

Anderson's suggestion is to allow the order of the steps in his model to be changed

according to the needs of the specific situation, artwork, or teacher. Anderson suggests

that the reaction remain first in order to acquire the students' interests, before moving on

to the other steps. Anderson (1995) claims, "The heart of understanding artworks and

special objects cross-culturally is contextual examination" (p. 203). Anderson's

alteration suggests that his model is flexible to meet the needs of multiple art criticism

experiences.

Like Anderson, Venable (1998) emphasizes the importance of historical and

cultural context when critically examining works of art. Venable claims that often

historical or cultural context is ignored in the traditional models of art criticism unless the

teacher makes an effort to emphasize this dimension (p. 7).

Geahigan's (1983) model of art criticism is based on the argument that "To have

teachers or students simply express their personal disapproval of works of art, on the fact

of it, seems to have little or no educational value" (p. 19). Geahigan briefly describes the various systems of art criticism, including Feldman (1967) and Smith (1966), and the revisions to art criticism later by Johanson (1979) and Mittler (1980). Geahigan explains that as art criticism progresses and changes, disputes among scholars will continue with regards to how to facilitate art criticism in the educational setting. Geahigan claims that there is "no single principle that can be applied to resolve such disputes" but rather "one must consider the kind of circumstances for which criticizing as an educational method is prescribed" (p. 20). Geahigan suggests that educators must evaluate if the students can perform the critical acts suggested, the capacity and interests of the audience, and whether the educational goals desired can be achieved (p. 20). Geahigan claims, "Given the prominence of criticism in the art education literature, it is surprising how little attention has been paid to the question of how models of critical discourse are to guide classroom instruction" (p. 12). Most art educators would agree that criticism should involve dialogue and discussion. "Current models of criticism, however, are clearly inadequate as representations of this sort of classroom discourse" (p. 12). He goes on to claim, "Current models of art criticism also overlook the unpredictability and dynamism that is typical of class discussion. Dialogue or discussion does not proceed in a step-by-step fashion" (p. 12). Geahigan argues, "To propose that students follow a rigid sequence of steps (describing, interpreting, evaluating, and so forth) in discussing works of art would be to stifle, not promote, meaningful discussion" (p. 12).

Geahigan warns that there are two mistakes made when "disputes about the correctness or propriety of critical methods arise" (21). The first mistake is to forget the educational value of the method when focusing on the methods of actual critical practice.

It is not the intent of educational art criticism to mimic what the actual critics do, according to Geahigan, because what a critic may say could very well not be considered criticism, depending on one's definition. The second mistake is to assume that there is only one way to conduct art criticism. Geahigan warns against adopting one criticism system as being correct or proper, because some will be better suited than others to particular educational situations. Geahigan suggests a variety of art criticism practices. Geahigan claims, "Since the circumstances surrounding the practice of education are changing, it also seems reasonable to expect that existing formulations of critical activity might well require modification in the future" (p. 21). Geahigan calls for educators to understand the nature of criticism, and focus on the educational value of the questions to devise methods most appropriate to the needs of the educational situation (p. 21). Venable (1998) endorses Geahigan's model of art criticism as being most promising in providing teachers and students with what is necessary to respectfully and responsibly reflect on artwork. He claims that the concepts taught are relevant to increasing students' abilities to respond to art (p. 9). Venable praises the flexibility of Geahigan's model, in contrast with other rigid step-by-step sequential models. Venable claims that flexible models like Geahigan's reflect learning that is "structurally nonlinear" (p. 9). Venable also appreciates the respect for individual encounters with works of art. Venable asserts,

> Primary and initial encounters are rarely objective. While not content to let these remain unchanged, Geahigan builds on the uniqueness of these early impressions so that they become an integral part of a student's understanding. (p. 9)

Rather than ignoring the initial responses to works of art, Geahigan uses them to develop students' understandings and connections.

Hickman (1994) describes an art criticism practice in which students use their own personal experiences when viewing a work of art. Unlike other models, Hickman encourages the use of initial reactions to develop meaning. Hickman's art criticism practice includes four areas of activity- reacting, researching, responding, and reflecting (p. 50). The reaction stage allows students to acknowledge their first reactions to the artwork, based on memories, experiences, and feelings. The research activity calls for examination of the formal qualities of the work, the work's content, how it may have been created, the artist's intentions, and the social, historical, and cultural context. The responding stage is based on what has been discovered through systematic inquiry (p. 51). The reflection is an opportunity for students to contemplate the meaning and nature of the work after the previous considerations. During the reflection stage, students have the opportunity to reflect on how a work of art could be meaningful to their own lives. Hickman claims that it is particularly important for adolescents to spend time contemplating and reflecting in schools, because they may be struggling to find their identity and place in the world (p. 51).

Hubard (2010) distinguishes two separate kinds of dialogues about artwork: predetermined dialogue and interpretive dialogue. Hubard offers some insight about dialogue about works of art that can be helpful in determining how the teacher should present information to the students. Predetermined dialogue is planned out by the teacher in advance. The teacher has predetermined what students will know and understand by the end of the lesson. Hubard offers examples of predetermined dialogue she used with students, noting that students

have noticed what she hoped they would in an image because of her questions that lead to those conclusions. The sequence of the questions asked, the direction of the teacher to keep the class on-course with what the teacher had planned, and the structure of the dialogue all help students to arrive at the conclusion determined by the teacher in advance. The teacher's duties are to decide what concrete lessons the students will learn from and about an image, redirect and eliminate conversations that lead students away from the conclusion, and facilitate learners of all types through both "right" and "wrong" answers. Pre-determined dialogue is fairly simple for the teacher, because there are few surprises. The trouble is that students miss out on their own understandings because the conclusions are somewhat forced onto them because of the fact that they are pre-determined.

Hubard (2010) defines interpretive dialogue, which unlike pre-determined dialogue, is mean to enable students to discover their own meanings in response to images. This allows for students to construct their own knowledge rather than merely being guided into the teacher's knowledge through a series of questions that easy arrive at pre-determined conclusions. Interpretive dialogue suggests that meanings in artwork are evolving and fluid, rather than concrete and fixed. Interpretive dialogue can be thematic or open. In thematic interpretive dialogue, the teacher presents artwork images that coincide with an established theme. Hubard begins the interpretive thematic dialogue by asking students what they notice about a work of art. This allows for the discussion to go in a number of directions, undetermined by the teacher in advance. The teacher invites the students to focus on a certain aspect of the work, based on the theme, so that they can then discuss it with their peers and share with the class their findings. Student responses

are varied and reveal the fact that artwork can have multiple meanings for multiple people.

Open dialogue does not focus on a specific theme. The students are very much in control of the dialogue. This can be the most difficult for teachers to facilitate because it is not a linear method of discussion. Hubard (2010) mentions that she often shifts from fellow inquirer to facilitator when using open dialogue with her students. Often predetermined dialogue is necessary to give students a basic foundation for learning about images. Interpretive dialogue, both open and thematic, can turn a teacher-centered classroom into a student-centered classroom, and allow for more independent and collaborative discovery.

Rene Sandell (2009) suggests that students in the 21st century have a particularly important challenge to be visually literate in multiple ways. Sandell states, "Through the informative process of critical response, art learners perceive, interpret, and finally judge ideas connected to visual imagery and structures, past and present" (p. 288). Sandell's suggestion for fostering visual literacy is Form + Theme + Context (FTC). Form discovers how the work is, or its visual properties, theme explores what the work is about, and context investigates when, where, by/for whom, and why the art was created (and why it is valuable). This method allows for the student to understand the historical and cultural significance of the work of art (p. 289). Sandell argues that "FTC" is structured to be successful with learners of all levels, from the novice to the seasoned viewer. FTC moves away from strictly formal analysis to inferring and understanding meaning and context within a work of art (p. 290). Sandell argues that unlike the Feldman approach, a sequential model of description, analysis, interpretation, and

judgment, and the FTC approach to art criticism "invites viewer participation to interact by considering three areas that contribute to the integrity of a work of art" (p. 296). Carney (1994) claims that critical evaluation is normative in art criticism, but should not be left without reasons. Carney's model for art criticism is a seven step process; including 1) locate the style, 2) descriptive features and structures, 3) primary aesthetic features, 4) value features, 5) low-level interpretation, 6) high-level interpretation, and 7) critical judgment.

Feinstein's (1989) "The Art Response Guide" is intended to organize "visual perceptions" and constructing "metaphoric meaning in visual forms" (p. 44). Feinstein creates a modification of the Feldman Model "Because words represent ideas which, in turn, govern reactions, the emphasis in The Guide is on language-literal and figurative." Literal and figurative language reflect literal and figurative meaning. (p. 44) Feinstein's model includes:

> 1) Description- an inventory of what you see and what you might know about the work without interpretation, analysis, or evaluation (literal language)
> 2) Analysis of form- requires more art vocabulary (composition, materials and techniques)
> 3) Metaphoric Interpretation- what does the work of art as a whole represent?
> 4) Evaluation- evaluating the work of art in comparison to others of its kind
> 5) Preference- like or dislike

In explaining the need of withholding personal preferences, Feinstein warns "if preferences are stated first and dwelled upon, they tend to close perceptions prematurely." Feinstein argues, It is important to bear in mind that the primary rationale for teaching students to read art is to enable them to discuss it intelligently and construct multiple meanings, not to change preferences" (p. 49).

Fehr (1993) describes the influence of popular culture on modern art. Fehr visited the *Mona Lisa* at the Louvre, only to find that the number of reproductions and popular culture appearances the painting has made has caused her to cease to be a masterpiece. Fehr claims that she has "fallen from the weight of the pop culture millstone hung about her delicately painted neck" (p. 68). Fehr finds that the reason that few can explain the sanctity of the *Mona Lisa* is in the use of educational art criticism models. Fehr describes Broudy and Feldman as the "Gemini Twins of Modern Classroom Criticism" (p. 68). Broudy's model emphasizes technical, sensory, and expressive properties of works, which includes mastery of medium, craftsmanship, and elements and principles of design. The last sequence of Broudy's model attends to the expressive properties in a work. Feldman's four-step model begins with description and analysis, and ends in interpretation and judgment. Fehr points out that both models follow Bloom's (1956) Taxonomy by beginning with simple levels and moving towards complex levels of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. In referring to the shared approach of Broudy and Barrett, Fehr points out that "there is no documentation that such an approach is the most effective for art criticism" and that the "foggy" attitudes towards master works could be a result of these educational art criticism practices. (p. 69). Fehr argues that teachers, with no preparation, can do something that looks like a criticism lesson using the Broudy or Feldman models, and in his view, this is "bad art teaching" (p. 69).

Fehr suggests a model of his own. Because he claims that both Broudy and Feldman fail to properly address the historical context of a work of art, he suggests that this should be the first step in the criticism model. A teacher cannot effectively introduce historical context without preparation, according to Fehr. Fehr suggests that the step that

follows historical context should be interpretation, which demonstrates "awareness of the milieu in which that work of art was created" (p. 69). Fehr claims that it is irresponsible to analyze the elements and principles until the meaning of the work has been established. The step that follows in Fehr's model is analysis. Fehr states, "Analyzing a work's formal aspects before determining its meaning is like guessing the purpose of a lawnmower if one has never seen grass" (p. 70). Fehr's analysis includes elements and principles, craftsmanship, mastery, and subject matter. Fehr claims that his model of criticism including historical context, formal analysis, and interpretation leads to "more enlightened understanding" (p. 70). Only after these steps have been taken is the viewer qualified to make a judgment, which is the last step of Fehr's model. Fehr claims that this model cannot be used without a properly prepared teacher, and therefore demands more time, but pays off in more enlightened students.

Fehr (1994) denounces the effectiveness of the Broudy and Feldman models of art criticism, claiming that they "embrace the modernist notion of the artifact largely as an object of aesthetic contemplation" and "have earned their place in history, but do not speak today" (p. 52). Fehr argues that all models of art criticism are inherently political, offering "alignment with one or another platform of power in society" and that the models "fail to examine political issues in art," and instead "bow to the presiding ideology" (53). Because they lack historical context, Fehr argues, they lack true interpretation (p. 55).

The National Standards for Visual arts suggest that the proficient high school student should be able to "interpret an artwork or collection of works, supported by relevant and sufficient evidence found in the work and its various contexts" and the

accomplished student should "identify types of contextual information useful in the process of constructing interpretations of an artwork or collection of works." (NCCAS Standards, 2013) Furthermore, students are required to "establish relevant criteria in order to evaluate a work of art or collection of works." Historical, social, and cultural context are particularly relevant for students when art criticism is supported by art history. The National Standards also outline how students should be able to have a deeper understanding of history, culture, and society through art criticism, requiring students to "describe how knowledge of culture, traditions, and history may influence personal responses to art" and "compare uses of art in a variety of societal, culture, and historical contexts and make connections to uses of art in contemporary and local contexts." (NCCAS Standards, 2013) Historical context and interpretations should be used in collaboration.

According to Geahigan and Wolff (1997), "The pursuit of meaning inevitably raises issues and concerns about moral value of works of art, about the artist and the viewer, and about the contexts in which the work of art is created and appreciated" (146). The concept of intermixing the separate practices of interpretation, historical context, and broader art criticism strategies is an idea rooted in discipline-based art education (DBAE).

In the DBAE handbook, Dobbs (1992) differentiates art criticism from aesthetic scanning, claiming that aesthetic scanning is used for "initiating the process of art criticism," while art criticism requires a "deeper level of analysis and exposition," which requires putting the work in context with other works by the same artist and the cultural context of the work of art" (p. 85). The DBAE handbook goes on to describe aesthetic

scanning as "a method developed by Harry S. Broudy and W. Dwaine Greer, is designed

to involved the learner in actually seeing what is in a work of art by visually scanning and

talking about four kinds of properties and qualities: sensory properties, formal properties,

technical properties, and judgments" (p. 93). The second aesthetic scanning model

provided by the DBAE Handbook is the Mittler Approach, which includes premature

decision- making, searching for internal cues (art criticism approaches, such as the

Feldman Model), searching for external cues (historical context and art history), and final

decision making (judgment). The DBAE handbook also suggests using the aesthetic

scanning strategies of Feldman and Mittler, which claims that they are based in formalist

aesthetic, and more "empathetic" approaches such as those of Laura Chapman and Per

Johansen.

Educators express concern regarding the effectiveness of in-class criticism

activities. Venable claims, "Both trained and untrained viewers of art make connections

between what they have experienced in their own lives and the artwork before them.

Many methods of art criticism make little use of such experiences" (p. 7). In fact,

Mittler's model labels previous experiences "premature decision-making," and

encourages the viewer to move past them (Venable 1998 p. 7). Venable argues that these

initial reactions based on past experiences should be used and built upon, rather than

ignored (p. 7). By dismissing these responses, the teacher is suggesting that the reactions

are not conducive to coming to an understanding of art, which is untrue. Feldman's

model of criticism suggests that interpretations, analyses, and judgments are withheld in

the initial step. Venable claims,

> Withholding judgment until the work is more fully understood assumes
> that initial judgments are arrived at too quickly, are incorrect, and are

entrenched. Such a practice does not integrate the viewer's experience
which is vital in a student's ability to make meaning (p. 7).

Venable (1998) claims that withholding judgment until the end is unavoidable and
unnatural (p. 7). Young students may find it particularly difficult to separate judgment
from interpretation. According to Geahigan and Wolff (1997), "Works of art are
potentially problematic because they can be understood and evaluated in different ways"
(p. 146). They go on to state, "If students are sometimes puzzled by a work of art and
realize that they lack relevant understanding, more often than not they believe that what
they observe is the only want to see and understand that work" (p. 147). Art criticism
models can present unique challenges for secondary art students.

Venable (1998) describes another issue with art criticism models, which is that
critical learning rarely happens in a sequential, linear, building on previous steps manner
(p. 8). "Art criticism models that use inflexible sequencing short circuit the potential for
complex learning by ensuring that certain outcomes are precast, discouraging connections
to other areas" (p. 8). Art criticism models that do not comply with student learning styles
could be less effective. Venable claims that there is not criticism model that is perfect for
every education situation, and that an adaptation of the models available may provide the
teacher with the critical methods needed to create dialogue about the importance of art
criticism. Venable feels that teachers should evaluate and re-evaluate their criticism
programs to ensure that observable results are noted. Venable (1998) claims, "Constant
reevaluation and scrutiny of our methods in art criticism, as in any discipline, will keep
the focus of understanding clear and our goals attainable" (p. 9). Responsible educators
must continuously seek observable results in their art criticism practices.

Student Peer Critique

Definition of Student Peer Critique Cotner (2001) claims, "Art is a form of communication. Talking about art is a way to communicate to others what we make of our encounters with our own art-making and of our encounters with artwork made by others" (p. 14). House (2008) defines critique as "an evaluation of student artwork. It can be a useful teaching tool for any age group studying the visual arts" (House p. 48). House claims that a good critique must include positive reinforcement as well as constructive criticism. House outlines the benefits of art critiques for teachers as a chance to evaluate artwork and an assessment of the fulfillment of project objectives (p. 49). "A critique that occurs in process, when students are actively engaged in developing ideas, and producing works of art, provides them time to slow down, step back and reevaluate the next step" (p. 49). Critiques are typically conducted by art instructors with students about artwork that is in process or completed by students. Critiques always involve the artwork and the maker. Critiques can be held for whole studio classes or individually, in process or at the conclusion of an assignment (Barrett 2000 p. 29). Typically students offer opinions about the work, and see how others interpret and judge their work. According to Waters-Eller and Basile (2013),

> To critique can be tricky, in fact the word "critique" is probably best when used least. It appears to inherently bring the sense of power and judgment to certain situations that are actually better at being considered conversation or discussion (p. 39).

Because the term "critique" has multiple definitions, it is important to define critique in terms of art education pedagogy and practice.

Elkins (2012) defines critique as "the most interesting, infuriating, and challenging part of art teaching" and "potentially the most helpful and rewarding" of all

things (p. vii). Elkins describes the struggle and benefits of critiques in a way that

emphasizes their crucial part in the curriculum. Elkins claims,

> Critiques can mimic real-life situations: they can sound like seductions,
> trials, poems, or fights. The can run the range from deathly boring to
> incoherently passionate- and that is appropriate, because artworks
> themselves express the widest spectrum of human response (p. vii).

Elkins' definition of critiques likely resonates with many art teachers as they define

critiques and their role in the art classroom.

In a study conducted by Barrett (2000) he found that teachers cited the purpose of

critique as judging student progress. A typical art critique, as defined by Hartung (1995),

is "an event in which student artworks from a specific class assignment or time frame are

on view" and during the critique process the student artists and teacher "talk about what

they see, the intentions, and whether or not the work is successful regarding various

compositional aspects (p. 36). Hartung (1995) outlines the benefits of in class student

peer critiques:

> The critique provides an opportunity to extend art production learning
> exercises into experiences that connect the student with expanded visual
> and aesthetic awareness, and reinforce that which has just been learned.
> There are many uses for the critique. If appropriately structured, it can fit
> particular learning goals and teaching objectives. There are many different
> ways to structure the critique to accomplish a chosen goal. The student
> critique has only one set characteristic-the presence of student work. (p. 36)

Anderson (1986) makes clear that students are capable of meaningful dialogue about art,

and their responses to art are no less important than those of adults. Anderson advocates

for the importance of talking about art by claiming that it creates a sense of

"connectedness in the minds of students" and allows them to see that seeing and

perceiving are "mandatory parts of the communicative nature of art" (p. 5).

Meaningful dialogue is an important aspect of student peer critiques. Talk helps with

conceiving, elaborating, and refining visual forms and helps students grasp content and feelings that are beyond their normal and accustomed modes, thus helping them develop new insights and novel and vivid imagery (Anderson, 1986, p. 6).

Outcomes of Student Peer Critique. According the National Visual Arts Standards (2013), proficient students should be able to "apply relevant criteria from traditional and contemporary cultural contexts to examine, reflect on, and plan revisions for works of art and design in progress." Accomplished students should be able to "engage in constructive critique with peers, then reflect on, re-engage, revise, and refine works of art and design in response to personal artistic vision." Advanced students should "reflect on, re-engage, revise, and refine works of art and design in response to traditional and contemporary criteria aligned with personal artistic vision." These standards directly apply to student peer critiques. Teachers should know the outcomes of student peer critique in order to best shape practices for the benefit of students.

Barrett (1988) conducted a study that compared the goals of studio art critiques conducted by college professors and the goals from education literature regarding the teaching of art criticism by teachers. Barrett concluded that the goals for the two are different, and that future art educators use their own experiences from critiques conducted by professors to model their teaching of critique. Barrett (1988) suggests that critiques have a great impact on a student because of the accumulation of critiques that students participate in during their coursework over a number of years. (p. 22) Barrett's study included 19 art professors and a mix of undergraduate students pursuing mostly art and humanities related degrees. Critiques among professors came in a variety of forms.

Some art professors used critiques as the culmination of studio projects, some used group in-process and end-of-project critiques, and others held critique only at the conclusion of the term. Some professors claimed that critique was the most important part of their teaching. Others expressed their concerns with the success of their critiques, and most preferred more student participation and determined the effectiveness of their critiques based on student participation. Some professors admitted that they talked too much during critique. One professor blatantly admitted that the student's role was to present, and the professor's role was to criticize. In terms of what was evaluated, the objectives of the project as assigned by the professor or the student's personal intent stood as the criteria for judging the artwork. Most professors used critique as an evaluation, and most critiques were aimed at bettering student work.

Barrett (1988) also heard from students about positive critique experiences that included a professor who kept notes to use in critiques throughout the quarter, and requiring students to keep a written critique journal. Another student felt respected by her teacher, who pointed out strengths and weaknesses in each piece presented in a non-threatening manner. One student said that critiques helped her to take ownership over her artwork (p. 31). Instructors citing negative critique experiences often complained of too much instructor-dominated dialogue, instructors who impressed their own opinions upon students, and overall lack of student participation, even student apathy. Instructors recalled times when students seemed to leave critiques defeated rather than uplifted. Some instructors felt that students were not receptive to peer or instructor comments, and sometimes the environment felt "unsafe." Students cited similar difficulties with critiques, expressing that teachers often dominate critiques, that critiques could be

discouraging or even hurtful. Some students desired corrective feedback and felt that the teacher was "afraid" to tell her when she was "screwing up" (p.32). Students could identify the lack of interpretation in critique, expressing frustration over nobody attempting to understand the work, but rather merely judging the work.

Barrett (1988) conducting a survey of criteria for "good" and "bad" critiques from both instructors and students. Instructors desired for students to be left with enthusiasm rather than negativity, to not be humiliated or discouraged, and to feel self-confidence and a sense of their own accomplishment. Instructors felt that critiques were good when the professor did not talk over students, and students kept energetic conversation. Successful critiques were honest and critical, yet celebrated strengths. Instructors desired for students to leave more aware of the language of criticism and with a sense of empowerment with a different point of view. Student criteria for a "good" critique included feeling supported, a comfortable environment, inspiration, and leaving the critique feeling confident. One student suggested a desire for historical information important to the art being critiqued.

House (2008) cautions against situations in which students stand in front of the class displaying their work while their peers talk about it, standing as "targets" while their peers are unsure of what to say about the artwork. There is need to improve student critique in order to avoid negative outcomes, as critiques can have a lasting impact on students (Barrett 1988).

Differences in Art Criticism and Student Peer Critique

There are distinct differences between art criticism and peer critique. Art criticism involves artwork outside of student work, and often includes art by professional artists. In many cases, art critiques are conducted for the purpose of bettering student artwork. Anderson (1986) differentiates between talking about student art and talking about professional art. In relation to student dialogue about student art, Anderson claims: "Talking about student art is largely for instruction to further students' artistic development. Formal qualities and thematic content are discussed in relation to what the student is trying to express and how that may be furthered" (p. 6). Therefore, student talk about student art is considered a student peer critique, and student talk about an outside work would be considered art criticism.

House (2008) similarly describes the difference between art critiques and art criticism. Art criticism, according to House, includes description, interpretation, judgment, and theory, as does the studio critique. The difference between the critique and criticism is in their purposes. The intention of a studio critique is to improve student artwork. Barrett also (1988) clarifies a large difference between student peer critiques (studio critiques) and the goals of art criticism in art education. He finds that teachers aim to use critique to improve student artwork, whereas in art education literature, there are a number of goals of art criticism aside from mere evaluation. Feldman and Barrett alike suggest that judgment is the least important aspect of criticism. Furthermore, Barrett suggests that because critiques are used mainly as evaluative tools, rather than interpretive dialogue, that the idea of criticism becomes a negative judgment. "Studio critiques perpetrate a very limited notion of art criticism as the judgment of art" (p.26).

Barrett (1988) begins to suggest a difference between studio critiques and art criticism, as outlined in art education literature, and emphasize the importance of discussing the difference with students:

> Harmony between studio art and art education curricula in the practice of art criticism would enhance the chance of success for the achievement of art education goals for the teacher of art and criticism. But since this is not the case, art educators could improve their chances of success with their students by examining and discussing the differences between the studio critique as it is practiced by studio professors and art criticism as it is recommended in art education readings (p. 27).

Barrett is both remarking on the need for improvement within the field of criticism and the common ground shared by critique and criticism. The similarities between critique and criticism could be used to better student peer critiques. House (2008) points out, "Both the critique and art criticism can be described as conversations about art that educate" (p. 48). Despite the differences in art criticism and student peer critiques, the similarities could be utilized to produce more meaningful critiques, based on interpretation rather than mere judgment (Barrett 1988; Feldman 1973).

Improving Student Peer Critique

Need for structure. In Barrett's (1988) study, student artworks were judged against the assignment from the professor or the intent of the student. Barrett found that few professors had a structure or model for their critiques. The basis of the interpretive aspect of art criticism was the assignment or student intent in the artwork. Art educators, however, express "considerable hesitancy in relying on intent as a basis of interpretive accuracy or artistic worth" (p. 26). Barrett suggests that there are narrow goals in art critiques, and a need for more organization in class critiques is evident in many observed

classrooms. Structure is needed in order for teachers to not be overly domineering in critiques, and rich dialogue can be facilitated by using models of art criticism found in art education literature. Those who conduct peer critiques must be aware of the goal of the critique in order for it to be successful. Barrett believes that if art critiques included more criticism strategies, such as description, interpretation, and theory, that they would be beneficial to students and teachers. According to Donmover (1993),

> After employing an art criticism approach to assess students' work, teachers should have a richer understanding of what students can do, the problems that need to be worked on, what might have caused these problems, and consequently how to go on about correcting them and building on students' strengths (p.259).

Organizing student peer critique can produce greater results for teacher assessment of student improvement.

Barrett (1988) claims that the purpose of organizing talk about art need to encourage more careful and longer observation, and the ability to "read the visual environment" (p. 22). Participants learn to cope with disagreements and take chances in interpreting works of art, if the teacher has structured critique to be a productive experience. Hartung (1995) provides helpful insight into what it means to structure critique: "Structuring a critique means the teacher has a set goal, has prepared for the session, has informed the students about the objectives, has helped the session relate to the goal and has encouraged the students to reflect on what occurred during the critique" (p. 37).

Need for goals. Barrett (1988) suggests that studio critiques could be improved with goals and procedures. He makes the point that not all students who participate in these critiques will pursue art careers, so critiquing for the sole purpose of improvement

may not be appropriate. Barrett suggests that if professors used more structure in their critiques and used description, interpretation, and evaluation to shape the dialogue, that judgments may be more effective and student participation may be improved. Barrett suggests ways to improve student dialogue, both about art they have made and the artwork of professionals, such as the teacher knowing the general trajectory of the learning outcomes, and directing discussion to meet those outcomes.

Anderson (1986) stresses that it is important for teachers to decide the goals for discussion before beginning a critique activity. Most teachers discuss formal elements and principles, or formal qualities in the artwork (p. 6) Anderson stresses that the discussion should go beyond the formal qualities of the work to discuss the expressive and thematic qualities as well.

Hartung (1995) suggests that the teacher structure critique with specific goals in mind, and to know the following questions before beginning the critique:

1. How could this critique expand on the learning that has already occurred in this lesson? How can it be used to fulfill other learning goals?

2. How should this critique be conducted?
   a. What lesson(s) will provide the student work for the session? How will it be displayed?
   b. What should I as the teacher say and do? What type of statements and questions will be made? Will they be addressed to individuals, small or large groups? What other materials are needed besides the students work?
   c. What do I want to elicit from the students?
   d. How can I accomplish a successful closure so the students are aware of what happened during the critique? (p.37)

Goal setting allows for the teacher to facilitate discussion and ask questions that may lead students in the direction of the goals.

The roles of teachers and students. According to Waters-Eller and Basile (2013), relationship development between teachers and students is a lengthy process requiring mutual respect, and every student has a different relationship to time, modes of communication, and learning styles (p. 22). The role of teachers and students in the classroom can be difficult to outline, but seems to play an important role in conducting student peer critiques. Anderson (1986) suggests a student-centered curriculum, with a teacher who is honest, straight-forward, and sensitive. If a teacher asks a question about a student's work, that student will know that the teacher feels that the student is important enough to elicit adult response (p.6). Similarly, Barrett suggests a mentorship model that places focus on student learning.

Barrett (2000) argues that with mentoring, the problems students and instructors experience with critiques could be diminished. "Critiques that are helpful to one person might be less effective for another, depending on many factors including personality type, learning style, level of maturation, and need for information" (p. 33). Barrett deduces that students essentially want to be cared for as individuals, for instructors to "foster a spirit of good will," and protect them from embarrassment so that they feel encouraged to continue art making. Barrett claims that many issues with critiques are created by instructors who are not fully aware of their teaching practice and its effect on students, positively or negatively. If instructors can begin to see themselves as "mentors," they may be able to improve their teaching. Notions of mentoring such as "loving, affirming, caring, and nurturing relationships" could keep instructors from creating situations that may "diminish a student's sense of self-worth and undermine the student's confidence to continue to learn" (Barrett, 2000, p. 34). Barrett suggests that it is necessary for

instructors and students to share responsibility for learning, and that both parties have positive contributions to provide one another. Instructors felt that it was necessary to dominate conversation to fill the silence when students were unwilling to participate in dialogue, but Barrett suggests that with an attitude of mentorship, that shared responsibility and goals for critiques will greatly improve participation.

Barrett (2004) suggests that through shared responsibility and mentorship, instructors can benefit from student perspectives and feel less pressured to be "right" when responding to student work in critiques. Mentoring does not solve all problems with critique, but can encourage teachers to reshape their practices to foster a positive environment and mutual respect. Barrett claims,

> Were students to know and feel that their instructors were trying to mentor them rather than criticize them, students would likely respond more positively to and engage more readily in critical discussions of their work. They would be less likely to assume defensive postures when their work was being discussed, even when remarks were made to rectify perceived deficiencies in the work (p. 35).

Mentoring can prompt changes in instructor's attitudes about their teaching, and cause them to improve their teaching for themselves and their students.

Barrett (2004) has found through studies that many teaching artists have complained of students over-using phrases such as "I like it" or "It's cool" (p. 88). Barrett suggests that by asking students what they see up front, that judgment is reserved and the facilitator may easily keep students on track by redirecting comments that stray from description. Barrett encourages descriptive observation by noting that some students may notice what others do not, to keep students from feeling embarrassed by stating what seems obvious. The facilitator must be reinforcing and honest. To avoid boring description, Barrett cautions to avoid naming elements of design "apart from their

contribution to the expressive meanings of any piece" (p. 89). The facilitator should gauge student interest and move on to a place between description and interpretation, by asking questions such as "How do you feel?" or "What has the artist done?" (p. 89). Because artworks cannot mean anything we want them to, the teacher must facilitate reasonable dialogue about the meaning of the work, taking into account all of the "elements or the cultural and historical context in which the work was made" (Barrett, 2004, p. 90).

In peer critiques, it is important that the student artist not over-determine what the artwork means and stress it to their peer viewers. Barrett (2004) states, "from an educational point of view, relying on the artist to make the work and explain the work takes all interpretive responsibility from the viewer and places it on the maker" (p. 91). To solve this, Barrett asks the student whose work is being discussed to refrain from explaining the work to allow the artist to listen to how the work is received. Barrett claims that,

> When student artists speak about their own work during an interpretive discussion, they often unintentionally undermine the discussion: They become defensive and want to explain; in the face of a compliment they become embarrassed and want to deflect praise; or they close conversations by giving supposedly definitive answers about meanings that should remain open-ended (p. 91)

Barrett suggests that positive responses can be received for judgment by asking questions such as "This is already good: How might it be even better?" In order to improve student responses, Barrett does not allow students to use the word "like" and does not advise that likes and dislikes are "entertained" because they reflect the personal preference of the speaker, rather than providing insight into the work. Barrett defines judgment as "what is valued and why" (p. 92). Barrett outlines three requirements of a responsible judgment: a

clear statement of appraisal, reasons for the appraisal, and explicit criterion on which the judgment is based (p. 92). He emphasizes that description and interpretation are most important in art talk, and that interpretation leads to appreciation. "When one understands a work of art, one likely will judge it to be good and also end up enjoying it, which is a highly desirable affective outcome" (p. 92).

Barrett (1991) suggests that critique facilitators direct questions from participants to each other rather than to the facilitator (p. 70). In his own facilitation of critiques, Barrett keeps remarks brief and avoids lecture. He says, "I frequently and sincerely compliment insightful comments" (p. 70). Barrett claims that thinking and talking about art can empower individuals if they are given direction in how to do it and are provided a safe environment in which to speak. Barrett claims, "My experiences have shown me that there are far fewer limits to what can be done with people and art, in schools and out, than we may imagine and that the activities of criticism are several and can be widely applied to a range of objects with anyone who is willing" (p. 72).

Anderson (1986) suggests beginning a critique with discussion about thematic qualities in works of art rather than the formal. Anderson states, "Formal discussion should be couched within thematic concerns expressed by the child" (p. 6). Anderson states that critiques of student art should be based on the theme of the lesson, and all formal qualities should be mentioned for the purpose of how they represent the assigned theme. The dialogue should be centered on the goals of the project, or the end that the assignment is to accomplish. Anderson argues that evaluation and judgments cannot be avoided in student critiques. However, judgments should come from an awareness of the objectives of the given lesson. He claims,

> If the primary objective is, as I believe it should be, to help the student advance his or her ability to make a communicative visual statement, judgments and corresponding evaluative statements should be interpretive rather than normative (p. 7).

In other words, the teacher should help students to understand what they are communicating and if they are successfully communicating that idea. Anderson warns teachers not to make judgments that could hurt the students' development. Talk about art can help students to progress in their "image-making abilities" (p. 7). Anderson cites Feldman's model of art criticism, which includes description, analysis, interpretation, and judgment. Feldman's model is intended to slow students down and keep them from immediately relying on their judgments. Anderson claims that students must have a method for approaching art, or a system of understanding art to use in their own approach to art. Anderson ensures that talk about art can increase student production and help them to better understand their own art, while increasing their appreciation of art.

Often it is difficult or seemingly impossible for the teacher to facilitate open discussion in the critique setting. Cazden (1988) outlines some reasons for the difficulty of open-discussion in the classroom setting. Cazden explains that in a typical classroom setting, teachers have control over the rights to speak. Teachers decide when and how to speak, may interrupt anyone, and can fill any silence (p. 54). A shift must occur in class discussions, from teacher-centered, to student centered. Cazden explains,

> It is easy to imagine talk in which ideas are explored rather than answers to teachers' test questions provided and evaluated; in which teachers talk less than the usual two-thirds of the time and students talk correspondingly more; in which students themselves decide when to speak rather than waiting to be called on by the teacher; and in which students address each other directly. Easy to imagine, but not easy to do. (p. 54)

In many cases, the need for student to raise their hands is eliminated when there is a shift away from teacher-elected commenters (p. 56). Often it is difficult for teachers and students to shift away from the structure of the teacher-centered classroom, or to "refrain from well-learned habits (p. 56). One teacher interviewed by Cazden claimed that she found it better to shift eye contact away from the student who is speaking, so that the student felt more encouraged to address fellow peers.

In order for students to have a successful discussion, students must be able to see one another, which is almost impossible if the desks are in rows. If students are placed in a circle arrangement, they are less likely to raise their hands, most likely to stay on task and make comments not in response to teacher nominations, and are less likely to withdraw from the class activity (Cazden, 1988, p. 59). A major inhibitor of student discussions is teacher questions. "At the heart of the shift from lesson to discussion is a different conception of knowledge and teaching" (p. 59). This can be difficult when teachers and students are used to behaving in a certain way. Elkins (2012) reiterates this point, claiming critiques are not the same as reading or lecturing, and all the differences count (p. 56). He claims "everything in critique matters," that the position of teachers, students, tone of voice, offhanded gestures, pose, and attitude all contribute to the success or failure of a critique (p. 56). The teacher's role is to make declarative and reflective statements, invitations to elaborate, and be silent. Teachers can also elicit more meaningful student responses if the time between asking a question and waiting for an answer or filling the silence with more talk if the answer is not given is increased. Increasing wait time can also eliminate the need to ask more questions, and therefore reducing questions to the ones most meaningful to discussion (p.60).

Importance of interpretation. Anderson (1993) directly identifies the purpose of interpretive discussion "The role of interpretation is to make sense of a work, to posit a meaning" (p.202). Barrett (2004) claims, "Learning to interpret meanings of works of art is more valuable than learning to judge their value" (p.87). Barrett advocates that interpretation is a key component to meaningful art criticism. Barrett (2003) states, "To interpret a work of art is to make it meaningful" (p. 1). Barrett (2004) stresses that there are many ways to interpret meaning: personal meaning, meaning for the artist, historical and cultural meaning, and communal meaning. Barrett warns that there may be tension between personal and communal meanings in works, and advises teachers to "set limits" on how works "can reasonably be interpreted" (p. 90). Students cannot simply make works of art mean whatever they want them to mean. Teachers must moderate student discussion of artwork to avoid unreasonable interpretations.

Barrett (1989) suggests that by using the questions presented by criticism models beyond mere judgment, that school art criticism could be more in line with professional art criticism through interpretation. Barrett quotes critics that claim that interpretation is more important than judgment. Barrett claims,

> Interpretive discussion increases understanding and thus deepens appreciation, whether that appreciation is ultimately of a negative or positive sort. A thorough understanding of a work of art requires adequate Instead of advocating a single and accurate description and implies a judgment; a judgment rendered without understanding, however, is irresponsive and irresponsible (p. 33).

Barrett (1994) defines and outlines the facets of interpretation in art criticism. "Teaching interpretation within art criticism is probably the most difficult aspect of teaching criticism because interpretation is perhaps the least understood and most often confused

of critical activities" (p. 8). Barrett claims that the most important part of art criticism is interpretation. Interpretation includes description and both can lead to understanding and appreciation. Barrett aims to help art teachers engage their students in interpretive discussion of art, and he provides criteria for evaluating their interpretations. Barrett (2003) claims that anyone who has a disposition to interpret and a positive willingness to engage in thinking about a work of art can participate in the interpretation of art. Barrett clams that the best interpretations are one in which the answers found are through the questions the interpreter deems meaningful (p. 37). Barrett (2003) claims,

> A good interpretation is one that satisfies your curiosity about the artwork that is of interest to you. It is one that clearly relates to what you can see in the work, one that expands your experience of the work, that leads you to think further about artworks and ideas, and one that motivates you to explore more artworks and ideas on your own (p. 36).

Barrett's theories about interpretation can be applied to classroom situations to help students reach more personal, meaningful connections with works of art. Barrett (2003) explains that interpretation can be both an individual and a communal endeavor. Shared interpretations or explanations of artwork can be found in groups of individuals (p. 220).

First Barrett (1994) clarifies that artworks have "aboutness" because art is made by people, unlike trees, rocks and other "mere things," they call for interpretations (p. 9). Barrett argues that responsible interpretations represent the artwork positively, and that interpretations are persuasive arguments. Some interpretations are stronger than others, and multiple, contradictory interpretations can be presented on the same work of art. There is room for diverse viewpoints within interpretation. Unlike judgments, which can sometimes be based on personal opinions, interpretations are more open to worldviews.

Barrett (2003) claims, "The evaluation of a work of art is dependent on how it is interpreted" (p. 24). Important particularly to art criticism within the classroom, Barrett claims, "good interpretations of art tell more about the artwork than they tell about the interpreter" (p. 10). The intent of interpretation is to reach understanding of the artwork, rather than to understand the critic. Good interpretations are coherent and convincing: they make sense. Interpretations do not ignore part of the artwork, but include all aspects of the work. Interpretations are emotional as well as intellectual, and are guided by feelings. The feelings, however, must be well articulated in the interpretation. Sometimes an interpretation does not match what the artist intended.

Artworks are not limited to the meanings intended by the artists. The artist's interpretation of his/her artwork is just that, an interpretation among interpretations. Another important point Barrett makes is very pertinent when considering criticism within a classroom context, which is "the objects of interpretations are artworks, not artists" (1994, p. 11). Biographical information about artists is necessary and good, but the object of interpretation is the artwork itself. Art is about the world in which it emerges from (p. 12). Barrett suggests that interpretation is a communal event, and that communities are self-correcting, so that if an interpretation is inadequate, it will eventually be improved by others in the community. Interpretation should invite the interpreter to form his/her own viewpoints, and emerge from interpretive dialogue. Though some of these criteria may be too advanced for some students, they serve as goals to base the progress of students in their interpretive skills as they practice art criticism. Barrett assures that not all of these principles of good interpretation must be implemented at once. The teacher may choose to focus on one principle per criticism activity or keep

track of them over time. He reminds the reader that the principles outlined for

interpreting artwork should hold true for children's art as well as professionally created

artworks. He claims,

> Too often in classroom situations we ask the child-artist to be the
> interpreter and spokesperson for his or her own work. This common
> activity diminishes the responsibility of the viewer to thoughtfully respond
> to works of art and runs counter to the interpretive principles offered here
> (p. 13).

Barrett's principles for interpretation ensure that classroom criticism activities produce

quality interpretation.

Anderson (1993) asserts,

> We do art criticism to understand and appreciate works of art. To
> understand, in this case, means to find meaning in a work of art. If we are
> trying to find meaning, it implies that we assume that art has meaning
> intentionally embedded in it (p. 204).

Smith (1999) also advocates for the need for interpretation in art criticism, rather than

mere judgment, claiming: "Aesthetic experience, as many have remarked, involves a

certain taking of things as they come without worrying how good they are" (p.8). Walker

(1996) states the need for interpretive dialogue in art lessons, rather than lessons centered

on formal characteristics or elements and principles (p. 14).

Buster and Crawford (2010) claim,

> Meaning can never be completely contained in any work of art or in any
> one of its parts. Although we immediately think of meaning as something
> that resides comfortably in a work's narrative imagery, it is really a
> slippery, shifting thing, informed also by a multitude of formal choices
> made by the artist- when and where a work exists, what is it made of, how
> it came into being, who made it, and what is carried to it by the
> viewer (p. 41).

Deciphering meaning in works of art, or interpreting, is a vital part of any meaning-based

art curriculum. Understanding and implementing interpretation can help to create more

productive class critiques, as students learn that multiple meanings can be found within single works.

Introducing students to the work of professional critics Exposing students to the work of professional critics can help them to more fully understand criticism and therefore be more comfortable with peer art critiques. "The value of reading good criticism is increased knowledge and appreciation of art" (Barrett 1989 p. 31). In understanding how to speak about art, professional art critics serve as examples of the use of qualitative language in writing about art (Tollifson 2011). There is something to be said for teaching students about the role of art critics and specifically how they shape the viewer's appreciation of artwork (Hartung, 1995, p. 37). In discussing the importance of exposing students to the work of critics, Barrett (1989) claims: "if we already know and appreciate artwork, reading someone else's view of it may expand our own if we agree or may sharpen our own if we choose to disagree and formulate counterarguments" (p. 31). Anderson (1993) suggests that the model that professional critics use for art criticism should also be implemented in educational settings in order to develop critical thinking skills (p. 204).

If students are able to slow down and spend more time with an image through art criticism, then they will "expand their attention to an artwork" and their perception will be altered (p.32). Barrett (1989) claims,

> With the risk of oversimplification, the four procedures of description, interpretation, evaluation, and theory can be presented to students in four basic questions: What is here? What is it about? How good is it? Is it art? Students can use these questions as a heuristic matrix with which they can read criticism so that they can discover how critics go about criticizing art. These questions, and many variations thereof, can be understood and given answers by all students, of few and many years, in critically examining art, their own and that made by established artists (p. 33).

Barrett states, "students who begin to consider art as critics consider it will likely increase their own understanding and appreciation of criticism and of art" (p. 33). Exposing students to professional criticism could help them to more fully understand the definition of criticism and its many forms. Students can begin to see criticism more broadly and help them to see the language involved to responsibly participate in the discussion of images.

Cotner (2001) describes the disparities between the work of professional critics, which use colorful, provocative, and persuasive, and educational art criticism, which is less focused on value and meaning. Cotner claims,

> This comparison strongly suggests that what is acceptable in professional practice is unacceptable in the classroom. Such findings have many questions regarding classroom practice unanswered, especially pertaining to high school art talk, in which student artwork and art discourse may be compared to professional standards (p. 13).

Teachers should not judge students against professional art critics, but rather enlighten them to the possibilities of art criticism by looking at the work of professional critics. Cotner also argues for a move away from child development models of learning to more professional models in the secondary classroom. (p. 12). Art criticism is important for all students, regardless of experience level, and looking at the work of professional critics can only further student understanding and appreciation of art. Barrett (1989) states "If the process of doing criticism is personally valuable even for frequently published professional critics, then it is likely that there are considerable advantages for others who are less experienced in criticizing art" (p. 32).

Lee (1993) argues that reading contemporary critical writings can develop students' understanding of describing, analyzing, and interpreting. (p. 42) Lee states,

> By reading, discussing, comparing, and analyzing opposing views of contemporary critics, secondary (and undergraduate) students will discover that different approaches exist for interpreting art and for forming criteria for evaluation (p. 42).

Lee claims that students will enhance their ability to form criteria for evaluating works of art when they are given the opportunity to compare and analyze how critics develop their judgments (p. 43).

Strategies for student peer critiques. There are many strategies for conducting successful critiques. Barrett (1991) suggests beginning art criticism with students by asking them what they know about art criticism and how the term "criticism" has negative connotations (p. 67). Barrett recommends to then explain to students that talking and writing about art can increase understanding and appreciation.

Barrett (2004) also suggests outlining some simple rules for critiques with the class, such as eliminating side conversations, having one student speak at a time and limiting comments to one thought at a time. He does not make the disclaimer that there are no wrong answers in art before beginning a critique, for the purpose of not reinforcing that anyone can say anything valid. Some comments are better than others. Barrett sometimes uses warm-up exercises for critique, having students write about what comes to mind with a work of art without censoring or editing, and he will read them aloud, keeping the writers anonymous. Barrett lets the students know ahead of time that their words will remain anonymous and finds that it encourages discussion. Barrett describes

prerequisites for dialogue, including a proper physical environment, appropriate works of art, a multiplicity of voices, and a summative closure of the discussion. He suggests having students write as closure for the dialogue using a provided prompt by the teacher related to the discussion. Barrett even suggests passing on some of the writing activities to the English teacher.

The environment in which a critique is conducted is also important in shaping successful critiques. Barrett (1991) claims,

> I try to establish a psychologically safe environment in which people feel comfortable to discuss art by reinforcing their comments, disallowing put-downs from others, acknowledging the role of individual histories in perceiving art, encouraging a multiplicity of understandings and drawing many people into the discussion. I especially encourage careful listening and ask members to build on each other's comments (p. 66).

Barrett (2004) offers suggestions for critique strategies such as having students write a single question about their work that they wanted answered that day in order to structure critiques in a more productive way. For this activity the class answers the question for the artist, while the artist listens.

Hartung (1995) suggests that the teacher keep in mind the goal of building descriptive vocabulary for students. She suggests that the teacher print cards with descriptive words on them, distribute them to the students to place next to the work that describes the word. During the discussion students justify their placement of the cards.

Writing about artwork can be helpful to foster student discussion of their own artwork and artwork of their peers. Barnes (2009) claims, "Sketching initial ideas, formative critiques, peer evaluation, guided critiques, artist statements, and sketchbooks are all strategies that help the student artist reflect on his/her ideas and create meaning through their own works" (p. 40). A preliminary writing activity, quickly completed

before critique, could improve student critiques. Barnes claims that writing essays can also improve students' fluency of ideas and help them to be more successful in critique, she claims "The five-paragraph essay is similar to a guided critique, with simpler ideas building to more complex interpretations" (p. 45). As students move from basic to more complex ideas in critique, they can begin to interpret and discuss meaning. In describing a classroom discussion of an artwork, Barnes (2009) claims "Group discussion was an essential element as students progressed from direct observation to interpretation" (p. 43). Whether through a quick preliminary writing activity or an essay written about their work, writing can help students to progress from description to interpretation in peer critiques.

Brocato (2009) offers suggestions for methods of critique within the Studio Based Learning model. Brocato suggest that student do in-process pin-up critiques for self-assessment, small group critiques, or teacher-student critiques. "Desk" critiques, or informal conversations of works, can be useful as well for artworks in process. Brocato also suggests more formal critique methods, or what she calls "formal juries" for students to discuss more finalized works of art, during which students defend their decision making rather than discussing possibilities or opportunities as is the case with pin-ups and desk critiques. (p. 142). Brocato advocates for a person- centered approach to classroom management for studio-based learning. She defines person-centered as a student-centered approach to education, where emphasis is placed on shared learning. House (2008) explains that students need to be taught the vocabulary necessary to participate in critiques. Younger students can focus on the vocabulary and formal

qualities of the work; while more advanced students can discuss intent, technical concerns, and aesthetics. (p. 49).

Tollifson (2011) suggests that qualitative language can improve students' response to artwork.

> Qualitative language such as adjectives, verbs, adverbs, metaphors, similes, and analogies are essentially non-technical, ordinary words put in the service of a higher calling, art criticism in this case. When students' preliminary descriptions of artworks are qualitative, the resulting analyses, interpretations, and evaluations will be enhanced. The larger the qualitative vocabulary available to students, the broader the range, variety, and depth of qualitative meanings they can see in works of art (p. 11).

Students, however, typically do not use much qualitative language without instruction (Tollifson p. 12). Students typically use nouns to describe artwork, or rely on words like "cool," "awesome," or "weird." Tollifson's problem with students relying on such language is that "they over-generalize, failing to describe the particular uniqueness of the art object" (p. 12). Qualitative differentiation allows for us to clearly state what we think about anything, including works of art, therefore "gaining insight into possible meanings" (12). House (2008) claims, "Critiques are a recursive process in that when someone introduces a new idea, it can speak a new idea for someone else" (p. 49).

Art educators should be mindful of educational goals when choosing critique strategies. House claims, "There are numerous methods for conducting critiques. The method chosen should be determined by the educational goals and the questions identified to be answered in the critique" (p. 49). House suggests that asking students specific questions about the work to lead discussion can allow student a point of entry into the conversation, and eliminate the "I like it" comments made because of students

being unsure of what to contribute. Questions posed by teachers can lead to the discussion of something specific within the artwork.

Another recommended method by House (2008) involves students placing tokens next to works of art they wanted to talk about. House claims that assigning written responses to works of art can ensure everyone participates. The instructor can provide a question for students to answer, or the students can write about their own work in their journals. House describes another method in which each artwork is numbered and students pull numbers to determine which artwork they offer a positive statement and a constructive suggestion for. This method requires participation from all students and allows the teacher to gauge the understanding of each student according to the vocabulary they choose.

Successful critiques can lead to students' understanding of the own artwork. House sympathizes with teachers who are consistently asked by students if their work is "good enough" or meeting the teacher's standards. Through positive student-teacher relationships within critiques, students can begin to make their own decisions about their artwork (p. 50). By maintaining positive relationships with students, teachers can create a learning space that allows for students to freely express their ideas. "Teachers, regardless of the grade or age they teach, must maintain a learning environment that is physically and emotionally safe as this provides students with a safe forum to express their ideas" (House, 2008, p.50).

> Teachers play a significant role in making the art critique a valuable teaching method to incorporate into the art classroom. They define the basis for the critique and what is to be evaluated as well as how it will be evaluated. Teachers maintain an emotionally safe environment such that students are free to express themselves, and in turn students are open to receiving constructive criticism as well as praise (p. 51).

Critiques can encourage students to think reflectively about their artwork and stand as means of evaluating student progress. In addition, critiques provide students with opportunities to use new vocabulary. "To be successful, teachers and students should know the purpose of the critique as they participate in the discussion that focuses on art" (House, 2008, p. 51).

Simpson (2012) describes a method of critique called Design Structures that enables cooperative learning and teaching that improves student participation. Simpson feels that critiques are often unproductive because of lack of participation from students and the frequency of hurt feelings or discouragement (p. 64).

Simpson (2012) outlines some different types of critiques. The pin-up critique is an informal opportunity for students and the teacher to offer feedback during a project. "Juries, crits, and reviews" are critiques that typically happen at the middle or end of the project, and are more formal. Students present their artworks orally to students and the teacher. Crits serve as evaluative tools for the teacher. Simpson advocates for a student-centered collaborative learning model that allows for student-led discussion. Simpson finds that students will participate in higher-order learning and thinking when the focus is shifted away from the teacher and onto the students as leaders. In order for a true cooperative learning experience to happen, positive interdependence and individual accountability must be present (p. 70). Positive interdependence encourages synergy and helps students to see that individuals are needed to finish the task at hand. Individual accountability is an understanding that each student in the group is held accountable for their contributions. Sometimes groups need to be pre-determined by the teacher, based on observation. Students bring their artworks to the group, in whatever stage of completion

they stand. The teacher must let the students know that each individual's input is valuable. Each student is given a separate grade for their participation in critiques, based on their presence in the critique, their written notes from the critique, and their contribution to discussions (p. 72). Each group is given a list of questions to consider, related to the lesson objectives. The teacher monitors the critique groups. According to Simpson's study, students in collaborative critique groups felt higher accountability for their participation and felt more motivation.

When a student merely names the subject matter in a work of art, or only identifies the medium used, or simply designates the formal aspects, the student fails to respond to the work's visual qualities- those characteristics that contribute to making an object, site, or event a work of art (Tollifson, 2011, p. 12). Description of subject matter, inferences regarding the meaning of a work of art, and the acknowledgement of the use of elements and principles does not allow a student to fully develop qualitative language.

Language is integral to perception, and determines what is possible to talk about (Tollifson, 2011, p. 14). Students need more qualitative differentiation in their vocabularies in order to have richer and more varied responses to artwork. In order to increase students' qualitative differentiation, the teacher must explain what qualitative language is, through description or the creation of a visual chart of nouns and qualitative words to describe those nouns. The teacher can model qualitative language, for example through pointing out relationships between visual media, form, and subject matter. Another method of improving students' qualitative language is collaborative group discussions. Compare/contrast activities and interpretive discussions of artwork can be reinforcing for demonstrating qualitative language. Writing about art individually can

help students to use their qualitative language. "When students write about art, teachers are able to assess and instruct individual students, focusing on their personal strengths and weaknesses" (Tollifson, 2008, p. 17). Students could write reviews of their peer's work using qualitative language and the reviews could be displayed along with the reviews. (p. 18) In order to help students more fully understand qualitative language, the teacher can expose students to reviews written by professional art critics.

Hartung (1995) suggests that critiquing unfinished work can help to decrease "the threatening nature of negative criticism" (p. 37). Grouping may also be used in critique so that "discussion will help bring out what aspects of a work support the interpretations given" (p. 37).

Dialogical critique. Establishing an environment that fosters meaningful dialogue could help students to practice communication skills. Broudy (1987) suggests,

> Both art and science depend on the imaginative powers of the mind, and although language is unable to label all that the imagination can conjure up, it is by far the best catalogue of experience we have. Poverty of linguistic resources may betoken poverty of thought and feeling as well (p. 23).

Dialogue could be an important key to improving students' linguistic skills. Miles (2010) suggests that dialogue is a rare occurrence in art education. Typically it is pre-determined dialogue, or question and expected response. Miles mentions that the standardization of education leaves little time or room for dialogue (p. 375). State mandated standards restrict the ways in which dialogue can occur in the classroom (p. 375). Miles suggests methods for creating dialogical experiences that are participatory, critical, and offer multiple viewpoints. Resisting an overly regimented or authoritative relationship with students as a teacher is helpful in keeping students active during dialogue. Removing the

hierarchy between novice learners and experienced critics is important. Regulating and restricting dialogue in the art classroom is contrary to creating a democratic environment in which all participants are free to infer meanings and interpretations. Miles is an advocate of collaboration with regards to criticism (p. 376).

Zander (2004) offers some insight into the best practices of creating a dialogical environment. Zander suggests, much like Hubard, that dialogue in the classroom is more than asking the right questions or planning the right strategy, but facilitating open-ended discovery. Meaningful dialogue in a secondary classroom seems great in theory but can be a challenge in practice.

> Dialogue is not just a matter of asking the right questions or understanding a teaching strategy but a matter of creating an environment in which the teaching relationship becomes one of open-ended discovery (p. 49).

Zander (2004) suggests that dialogue requires commitment mutual respect, and time. The teacher and students like must be open to unexpected ends. The teacher must value relationships and a positive, safe learning environment.

> The dialogical relationship involves not just teaching strategies but a personal philosophy towards teaching that values relationships and the commitment of time to developing an environment in which these relationships can be established (p. 49).

Active student involvement will make the dialogue successful. Zander warns that dialogical relationships are not argumentative, polarizing, or partial (p. 50). The teacher must be comfortable enough to become an active participant, a mediator, a facilitator, and also maintain impartiality. Students must be taught how to conduct themselves in open dialogue and the teacher may reinforce healthy dialogical encounters by modeling the correct behavior. Rules and guidelines must be taught so that students know how to respond to opinions that are different from their own. Part of having students actively

engaged in critiques is ensuring that they feel safe enough to participate, that their

opinions are valued, and that they are supported by the teacher.

High school art classrooms are unique places for student dialogue. High school art

classrooms are rarely quiet. Student talk amongst themselves throughout the class until

the teacher addresses the entire group. Typically studio teachers do not lecture for the

entire class period, and most times the teacher interacts with students individually

(Cotner, 2001, p. 14). Cotner argues that the language used to discuss art in the high

school art classroom will "shape the teaching and learning that takes place in that

particular environment" (p. 15). Cotner claims that a "rich backdrop of classroom art

talk" can be provided when there is an abundance of comments made by students and a

trained teacher (p. 15). Classroom art talk can impart art and social concepts, while verbal

cues can help students create meaning in their art (Cotner, 2001, p.15). Cotner claims

"even in high school art classroom where literature such as art history texts and art

magazines are readily available the presence of the spoken word far outweighs that of the

written" (p. 16). Class dialogue about artwork can further students' understandings of

their visual environment, particularly at the secondary level. High school art may be the

last experience with formal education in the arts that students receive (Cotner p. 16).

If students are involved in making their own rules for class discussion, they will

be more likely to keep them (Zander, 2004, p. 52). A tool for art criticism could be to

have a discussion with students about what makes a respectful discussion. Students can

develop their own rules and begin to establish and environment of respect that is student-

centered. Zander's findings are similar to that of Hubard in ensuring that students are able

to come to their own conclusions about works of art. Zander's suggestions ensure that

students are able to express these conclusions and discuss them with peers in meaningful, respectful dialogue.

The art classroom is the perfect setting for students to improve their critical thinking skills and problem solving capabilities. Inquiry –based activities, according to Nancy Lampert (2006) are the way to enhance these skills and stimulate higher thinking in students. Lampert is an advocate of aesthetic inquiry, which is questioning what art means and art's definition. Aesthetic inquiry requires dialogue of artworks. Lampert suggests that open-ended questions prompt students to use higher order thinking skills.

Lampert breaks down several criticism methods and suggests that all methods are best used in collaborative settings. The models include compare/contrast, the exchange of observations, reflection, and aesthetic awareness. Students can be shown new perspectives that reconcile their established beliefs through inquiry. Lampert suggests using a variety of strategies in art criticism, including Terry Barrett's three step model for art criticism (describe, interpret, judge), which is mandated by the Virginia Standards of Learning. Lampert concludes that aesthetic, critical, and creative questioning can be used by teachers to facilitate student discussions about artwork. Through these methods, students will be able to openly express what they see in a work of art and their individual experiences, which will translate into the disposition of being respectful of varying viewpoints. The questions a teacher asks can have a great influence on the effectiveness and depth of a criticism activity discussion. House (2008) claims, "Questions worthy of dialogue are those that relate to student experiences and personal knowledge" (p. 52). House asserts that teachers must ask questions that "deserve inquiry," yet are reasonable

for students to answer, meaningful, and open-ended enough to spark discussion (p. 52).

Proper questioning may require planning ahead of critique.

White (2011) values interpretation in art criticism above evaluation. However,

when students encounter interpretive criticism, they are timid and their interpretations

"lack vitality and individual voice" (p. 144) and their interpretive writings do not reflect

their emotional response to the work. White suggests evocative writing in art criticism,

which is poetry-like writing or storytelling.

> Critiques are aesthetically founded reflections and commentaries. In other
> words, the nature of the type of critique under discussion here is oriented
> toward the experience of the viewer. In addressing that experience, of
> course, significant details about the artwork emerge. The interaction is
> reciprocal (p. 151).

White advocates for the use of evocative critiques because of his interest in experience

sharing. White calls for a broadening of art education to include creative writing.

Student peer critiques can be improved by borrowing structures from traditional

art criticism models, incorporating contemporary models of art criticism in art education

literature and from the examples of art critics, and from structuring student dialogue in a

way that promotes meaningful connections. Teachers should mindfully plan student peer

critiques to determine learning goals for each activity. Students can benefit from

reflecting on their work both orally and in writing. Student peer critiques enrich art

education.

Chapter III

Methodology

Design

The goal of this qualitative research study is to address the role of student peer critiques in the secondary art classroom, find strategies to encourage meaningful experiences in art critiques, and organize strategies into activities that can be implemented with any lesson plan. The role of art criticism in the secondary classroom will be explored through art education literature.

Sample

Peer critique strategies for each level of secondary art: Art I, Art II, Art III, and Art IV, will be created to show the ability to adapt activities to suit the needs of any level of art. Strategies will meet the requirements of the Virginia Standards of Learning for Visual Arts with particular regard to Analysis, Evaluation, and Critique, and will be structured for compliance with any secondary art curriculum.

Instrumentation

Strategies will include sequential instructions that can be used by secondary art teachers with any lesson. One strategy for each grade level: Art I, Art II, Art II, and Art IV will be provided in a detailed template, in addition to a list of strategies and suggestions for implementation in any secondary art curriculum. The template for creating the strategies for art education for each level will include the following information:

Strategy Title:

Approximate Time: About how long will it take? At what point in the lesson will this strategy be conducted?

Brief Description: What is the general purpose of this strategy and what does it entail? (Briefly describe in a synopsis format, longer steps will be listed under the "Procedures" section)

Connection to the National Standards for Art Education: What anchor standards does this critique activity include? What level(s) in secondary art are best suited for this particular activity?

Connection to Virginia Standards of Learning: How does this critique activity comply with the Virginia Standards?

Essential Vocabulary: What vocabulary might students need in order to participate in dialogue? How will students know these vocabulary words before the activity?

Materials: What materials are necessary to successfully conduct the student peer critique strategy? What is needed in the physical environment in order to carry out this critique strategy?

Preparation: What does the teacher need to do ahead of time in order to be prepared for this critique activity?

Teacher Actions: What actions must the teacher take in order to facilitate this activity? What questioning strategies might be used to facilitate discussion? What is the teacher's role in this particular activity?

Student Actions: What actions must the student take in order to facilitate this activity?

Procedures: List, in detail, the steps that need to be taken in order to successfully conduct the strategy?

Assessment: How will students be assessed? How will student participation be gauged?

Strategies for Differentiation: How will a variety of learners participate in this activity?

Resources: List any resources that may be helpful to the teacher, or sources that were used in the creation of the strategy.

Procedure

The procedures for the research include the following sequence: 1) substantial review of the literature found on art criticism, student peer critique, the differences in art criticism and student peer critique, and improving student peer critique. 2) Analyze the National Standards for Art Education and the Virginia state requirements for Visual Art as they pertain to analysis, evaluation, and critique to ensure that activities created will meet the requirements. 3) Create strategies for conducting student peer critiques for each of the four levels of secondary art and place them in the template of criteria for peer critique strategies, in addition to a list of strategies and suggestions for implementation into any existing secondary art curriculum. The literature review will reveal the definition and purpose of art criticism, models for art criticism, the definition and outcomes of student peer critiques, differences in art criticism and student peer critique, and methods of improving student critiques. Based on the findings, the researcher will create a list of strategies and four detailed strategies that may be incorporated into existing lesson plans.

Chapter IV

Results

The results and conclusions for this study were derived from the review of literature, specifically revisiting research questions suggested in chapter one. A review of literature provided a background of information for the purposes of art criticism and art critiques and how to improve student peer critiques in the secondary art classroom.

1. What is the role of student peer critique in secondary art education?

Results

The results of this research indicated that the role of student peer critique is a necessary part of secondary art education for the following reasons:

- Criticism can provide an opportunity for students to share ideas, meanings, values, and beliefs concerning the human condition (Garber, 1990; Feldman, 1973; Smith, 1973).

- Critically examining works of art can help students to become better at observation, description, and perception (Dobbs, 1992).

- Students can become more aware of the cultural, historical, and social context in which works of art are created. Contextual understanding can help students to value art and its reflection of larger social and cultural realities, in addition to better understanding their own choices. Art criticism can expose students to cross-cultural experiences (Dobbs, 1992; Anderson, 1995; Venable, 1998).

- Students can cultivate the ability to take in a work of art in terms of form, multiple meanings, and make critical judgments about artwork. When students use description, analysis, and interpretation, they can make more responsible judgments (Dobbs, 1992; Barrett, 1989).

- The understanding of artwork can lead to new knowledge of the world and new ways of experiencing it. Students can become less intimidated by artwork, and therefore less indifferent or hostile towards it. Students can develop personal connections with works of art through critique (Barrett, 1991, 2003).

- Students can learn to construct meaning in visual forms so that they can become more visually literate, which will help them to better understand and arrange their visual environment. Imagery is involved in all forms of learning. As the influences of electronics and technology in our visual environment increase, it is particularly important that students can deconstruct meaning in imagery (Feinstein, 1989; Lankford, 1984; Feldman, 1973; Broudy, 1987; Sandell, 2009).

- Criticism encourages the exercise of cognitive and affective processes that could be ignored in most other areas. Students can become more aware of others and in turn more aware of themselves because of the approach to deriving significance of meaning and feeling from art, which is a human endeavor. Students can make connections between their own experiences and the artwork before them (Lankford, 1984; Venable, 1998).

- Through the critical discussion of imagery, students can increased their understanding and appreciation of art (Barrett, 1991; Geahigan, 1999).

- Perceptual skills gained through criticism are essential in reading, writing, and scientific observation. Students can learn not only to decode symbols and observe properties of things, but also to search for expressive meanings in visual forms (Chapman, 1978).

- Students can learn to withhold judgment before fully understanding a work of art and to use criteria to evaluate a work of art, and conversely use their initial judgments about works of art to bring them to understandings of meaning (Chapman, 1978; Venable 1998).

- Through criticism students learn to use analogies and metaphors to relate to feelings, to draw comparisons and to use their imaginations (Chapman, 1978).

- During group critique settings, students can learn to reach a consensus based on research, discussion, and questioning. Students critiquing in a group can self-correct if interpretations of artwork are inadequate. Critiques bring about a sense of connectedness among students (Chapman, 1978; Anderson, 1986; Barrett, 1994).

- Criticism in the secondary art classroom is particularly important because it is the optimal time for aesthetic education (Smith, 1973).

- Students can learn the relationships between formal qualities and meaning in works of art (Anderson, 1993).

- The structure of critique can help students to become both creative and intuitive (Anderson, 1995).

- The pursuit of understanding meaning can raise questions regarding the moral value of art, the artist, and the viewer, and examine contexts in which artwork is created and appreciated (Geahigan and Wolff, 1997).

- Teachers can use art criticism and peer critique strategies to assess student progress for evaluative or grading purposes (House, 2008).

- Class critiques provide an opportunity for students to receive positive feedback and constructive criticism regarding their artistic endeavors. This can increase not only student understanding, but boost confidence (House, 2008; Barrett, 2000; Hartung, 1995).

- Critiques can expand visual aesthetic and visual awareness, reinforce what is taught in the art classroom, expand learning goals, meet teaching objectives, and present student artwork that may otherwise not receive adequate attention (Hartung, 1995).

- Critiques help students to conceive, elaborate, and refine visual forms and grasp content and feelings that are beyond the norm, helping them to develop new insights. Critiques force students to spend more time with works of art, which leads to deeper understanding (Anderson, 1986; Barrett, 1989).

- Critiques can be used in process or the culminating experience for projects. Critiques provide students opportunities to take ownership over their art making processes and their artwork. Students may then increase and improve their studio production as a result of critique (Barrett, 1988; Anderson, 1986).

- Critiques can foster meaningful, respectful relationships between students and teachers, and students with their peers. Opportunities for the mentorship of

students are present during critiques when correctly conducted. Responsibility for learning can be shared by teachers and students during critique, so that all parties equally participate (Anderson, 1986; Barrett, 2000; Zander, 2004).

- The dialogue involved in critique can increase students' linguistic skills. With an educational system reliant on standards with little time for dialogue, often students are given few experiences to practice structured discussion in the classroom (Miles, 2010).

Conclusions

Criticism and critique experiences are necessary for student growth in secondary art education. Teachers who provide opportunities for students to have meaningful dialogue regarding works of art open possibilities for students to further their understanding and appreciation of art, while refining linguistic skills. Students and teachers can form respectful, honest relationships through critiques. Whether critiques are conducted in-process, as a culminating evaluation at the conclusion of projects, in group settings or individually, they can enlighten students on their own art making processes and those of others, while encouraging them to continue studio production. Criticism in the secondary art classroom can provide avenues for students to express themselves in ways that they may not have opportunities to otherwise. Critiques can display and give attention to works of art and students that may be in need of reinforcement, which individualizes and personalizes their experiences in art. They bring to light commonalities shared in the human experience, while broadening student understanding of culture, society, and diversity. Mutual understandings of the human experience can be reached during critiques. Students who participate in critiques can learn to become better

observers and more mindful of the world around them. Experiences in critiques can help students to become visually literate, or more aware of the visual environment and its meanings, particularly as technology becomes more pervasive.

Critique has an important role in secondary art education. It is particularly important for students in secondary school to have experiences that challenge them to make observations, form opinions, and reach judgments on their own. Critiques provide teachers with more understanding of students, their art making processes, and their progress in meeting learning objectives so that evaluation becomes more holistic. Criticism is necessary for comprehensive art education at the secondary level.

2. What strategies are effective for conducting student peer critiques that align with state and national standards in the secondary art classroom?

Results

- Barrett suggests that there are necessary pre-requisites for dialogue, including a proper physical environment, appropriate works of art, and a multiplicity of viewpoints. A summative closure of the discussion is necessary to close the critique (Barrett, 2004).

- Before critique, the teacher should be mindful of educational goals when determining a critique strategy. There are numerous critique strategies, and the method chosen should be driven by the questions in need of answering through critique (House, 2008).

- A psychologically and physically safe environment must be established so that students feel comfortable to discuss art. The teacher can provide a safe

environment by reinforcing student comments, disallowing put-downs,

acknowledging the role of individual histories in the perception of art,

encouraging multiple viewpoints, and drawing many people into the discussion.

Positive student-teacher relationships can allow students to feel safe expressing

their own opinions. Careful listening must be modeled and reinforced by the

teacher and students should be encouraged to build on each other's comments.

Critiques should be a safe for expressing both constructive criticism and praise

(Barrett, 1991; House, 2008).

- The teacher may begin critiques by asking students what they know about art

  criticism and what the term "criticism" means in art and non-art contexts. The

  teacher should discuss the benefits of writing and talking about art, such as

  increasing understanding and appreciation for art (Barrett, 1991).

- The teacher should outline simple rules for critiques before beginning critiques,

  eliminating side conversations, having one student speak at a time, and limiting

  comments to one thought at a time. Rules and guidelines for critiques can teach

  students how to respond to opinions that differ from their own. These boundaries

  for participation allow students to feel safe. Involving students in the creation of

  rules for critique will ensure that the rules are followed. The teacher can conduct a

  discussion of what makes a respectful critique before beginning dialogue.

  Students can begin to establish their own safe environment when rules are

  established to ensure respect (Barrett, 2004; Zander, 2004).

- The teacher may use warm-up exercises for critique, such as asking students to

  write about what comes to mind when viewing a work of art without censorship

or editing. The teacher may choose to read these writings aloud, keeping the authors anonymous. Students should be notified ahead of time that their writings remain anonymous, so that discussion may be encouraged (Barrett, 2004).

- The teacher could ask students to write a single question about their work that they would like answered during critique in order to structure critiques more productively. The class can answer the question for the artist, while the artist listens. Another strategy involves students preparing five to ten questions about their work before critique and photocopying them for their classmates. The questions can be answered in a quiet writing period before discussion (Barrett, 2004; Buster & Crawford, 2010).

- Building vocabulary is an important component of critique. The teacher could encourage practicing vocabulary by printing cards with descriptive words on them and distributing them to the students to place next to the work that describes the word. During the discussion students justify their placement of the cards (Hartung, 1995).

- Writing about artwork can help foster dialogue. The use of idea sketching, formative critiques, peer evaluation, guided critiques, artist statements, and sketchbooks can all help students to reflect on their ideas and create meanings. Preliminary writing activities quickly completed before critique can make dialogue more productive (Barnes, 2009).

- The teacher may ask students to write essays about their work to improve fluency of ideas and to help them to be more successful in critique. A five-paragraph essay could be used to move students from simpler ideas to more complex

interpretations. Students can move from description to interpretation in a five-paragraph essay similarly to the critique experience (Barnes, 2009).

- In-process pin-up critiques can be useful activities for encouraging students to self-reflect, critique in small groups, or meet individually with the teacher. Pinning up artwork can make a critique feel more formal. In process critiques can remove the pressure of negative criticism (Brocato, 2009; Hartung, 1995).

- "Desk" critiques, or informal critiques, can be useful when students are in process. Problem solving and brainstorming possibilities may come more naturally in a more informal critique (Brocato, 2009).

- Students must be taught the vocabulary necessary to participate in critique. Beginning students can be taught formal vocabulary, while more advanced students can utilize vocabulary concerning intent, technical concerns, and aesthetics. Students may be taught qualitative language to avoid over-generalizations and the over use of popular vocabulary (House, 2008; Tollifson, 2011).

- The teacher can ask students specific questions about a work of art to lead discussion and allow students a point of entry into the conversation, to eliminate the overuse of generalizations. Questions posed by teachers can lead to the discussion of specific aspects of a work of art (House, 2008).

- Students may place tokens next to works of art they would like to talk about. Assigning written responses to specific works can ensure active engagement from all participants. The instructor can provide a question for students to answer, or students can write about their own work in journals (House, 2008).

- One critique strategy requires the teacher to number each artwork and students pull numbers to determine which artwork they offer a positive statement and constructive suggestion for. This method requires participation from all students and allows the teacher to gauge the understanding of each student according to what vocabulary they choose. The teacher may want to ask students to answer more questions about their peers' work, such as their immediate response to it, a description of the work, any formal complaints about presentation, craftsmanship, or composition, any stories the work may tell, or how the work connects to the world (House, 2008; Buster & Crawford, 2010).

- Collaborative group discussions that involve compare/contrast and interpretive discussions can help to improve student dialogue. The teacher may want to mindfully group students to ensure productivity (Tollifson, 2008; Hartung, 1995).

- Teachers should avoid being overly authoritative in critiques in order to encourage open dialogue. Overly regulating and restricting dialogue may be contrary to critique purposes. Teachers should strive to remove the hierarchy between notice and experienced critics. Collaboration and the facilitation of open-ended discovery can help students to contribute more meaningfully. The teacher must act as a participant, mediator, and facilitator, while remaining impartial (Miles, 2010; Zander, 2004).

- The teacher may encourage students to write creatively about their own work and the work of peers, by writing poems or stories about the work. Students could title a work of art by their peers and write a short narrative about what they see. The teacher may want students to write a letter about another student's work that is

being critiqued. The letter can be written to a friend or the instructor, describing the piece as if they are not able to see it. Conversely, the student could write a letter to the viewer as if he or she is the artwork (White, 2011; Buster & Crawford, 2010).

- Students can spend time responding to works of art present in critique by drawing their reactions to the work. The drawings could be quick gestural drawings, drawings from multiple viewpoints, positive/negative space studies, drawing the work from memory, etc. Students could draw how the works make them feel (Buster& Crawford, 2010).

- Teachers could provide students with questionnaires or checklists that facilitate their interaction with their peers' artwork, asking them to answer questions regarding form, technique, and meaning (Buster &Crawford, 2010).

- Traditional and contemporary models of art criticism can be implemented into critique settings. Lampert suggests Barrett's model of art criticism, which involves description, interpretation, and judgment (Lampert, 2006).

- Teachers may ask students to write a closure for the dialogue using a prompt provided by the teacher related to the discussion (Barrett, 2004).

Conclusion

There are many critique strategies that effectively engage students in meaningful dialogue about their own work and the work of their peers. Successful critiques begin with safe, positive environments respected by both teachers and students. There are a variety of writing activities and prompts teachers can provide students before, during, and at the conclusion of critiques. Critiques can be in process or at the conclusion of

assignments. There are a number of ways to encourage participation from all students, including providing them the necessary vocabulary to participate in critique and purposeful questioning. Both formal and creative writing can help to prepare students for critiques and relate to one another's work. Goals for critiques must be established before critique begins, in order for the teacher to select a strategy most suited for successful learning outcomes. Critiques should be concluded with writing or closed with dialogue by teachers or students, and students should leave critique feeling encouraged to continue creating.

The following strategies were created based on research from the review of literature and are aligned with state and national visual arts standards as they apply to art criticism and student peer critique. A detailed strategy is provided in a template (template can be found in Appendix A) for each level of art outlined in the Virginia Standards of Learning (Art I, II, III, and IV), and a list of additional strategies can be found in Appendix B. The strategies were designed with levels of experience in mind from novice to advanced for each level of art, and can be implemented with any existing secondary lesson plans. The detailed strategies provided in the templates reflect the ability to modify a common strategy across all levels of art. The list of strategies provided in Appendix B includes outlines of strategies that are compatible with the template and can be implemented into any lesson plan. An additional strategy is included to demonstrate how an in-process critique strategy may be organized using the template. A list of the state and national standards pertaining to art criticism and peer critique are included in Appendix C.

Strategy Title: Interpreting Meaning through Comparison
Art I

Approximate Time:
This critique strategy can be broken down into the following format:
Day 1- Work is displayed, students interpret the artwork of their peers, students have an opportunity to reinterpret or analyze the artwork of their peers
Day 2- The students present their reinterpretation or analyses to their peers and a class discussion concludes the critique.
A third day may be necessary for larger classes, depending on the length of the class period. This critique strategy can be made shorter by eliminating artist statements and time spent finding images to compare, or lengthened by going further into analysis and broadening discussion.

Brief Description:
In this critique strategy, students interpret an artwork by a fellow peer, drawing conclusions about meaning and artist intentions. After interpreting the peer's work, each student will find artwork or design that communicates a similar topic or theme. Students will present their analyses of their peer's work, along with the artwork they chose that reinterprets the original artwork. Artists of the original work will then have the opportunity to present their intentions and a compare/contrast discussion will follow.

Connection to the National Standards for Art Education:

- **Anchor Standard 3: Refine and complete artistic work**
  Enduring Understanding: Artist and designers develop excellence through practice and constructive critique, reflecting on, revising, and refining work over time.
  Performance Standards for High School:
  Proficient: Apply relevant criteria from traditional and contemporary cultural contexts to examine, reflect on, and plan revisions for works of art and design in progress.
  Accomplished: Engage in constructive critique with peers, then reflect on, re-engage, revise, and refine works of art and design in response to personal artistic vision.
  Advanced: Reflect on, re-engage, revise, and refine works of art and design in response to traditional and contemporary criteria aligned with personal artistic vision.
- **Anchor Standard 7: Perceive and analyze artistic work**
  Enduring Understanding: Visual imagery influences understanding of and responses to the world
  Performance Standards for High School:
  Proficient: Analyze how one's understanding of the world is affected by experiencing visual imagery
  Accomplished: Identify types of contextual information useful in the process of constructing interpretations of an artwork or collection of works
  Advanced: Analyze differing interpretations of an artwork or collection of works in order to select and defend a plausible critical analysis

Connection to Virginia Standards of Learning:

- AI.15   The student will use art criticism skills to interpret, analyze, and evaluate works of art.

- AI.17   The student will analyze how media and visual organization in works of art affect the communication of ideas.

- AI.18   The student will develop constructive approaches to critique (formative, peer-to-peer, self-reflective, summative) that are supportive in intent and that offer alternative points of view.

- AI.21   The student will analyze the functions, purposes, and perceived meanings of works of design.

Essential Vocabulary:

Critique- organized discussion within the classroom setting regarding artwork

Interpretation- coming to an understanding of the meaning of a work of art

Meaning- the concept or "aboutness" of a work of art

Artist Statement- a brief description of the artwork, provided by the artist

Materials:
Sketchbooks and/or tablets
Space to display artwork around the parameter of the room so that pieces are given enough room to be observed individually, if possible.
Two sets of numbers written or printed on cards, corresponding to the number of students in the class.
Students may need art materials if they choose to use them to reinterpret the original works of art by their peers

Preparation:
The teacher should have students help him/her display the completed works of art in the room, and label each artwork with a number in a way that does not distract from the work. The teacher should not tell students what the numbers mean during display.

Teacher Actions:

- The teacher will review the objectives for the project and determine goals for the critique.
- The teacher should familiarize him/herself with this strategy beforehand.
- Throughout the entire critique, the teacher should have a printed roster or grade book on which he or she can take notes on each student's level of participation, interests, and ideas. The teacher should take time to circulate among individuals, asking them questions regarding their interpretation of their peer's work and the creation of their own reinterpretation or analysis.

Student Actions:

- The student will be asked to write an artist statement for their completed artwork.
- The student will be asked to reinterpret a work of art by a fellow student by finding an example of the same message from art history or visual culture.
- The student will be required to describe, analyze, and interpret a work of art.
- The student will be required to participate in discussion at the conclusion of the project.

Procedures:

1. The teacher will introduce the idea of peer critique to students if they are not familiar.

2. The teacher will conduct a class discussion of what behaviors are necessary for a respectful and productive critique environment. If not brought up by students, the teacher should remind students to only speak one at a time, to be respectful of differing opinions, to listen carefully to their peers' input, and to mindfully build on one-another's comments. The class should identify qualities of a productive critique (2-3) that align with these ideas and a student should record these findings in a visible place for all to see. The teacher should warn students that the questions they have written for critique and the answers that follow will be their evaluation for the critique, and that participation is required of all class members.

3. Students should complete their artwork according to the objectives and expectations determined by the teacher for the given project.

4. Students will begin by writing a brief artist statement for their own work including the following information:

   - Title
   - Describe the process: What is it made out of? How did you do it?
   - Meaning: What does this artwork mean? What decisions did you make when planning for (brainstorming and sketching), designing, and completing this work of art?
   - What emotions to you think your viewers will feel? What thoughts will they have? Why?
   - If you had to convey the same meanings in alternate materials or through different means, what would you do?

5. Each artwork will be displayed around the room and assigned a visible number. Students should take note of which number their own artwork was assigned.

6. Students will walk around the room, taking in each artwork briefly as if in an art gallery.

7. Each student will draw a number that corresponds with an artwork on display.

8. Students should situate themselves in front of the artwork that matches their number comfortably with their sketchbooks in hand.

9. While the teacher asks the class the following questions, each student should have a sketchbook in front of them so that they may record responses. Responses to the questions in their sketchbook can come in a variety of forms: sentences, bullet points, sketches, a combination of sketching and note taking, or word processors/technology such as tablets may be used. Students should be warned that their responses will be collected for teacher observation, and that participation is imperative, but should not bother with lengthy responses to each question. As the teacher moves on to the next question, the student should move on as well. The teacher should read the following statements in order, pausing long enough for students to give careful thought to their responses.

   - What is your personal reaction to this work of art? Take notice of your reaction as soon as you are aware of it. How does this artwork make you feel?
   - Describe the artwork. What do you see?
   - What lines, shapes, colors, and textures do you notice in this work of art? Where do you see contrast, unity, variety, rhythm, is there anything dominant in the work? Where does your eye go first?
   - Pretend you have to describe the organization of this work of art to someone who is not present to observe it. Where did the artist put the different parts?
   - Why do you think the artist made this work?
   - What meanings can be drawn from the work? What is this work of art about? What does the artwork mean to you personally?
   - What is the artist trying to say?
   - What feelings do you have when viewing this work of art?
   - What does this work of art remind you of?
   - What do you know about the artist that could lead you to further understand the work?
   - It will now be your challenge to judge the effectiveness of this artists' visual communication by finding a work of art that matches this artwork's message.

10. Students will be given an appropriate amount of time to find an artwork or design that communicates the same message or has a similar interpretation for the student interpreting the piece. Students may be given tablets or computer access for this activity, or the teacher may use reproductions or

examples from visual culture. The goal of this critique strategy is to allow students to use visual means to interpret works of art.

11. Students will present their analyses of their peer's work, along with the artwork they chose that reinterprets the original artwork. Students should make known the number assigned to the original work of art, so that the original creator knows to pay particular attention to the piece being presented.

12. Each student should recover the artist statement from his or her original work of art. The student should then give the artist statement to the student who reinterpreted their work

13. Artists of the original work will then have the opportunity to present their intentions and a compare/contrast discussion will follow, which should be moderated by the teacher. The teacher should keep the discussion focused on interpretation.

14. In their sketchbooks, students should draw conclusions about their own effectiveness in communicating ideas based on the following questions:

    - What similarities are there between your intentions and your peers' interpretation of your work?
    - Did you peer interpret the work the way you intended as the artist? What was your feeling about the work of art your peer chose?
    - In what ways were you effective in your communication of ideas? In what ways were you ineffective?
    - Did you interpret your peers' work as they intended it to be interpreted when creating your reinterpretation or analysis?
    - How might you more clearly communicate your concept if you were to do your original artwork again?

15. . The teacher should evaluate the performance of each student by collecting the artist statements, interpretive notes, and any notes he/she may have taken on each student during the critique.

Assessment:
Students will be assessed based on observations, artist statements and interpretive notes. It is suggested that the students' participation in the critique be factored into their project grades or used as a separate grade to further ensure participation.

Strategies for Differentiation:
Because this critique strategy accommodates for a variety of learning strengths, students may choose how they will interpret the work of their peers. This critique strategy was designed to be successful for all students. Some students may need assistance in writing their artist statements. Students may use word processors/technology such as tablets if desired.

Resources:
This student peer critique was created based on research found in the review of literature. Suggestions from chapter four were directly utilized in the creation of this strategy.

Strategy Title: Interpretation through Comparison
Art II

Approximate Time:
This critique strategy can be broken down into the following format:
Day 1- Work is displayed, students interpret the artwork of their peers
Day 2- The students have an opportunity to find an example from literature, music, art, theatre, visual culture, or design that communicates a similar concept to that of their peer's work
Day 3- The students present their findings to their peers and a class discussion concludes the critique

Depending on the length of the class period, the teacher may want to combine Days 1 and 2 to shorten the critique strategy, or limit the amount of time students have to find their resources.

Brief Description:
In this critique strategy, each student will have the opportunity to interact with a work of art by a fellow student by describing, analyzing, and interpreting. After the student has interpreted the artwork by their fellow student, they will be asked to find an example from literature, music, art, theatre, visual culture, or design that communicates a similar concept to that of their peer's work. Students will present their findings to the class, and their peers will have an opportunity to compare and contrast the found works with the student artwork.

Connection to the National Standards for Art Education:

- **Anchor Standard 3: Refine and complete artistic work**
  Enduring Understanding: Artist and designers develop excellence through practice and constructive critique, reflecting on, revising, and refining work over time.
  Performance Standards for High School:
  Proficient: Apply relevant criteria from traditional and contemporary cultural contexts to examine, reflect on, and plan revisions for works of art and design in progress.
  Accomplished: Engage in constructive critique with peers, then reflect on, re-engage, revise, and refine works of art and design in response to personal artistic vision.
  Advanced: Reflect on, re-engage, revise, and refine works of art and design in response to traditional and contemporary criteria aligned with personal artistic vision.
- **Anchor Standard 7: Perceive and analyze artistic work**
  Enduring Understanding: Visual imagery influences understanding of and responses to the world
  Performance Standards for High School:

Proficient: Analyze how one's understanding of the world is affected by experiencing visual imagery
Accomplished: Identify types of contextual information useful in the process of constructing interpretations of an artwork or collection of works
Advanced: Analyze differing interpretations of an artwork or collection of works in order to select and defend a plausible critical analysis

Connection to Virginia Standards of Learning:

- AII.17 The student will use art criticism skills when analyzing, interpreting, and evaluating personal and professional works of art and design.

- AII.19 The student will evaluate the effectiveness of the communication of ideas in personal works of art and design.

- AII.21 The student will use constructive critical approaches to critique (formative, peer-to-peer, self-reflective, summative).

- AII.23 The student will demonstrate the ability to reflect on and analyze personal responses to works of art and design.

- AII.25 The student will investigate how art and design can be viewed from a variety of aesthetic stances/theories.

Essential Vocabulary:

Critique- organized discussion within the classroom setting regarding artwork

Interpretation- coming to an understanding of the meaning of a work of art

Meaning- the concept or "aboutness" of a work of art

Artist Statement- a brief description of the artwork, provided by the artist

Materials:
Students will need Internet access or access to library resources.
Sketchbooks and/or tablets
Space to display artwork around the parameter of the room so that pieces are given enough room to be observed individually, if possible.
Two sets of numbers written or printed on cards, corresponding to the number of students in the class.

Preparation:
The teacher should have students help him/her display the completed works of art in the room, and label each artwork with a number in a way that does not distract from the work. The teacher should not tell students what the numbers mean during display.

Teacher Actions:

- The teacher will review the objectives for the project and determine goals for the critique.
- The teacher should familiarize him/herself with this strategy beforehand.

- Throughout the entire critique, the teacher should have a printed roster or grade book on which he or she can take notes on each student's level of participation, interests, and ideas. The teacher should take time to circulate among individuals, asking them questions regarding their interpretation of their peer's work and the creation of their own reinterpretation or analysis.
- The teacher may need to help students find resources.
- The teacher should familiarize students with what critique means and have a goal for critique before beginning any interpretive dialogue.

Student Actions:

- The student will be asked to come up with a goal they would like to achieve during critique.
- The student will be asked to write an artist statement for their completed artwork.
- The student will be asked to find an example from literature, music, art, theatre, visual culture, or design that communicates a similar concept to that of their peer's work.
- The student will be required to describe, analyze, and interpret a work of art.
- The student will be required to participate in discussion at the conclusion of the project.

Procedures:

1. Students should complete their artwork according to the objectives and expectations determined by the teacher for the given project.

2. The teacher will introduce the idea of peer critique to students if they are not familiar.

3. The teacher will ask students to record one goal they have for critique. For example, students may want to become more familiar with the work of their peers, become more comfortable speaking in front of others, or learn about how their artworks are received by peers. The teacher should write a goal of his/her own on the board to model the behavior for setting critique goals. The teacher may have a goal of helping students to further understand how visual communication works, or a goal of having everyone leave critique inspired.

4. The teacher will conduct a class discussion of what behaviors are necessary for a respectful and productive critique environment. If not brought up by students, the teacher should remind students to only speak one at a time, to be respectful of differing opinions, to listen carefully to their peers' input, and to mindfully build on one-another's comments. The class should identify qualities of a productive critique (2-3) that align with these ideas and a student should record these findings in a visible place for all to see. The teacher should warn students that the questions they have written for critique and the answers that follow will be their evaluation for the critique, and that participation is required of all class members.

5. Students will begin by writing a brief artist statement for their own work including the following information:

- Title
- Describe the creation of the work: What materials did you use? What major steps were taken to make the artwork?
- Meaning: What does this artwork mean? What intentions did you have when brainstorming and sketching for and completing this work of art? What ideas would you like to communicate through this work? What does this artwork mean to you personally?
- What emotions to you predict your viewers will feel? What thoughts will they have? Why?
- If you had to convey the same meanings in a separate medium or through different means, what would you do?

6. Each artwork will be displayed around the room and assigned a visible number. Students should take note of which number their own artwork was assigned.

7. Students will walk around the room, taking in each artwork briefly as if in an art gallery.

8. Each student will draw a number that corresponds with an artwork on display.

9. Students should situate themselves in front of the artwork that matches their number comfortably with their sketchbooks in hand.

10. While the teacher asks the class the following questions, each student should have a sketchbook in front of them so that they may record responses. Responses to the questions in their sketchbook can come in a variety of forms: sentences, bullet points, sketches, a combination of sketching and note taking, or word processors/technology such as tablets may be used. Students should be warned that their responses will be collected for teacher observation, and that participation is imperative, but should not bother with lengthy responses to each question. As the teacher moves on to the next question, the student should move on as well. The teacher should read the following statements in order, pausing long enough for students to give careful thought to their responses.

- What is your personal reaction to this work of art? Take notice of your reaction as soon as you are aware of it. How does this artwork make you feel?
- Describe the artwork. What do you see?
- What lines, shapes, colors, and textures do you notice in this work of art? Where do you see contrast, unity, variety, rhythm, is there anything dominant in the work?
- Is there a focal point? What is it?
- Pretend you have to describe the organization of this work of art to someone who is not present to observe it. Where did the artist put the different parts?

- What meanings can be drawn from the work? What is this work of art about? What does the artwork mean to you personally?
- What is the artist trying to say?
- Does this artwork remind you of anything?
- Is there any information you know about the artist or their art making that could lead you to conclusions regarding the meanings in this work?
- It will now be your challenge to judge the effectiveness of this artists' visual communication by finding a work of art that matches this artwork's message.

11. Students will be given an appropriate amount of time to find an example from literature, music, art, theatre, visual culture, or design that communicates a similar concept to that of their peer's work. Students may be given tablets or computer access for this activity, or the teacher may use reproductions or examples from visual culture. The students may need access to library materials.

12. Students will present their analyses of their peer's work, along with the piece they chose that reinterprets the original artwork. Students should make known the number assigned to the original work of art, so that the original creator knows to pay particular attention to the piece being presented.

13. Each student should recover the artist statement from his or her original work of art. The student should then give the artist statement to the student who interpreted their work.

14. Artists of the original work will then have the opportunity to present their intentions and a compare/contrast discussion will follow, which should be moderated by the teacher. The teacher should keep the discussion focused on interpretation.

15. In their sketchbooks, students should draw conclusions about their own effectiveness in communicating ideas based on the following questions:

- What similarities are there between your intentions and your peers' interpretation of your work?
- Did you peer interpret the work the way you intended as the artist
- What was your feeling about the work of art your peer chose?
- In what ways were you effective in your communication of ideas? In what ways were you ineffective?
- Did you interpret your peers' work as they intended it to be interpreted when creating your reinterpretation or analysis?
- How might you more clearly communicate your concept if you were to do your original artwork again?

16. The teacher should evaluate the performance of each student by collecting the artist statements, interpretive notes, and any notes he/she may have taken on each student during the critique.

Assessment:
Students will be assessed based on observations, artist statements and interpretive notes. It is suggested that the students' participation in the critique be factored into their project grades or used as a separate grade to further ensure participation.

Strategies for Differentiation:
Because this critique strategy accommodates for a variety of learning strengths, students may choose how they will interpret the work of their peers. This critique strategy was designed to be successful for all students. Some students may need assistance in writing their artist statements. Students may use word processors/technology such as tablets if desired. Students may need help finding resources.

Resources:
This student peer critique was created based on research found in the review of literature. Suggestions from chapter four were directly utilized in the creation of this strategy.

Strategy Title: Interpreting Meaning through Compare/Contrast
Art III

Approximate Time:
This critique strategy can be broken down into the following format:
Day 1- Work is displayed, students interpret the artwork of their peers
Day 2- The students have an opportunity to create a visual reinterpretations to their peers' work that communicates the same concept.
Day 3- The students present their reinterpretations to their peers and a class discussion concludes the critique

Depending on the length of the class period, the teacher may want to combine Days 1 and 2 to shorten the critique strategy, or limit the amount of time students have to work on their visual reinterpretations of peer artwork.

Brief Description:
In this critique strategy, each student will have the opportunity to interpret a work of art by a fellow student by creating a visual reinterpretation to the artwork that communicates the same concept. Students will then compare and contrast their interpretations with that of their peers.

Connection to the National Standards for Art Education:

- **Anchor Standard 3: Refine and complete artistic work**
  Enduring Understanding: Artist and designers develop excellence through practice and constructive critique, reflecting on, revising, and refining work over time.
  Performance Standards for High School:
  Proficient: Apply relevant criteria from traditional and contemporary cultural contexts to examine, reflect on, and plan revisions for works of art and design in progress.

Accomplished: Engage in constructive critique with peers, then reflect on, re-engage, revise, and refine works of art and design in response to personal artistic vision.

Advanced: Reflect on, re-engage, revise, and refine works of art and design in response to traditional and contemporary criteria aligned with personal artistic vision.

- **Anchor Standard 7: Perceive and analyze artistic work**
  Enduring Understanding: Visual imagery influences understanding of and responses to the world
  Performance Standards for High School:
  Proficient: Analyze how one's understanding of the world is affected by experiencing visual imagery
  Accomplished: Identify types of contextual information useful in the process of constructing interpretations of an artwork or collection of works
  Advanced: Analyze differing interpretations of an artwork or collection of works in order to select and defend a plausible critical analysis

Connection to Virginia Standards of Learning:

- AIII.16 The student will compare and contrast two or more points of view when interpreting works of art.

- AIII.17 The student will interpret works of art for symbolic and metaphorical meanings.

- AIII.19 The student will use a critique process (formative, peer-to-peer, self-reflective, summative) to reflect on and inform personal artistic vision/voice.

Essential Vocabulary:

Critique- organized discussion within the classroom setting regarding artwork

Interpretation- coming to an understanding of the meaning of a work of art

Meaning- the concept or "aboutness" of a work of art

Artist Statement- a brief description of the artwork, provided by the artist

Materials:
Sketchbooks and/or tablets
Space to display artwork around the parameter of the room so that pieces are given enough room to be observed individually, if possible.
Two sets of numbers written or printed on cards, corresponding to the number of students in the class.
Students will need art materials to use them to create visual reinterpretations the original works of art by their peers

Preparation:
The teacher should have students help him/her display the completed works of art in the room, and label each artwork with a number in a way that does not distract

from the work. The teacher should not tell students what the numbers mean during display.

Teacher Actions:

- The teacher will review the objectives for the project and determine goals for the critique.
- The teacher should familiarize him/herself with this strategy beforehand.
- Throughout the entire critique, the teacher should have a printed roster or grade book on which he or she can take notes on each student's level of participation, interests, and ideas. The teacher should take time to circulate among individuals, asking them questions regarding their interpretation of their peer's work and the creation of their own reinterpretation or analysis.

Student Actions:

- The student will be asked to write an artist statement for their completed artwork.
- The student will be asked to visually reinterpret a work of art by a fellow student.
- The student will be required to participate in discussion at the conclusion of the project.

Procedures:

1. Students should complete their artwork according to the objectives and expectations determined by the teacher for the given project.

2. Students will begin by writing a brief artist statement for their own work including the following information:

   - Title
   - A bit about the process of creating the work: Why the chosen medium? What steps were taken to complete the artwork?
   - Meaning: What meanings are conveyed by this work of art? What intentions did you have when planning for, designing, and completing this work of art?
   - If you had to convey the same meanings in a separate medium or through different means, what would you do?

3. Each artwork will be displayed around the room and assigned a visible number. Students should take note of which number their own artwork was assigned.

4. Students will walk around the room, taking in each artwork briefly as if in an art gallery.

5. Each student will draw a number that corresponds with an artwork on display.

6. Students should situate themselves in front of the artwork that matches their number comfortably with their sketchbooks in hand.

7. While the teacher asks the class the following questions, each student should have a sketchbook in front of them so that they may record responses. Responses to the questions in their sketchbook can come in a variety of forms: sentences, bullet points, sketches, a combination of sketching and note taking, or word processors/technology such as tablets may be used. Students should be warned that their responses will be collected for teacher observation, and that participation is imperative, but should not bother with lengthy responses to each question. As the teacher moves on to the next question, the student should move on as well.

8. The teacher should read the following statements in order, pausing long enough for students to give careful thought to their responses.
   - What is your initial reaction to this work of art? Take notice of your reaction as soon as you are aware of it.
   - Observe the details of this artwork. What do you see? Pretend you are a fly on the work of art, taking in every detail of the work as you move across the surface. What is going on in this work of art?
   - What elements of art do you notice in this work of art? What principles are created from the combination of the elements?
   - How is this work organized? Pretend you have to describe the organization of this work of art to someone who is not present to observe it.
   - What intentions did the artist have when creating the work of art?
   - What meanings can be drawn from the work? What is this work of art about?
   - What is the artist communicating?
   - What feelings do you have when viewing this work of art?
   - What does this work of art remind you of?
   - Is there any information you know about the artist or their art making that could lead you to conclusions regarding the meanings in this work?
   - It will now be your challenge to judge the effectiveness of this artists' visual communication by visually reinterpreting this work of art.

9. Each student will respond to the artwork they have been assigned through reinterpretation. Students may choose to react to the artwork in visual form through a different style or medium. Students should find a different way to visually communicate the same idea as the artist and avoid direct duplication. If the work of art was originally realistic, the work of art created could be abstract or the style of the work could be changed from its original form.

10. The student will present their reinterpretations after being given an appropriate amount of time to complete it, which should be a shorter time than the original work of art. The goal of this critique strategy is to allow students to interpret the work of art using a method with which they are comfortable expressing themselves. Students should make known the number assigned to the original work of art, so that the original creator knows to pay particular attention to the piece being presented. Each artist will present the visual reinterpretation of their peer's work and describe it, perhaps using the original artist statement suggestions.

11. Each student should recover the artist statement from his or her original work of art. The student should then give the artist statement to the student who reinterpreted or analyzed their work.

12. Because students were given the opportunity to reinterpret the work, the discussion that follows should be rich and meaningful. The teacher should facilitate a class discussion of the experiences, having each student discuss differences in their perceived interpretations and the artist statements that they read at the conclusion of their reinterpretation or analysis.

13. Students can compare/contrast their intentions in creating the original work of art with the interpretations of their peers.

14. In their sketchbooks, students should draw conclusions about their own effectiveness in communicating ideas based on the following questions:

    - What similarities are there between your intentions and your peers' interpretation of your work?
    - Did you peer interpret the work the way you intended as the artist?
    - What was your feeling about their reinterpretation or analysis?
    - In what ways were you effective in your communication of ideas? In what ways were you ineffective?
    - Did you interpret your peers' work as they intended it to be interpreted when creating your reinterpretation or analysis?
    - How might you more clearly communicate your concept if you were to do your original artwork again?

15. The teacher should evaluate the performance of each student by collecting the artist statements, interpretive notes, and any notes he/she may have taken on each student during the critique.

Assessment:
Students will be assessed based on observations, artist statements and interpretive notes. It is suggested that the students' participation in the critique be factored into their project grades or used as a separate grade to further ensure participation.

Strategies for Differentiation:
Because this critique strategy accommodates for a variety of learning strengths, students may choose how they will visually reinterpret the work of their peers. This critique strategy was designed to be successful for all students. Some students may need assistance in writing their artist statements. Students may use word processors/technology such as tablets if desired.

Resources:
This student peer critique was created based on research found in the review of literature. Suggestions from chapter four were directly utilized in the creation of this strategy.

Strategy Title: Interpreting Meaning through Reinterpretation or Analysis
Art IV

Approximate Time:
This critique strategy can be broken down into the following format:
Day 1- Work is displayed, students interpret the artwork of their peers
Day 2- The students have an opportunity to reinterpret or analyze the artwork of their peers
Day 3- The students present their reinterpretation or analyses to their peers and a class discussion concludes the critique

Depending on the length of the class period, the teacher may want to combine Days 1 and 2 to shorten the critique strategy, or limit the amount of time students have to work on their reinterpretations or analyses of peer artwork.

Brief Description:
This critique strategy provides opportunities for students to interpret works of art through a medium of their choosing, rather than a pre-prescribed writing activity. Each student will be assigned the completed artwork of another student in the class to interpret. Each student will respond to peer artwork through reinterpretation or analysis using writing, performance, musical composition, or visual art. Students will present their reinterpretations or analyses to the class and the peer responsible for the original artwork. The students will then discuss their interpretations in a concluding class dialogue.

Connection to the National Standards for Art Education:

- **Anchor Standard 3: Refine and complete artistic work**
  Enduring Understanding: Artist and designers develop excellence through practice and constructive critique, reflecting on, revising, and refining work over time.
  Performance Standards for High School:
  Proficient: Apply relevant criteria from traditional and contemporary cultural contexts to examine, reflect on, and plan revisions for works of art and design in progress.

Accomplished: Engage in constructive critique with peers, then reflect on, re-engage, revise, and refine works of art and design in response to personal artistic vision.

Advanced: Reflect on, re-engage, revise, and refine works of art and design in response to traditional and contemporary criteria aligned with personal artistic vision.

- **Anchor Standard 7: Perceive and analyze artistic work**
  Enduring Understanding: Visual imagery influences understanding of and responses to the world
  Performance Standards for High School:
  Proficient: Analyze how one's understanding of the world is affected by experiencing visual imagery
  Accomplished: Identify types of contextual information useful in the process of constructing interpretations of an artwork or collection of works
  Advanced: Analyze differing interpretations of an artwork or collection of works in order to select and defend a plausible critical analysis

Connection to Virginia Standards of Learning:

- AIV.13 The student will interpret works of art, including personal work, in order to construct meaning.

- AIV.18 The student will explain aesthetic positions regarding personal works of art.

- AIV.19 The student will justify personal perceptions of an artist's intent, using visual clues and research.

Essential Vocabulary:

Critique- organized discussion within the classroom setting regarding artwork

Interpretation- coming to an understanding of the meaning of a work of art

Reinterpretation- explaining or recreating an idea in a different way

Analysis- an examination of a work of art, based on formal and expressive qualities

Meaning- the concept or "aboutness" of a work of art

Artist Statement- a brief description of the artwork, provided by the artist

Materials:
Sketchbooks and/or tablets
Space to display artwork around the parameter of the room so that pieces are given enough room to be observed individually, if possible.
Two sets of numbers written or printed on cards, corresponding to the number of students in the class.
Students may need art materials if they choose to use them to reinterpret the original works of art by their peers

Preparation:
The teacher should have students help him/her display the completed works of art in the room, and label each artwork with a number in a way that does not distract from the work. The teacher should not tell students what the numbers mean during display.

Teacher Actions:

- The teacher will review the objectives for the project and determine goals for the critique.
- The teacher should familiarize him/herself with this strategy beforehand.
- Throughout the entire critique, the teacher should have a printed roster or grade book on which he or she can take notes on each student's level of participation, interests, and ideas. The teacher should take time to circulate among individuals, asking them questions regarding their interpretation of their peer's work and the creation of their own reinterpretation or analysis.

Student Actions:

- The student will be asked to write an artist statement for their completed artwork.
- The student will be asked to reinterpret a work of art by a fellow student or write an analysis of the work.
- The student will be required to participate in discussion at the conclusion of the project.

Procedures:

1. Students should complete their artwork according to the objectives and expectations determined by the teacher for the given project.

2. Students will begin by writing a brief artist statement for their own work including the following information:

    - Title
    - A bit about the process of creating the work: Why the chosen medium? What steps were taken to complete the artwork?
    - Meaning: What meanings are conveyed by this work of art? What intentions did you have when planning for, designing, and completing this work of art?
    - If you had to convey the same meanings in a separate medium or through different means, what would you do?

3. Each artwork will be displayed around the room and assigned a visible number. Students should take note of which number their own artwork was assigned.

4. Students will walk around the room, taking in each artwork briefly as if in an art gallery.

5. Each student will draw a number that corresponds with an artwork on display.

6. Students should situate themselves in front of the artwork that matches their number comfortably with their sketchbooks in hand.

7. While the teacher asks the class the following questions, each student should have a sketchbook in front of them so that they may record responses. Responses to the questions in their sketchbook can come in a variety of forms: sentences, bullet points, sketches, a combination of sketching and note taking, or word processors/technology such as tablets may be used. Students should be warned that their responses will be collected for teacher observation, and that participation is imperative, but should not bother with lengthy responses to each question. As the teacher moves on to the next question, the student should move on as well.

8. The teacher should read the following statements in order, pausing long enough for students to give careful thought to their responses.

   - What is your initial reaction to this work of art? Take notice of your reaction as soon as you are aware of it.
   - Observe the details of this artwork. What do you see? Pretend you are a fly on the work of art, taking in every detail of the work as you move across the surface. What is going on in this work of art?
   - What elements of art do you notice in this work of art? What principles are created from the combination of the elements?
   - How is this work organized? Pretend you have to describe the organization of this work of art to someone who is not present to observe it.
   - What intentions did the artist have when creating the work of art?
   - What meanings can be drawn from the work? What is this work of art about?
   - What is the artist communicating?
   - What feelings do you have when viewing this work of art?
   - What does this work of art remind you of?
   - Is there any information you know about the artist or their art making that could lead you to conclusions regarding the meanings in this work?
   - It will now be your challenge to judge the effectiveness of this artists' visual communication by reinterpreting or analyzing this work of art.

9. Each student will respond to the artwork they have been assigned through reinterpretation or analysis. Students who choose to reinterpret the work may do so in the form of creative writing in narrative or prose, compose a

musical number that the student feels conveys the same meanings, choreograph a dance or kinesthetic response to the work of art, or recreate the artwork in visual form through a different style or medium. If the student chooses to reinterpret the work of art through creating a visual work of art, the student should change the medium, perhaps from 2D to 3D, and if the work of art was originally realistic, the work of art created could be abstract or the style of the work could be changed from its original form. Students who choose to analyze the work of art may do so in written or verbal form, and could follow an established traditional format, such as Broudy, Barrett, Feldman, or may opt more contemporary models. Students may also write about the artwork in a five-paragraph essay format, beginning with simpler ideas and moving to more complex interpretations.

10. The student will present their reinterpretation or analysis after being given an appropriate amount of time to complete it, which should be a shorter time than the original work of art. The goal of this critique strategy is to allow students to interpret the work of art using a method with which they are comfortable expressing themselves. Students should make known the number assigned to the original work of art, so that the original creator knows to pay particular attention to the piece being presented. If the reinterpretation was a work of art, the artist would present the work and describe it, perhaps using the original artist statement suggestions. If the work of art is a performance, the student should perform. If the student chose to write an analysis of the work, copies could be provided to each student or the writer may be inclined to read the analysis aloud while standing beside the original work of art.

11. Each student should recover the artist statement from his or her original work of art. The student should then give the artist statement to the student who reinterpreted or analyzed their work.

12. Because students were given the opportunity to reinterpret or analyze the work through means which the felt most comfortable, the discussion that follows should be rich and meaningful. The teacher should facilitate a class discussion of the experiences, having each student discuss differences in their perceived interpretations and the artist statements that they read at the conclusion of their reinterpretation or analysis.

13. Students can compare/contrast their intentions in creating the original work of art with the interpretations of their peers.

14. In their sketchbooks, students should draw conclusions about their own effectiveness in communicating ideas based on the following questions:
    - What similarities are there between your intentions and your peers' interpretation of your work?

- Did you peer interpret the work the way you intended as the artist?
- What was your feeling about their reinterpretation or analysis?
- In what ways were you effective in your communication of ideas? In what ways were you ineffective?
- Did you interpret your peers' work as they intended it to be interpreted when creating your reinterpretation or analysis?
- How might you more clearly communicate your concept if you were to do your original artwork again?

15. The teacher should evaluate the performance of each student by collecting the artist statements, interpretive notes, and any notes he/she may have taken on each student during the critique.

Assessment:
Students will be assessed based on observations, artist statements and interpretive notes. It is suggested that the students' participation in the critique be factored into their project grades or used as a separate grade to further ensure participation.

Strategies for Differentiation:
Because this critique strategy accommodates for a variety of learning strengths, students may choose how they will interpret the work of their peers. This critique strategy was designed to be successful for all students. Some students may need assistance in writing their artist statements. Students may use word processors/technology such as tablets if desired.

Resources:
This student peer critique was created based on research found in the review of literature. Suggestions from chapter four were directly utilized in the creation of this strategy.

Example of an in-process critique strategy
Art I

Approximate Time:
This critique is designed for in the middle of an assignment. Students should be at least half way through their art making processes. Depending on the length of class meetings, this critique strategy may be condensed into a single class block, or lengthened to two class blocks.

Brief Description:
This in process critique allows an opportunity for students to employ their peers' support on how to best complete their projects.

Connection to the National Standards for Art Education:

- **Anchor Standard 3: Refine and complete artistic work**
  Enduring Understanding: Artist and designers develop excellence through practice and constructive critique, reflecting on, revising, and refining work over time.

Performance Standards for High School:
Proficient: Apply relevant criteria from traditional and contemporary cultural contexts to examine, reflect on, and plan revisions for works of art and design in progress.
Accomplished: Engage in constructive critique with peers, then reflect on, re-engage, revise, and refine works of art and design in response to personal artistic vision.
Advanced: Reflect on, re-engage, revise, and refine works of art and design in response to traditional and contemporary criteria aligned with personal artistic vision.

- **Anchor Standard 8: Interpret intent and meaning in artistic work**
Enduring Understanding: People gain insights into meanings of artworks by engaging in the process of art criticism.
Performance Standards for High School:
Proficient: Interpret and artwork or collection of works, supported by relevant and sufficient evidence found in the work and its various contexts
Accomplished: Determine the relevance of criteria used by others to evaluate a work of art or collection of works
Advanced: Construct evaluations of a work of art or collection of works based on differing sets of criteria.

Connection to Virginia Standards of Learning:

- AI.18   The student will develop constructive approaches to critique (formative, peer-to-peer, self-reflective, summative) that are supportive in intent and that offer alternative points of view.
- AI.23   The student will use personal criteria when making visual aesthetic judgments

Essential Vocabulary:
Peer Critique- organized discussion within the classroom setting regarding artwork

In Process Critique- an opportunity to critique artwork that is not yet completed

Materials:
What materials are necessary to successfully conduct the student peer critique strategy? What is needed in the physical environment in order to carry out this critique strategy?

Preparation:
- Unfinished student work needs to be displayed around the parameter of the room, if possible, as if complete. Artworks should be displayed in a way that eliminates distraction from the work, if possible.
- Students will be broken up into groups of 3-4 during this activity. If the teacher prefers, students can be broken up ahead of time to ensure students are most productive. If not, the teacher may group students spontaneously or the teacher may choose to let students group themselves.

Teacher Actions:
- The teacher will review the objectives for the project and determine goals for the

critique.
-The teacher should familiarize him/herself with this strategy beforehand.
- The teacher will hold a class discussion before critique to determine what constitutes respectful behavior during discussion.
- The teacher will be a moderator and facilitator for discussions by circulating around the room and interjecting in conversations only when appropriate or necessary.

Student Actions:
- Students are asked to come to critique with three questions they would like answered about their artwork. The questions can involve form, technique, materials, composition, meaning, influential artists, process, or any other topics the student finds pertinent. Because the work that will be critiqued is in process, students may choose to ask specific questions about how to best finish the work, or guidance on the direction of meaning.
- Students will break up into groups of 3-4. The teacher may have pre-arranged these groups.
- The student may want to write an artist statement describing the general trajectory of the work, and any information pertinent to the interpretation of the piece.

Procedures:

1. The teacher will conduct a class discussion of what behaviors are necessary for a respectful and productive critique environment. If not brought up by students, the teacher should remind students to only speak one at a time, to be respectful of differing opinions, to listen carefully to their peers' input, and to mindfully build on one-another's comments. The class should identify qualities of a productive critique (2-3) that align with these ideas and a student should record these findings in a visible place for all to see. The teacher should warn students that the questions they have written for the in process critique and the answers that follow will be their evaluation for the critique, and that participation is required of all class members.

2. The teacher will introduce the idea of peer in-process critique to students if they are not familiar. The teacher will let students know that the reason they are stopping art production before finishing to critique is to help them to consider how to best finish their work with peer's input.

3. The class will break up into groups of 3 or 4. Students will determine which group member will have their work discussed first.

4. Each group member will briefly describe their work, and read the three questions they prepared ahead of time to their groups.

5. The students will take turns responding to the questions. When responding to the questions, the students should give direct, specific feedback in a respectful,

organized manner, remembering the guidelines for respectful critique created before the activity. When all group members have advised the person presenting, the next team member may present their work until all group members have had their work addressed. The class should be continuously moving in small groups around the room, as the artworks are on display around the parameter. The teacher will circulate among groups, joining the discussion when appropriate or necessary. The teacher's crucial role is to ensure that all students are actively engaged in discussions.

6. Each student should answer the questions they wrote previous to critique based on the feedback they received. It may be the case that students do not use the feedback provided by their peers directly, but should answer the questions as best as they can with the options they heard considered.

7. The class should reconvene as a group. The teacher should ask each group if there were questions that were difficult to answer and need further feedback. Questions can then be opened up to the entire class for discussion. The teacher should be the moderator at this point.

8. When there are no more questions from the class, the teacher should conclude the critique by reminding students of the objectives of the project they are currently working on, and ask that they finish their projects with the suggestions provided by their peers close in mind.

9. The students should turn in their questions and answers to the teacher for review.

Assessment:
Students will be assessed based on the questions that they came up with and then answered based on peer feedback. The teacher may want to walk around with a roster and clipboard and make notes of student participation as an added evaluation. The teacher should make notes on the questions where applicable. It is suggested that the students' participation in the in process critique be factored into their project grades or used as a separate grade to further ensure participation.

Strategies for Differentiation:
This activity requires students to plan ahead for critique by posing questions. Students will be continuously moving around the classroom from artwork to artwork in their small groups. Students will have to work collaboratively in a respectful manner. Students in need of extra help may be purposefully grouped to ensure that their group members will help to make their experiences positive and productive.

Resources
Buster & Crawford 2010

Chapter V

Summary, Implications, and Recommendations

Summary

The conclusions of this study indicate that peer art critique strategies that comply with state and national standards can be created for use with any existing secondary art lesson plan. There are many critique strategies that can effectively engage students in meaningful dialogue about their own work and the work of their peers when mindfully implemented into the secondary art curriculum. Successful critiques begin with safe, positive environments respected by both teachers and students. When teachers establish goals for critiques before critique begins, strategies can be selected that are most suited for learning outcomes. Whether critiques are conducted in-process, as a culminating evaluation at the conclusion of projects, in group settings or individually, they can enlighten students on their own art making processes and those of others, while encouraging them to continue studio production. Criticism in the secondary art classroom can provide avenues for students to express themselves in ways that they may not have opportunities to otherwise. Critiques can encourage and inspire students. Critiques can display and give attention to works of art and students that may be in need of reinforcement, which individualizes and personalizes their experiences in art. Most importantly, critiques help us to realize commonalities shared in the human experience, while broadening understanding of culture, society, and diversity. Critiques help students and teachers to reach mutual understandings of the human experience. With imagery

constantly at their disposal, critiques can help students to become visually literate, or more aware of the visual environment.

The four strategies created in this study demonstrate the ability to adapt any critique strategy to meet the needs of students in any level of secondary art. The reason for adapting a similar strategy across the different levels was to reflect how there are a number of ways to adapt critique. From one critique strategy comes a number of ways to cater it to the needs of the students in any secondary art class. There is no single critique strategy that best fits a specific level, as the template provided in Appendix A is designed to help teachers to modify their strategies for all students. The strategies provided in template form are not unique in that they do not reflect a single way to conduct interactive critiques. The strategies were provided in that format to show the adaptability of the template, rather than as a single method that is most effective. The art teacher conducting the critique will know the learning preferences and strengths of his/her classroom best, and should therefore use the template to plan for strategies such as the ones suggested in Appendix C.

The example of a detailed critique strategy provided in the template was created with the idea of having students re-interpret the artwork of their fellow peers by finding or creating a work that they feel communicates the same message. This is only one way to engage a variety of interests within a classroom and is provided as an example rather than a rule. By having student use other means of interpreting, aside from strict writing, students who may have weaknesses or preferences in certain areas are not limited. Language and writing are only one means of communicating meaning, which is why the

students are given the option to write, speak, act out, listen, or move to show their interpretations of their peers' work.

The research led me to use this particular critique strategy as an example of how to utilize the rubric for a number of reasons. In the DBAE Handbook, Dobbs (1992) defines art criticism and emphasizes that it includes basic observation, scrutiny, and report in order to help the viewer to help to know and understand what is presented in visual form (Dobbs, 1992, p. 84). Students were first asked to observe the work casually, before moving on to a more detailed analysis prompted by the teacher's questions, followed by a report of those findings in a form other than writing or speaking, which some students struggle with. Students who have strength in dance, music, or art could demonstrate or "report" their findings through methods that they felt comfortable. The intent of the strategy was to force students to truly find meaning in their peer's work, rather than just describing what they saw or quickly judging it. In order to re-create the work in some way, the students were forced to find meaning, especially since their findings or re-interpretations would later be shared with that artist. Feinstein (1989) argued that having eyes does not mean knowing how to see, and therefore we must reeducate students to be able to construct meaning in visual forms (Feinstein, 1989, p. 44). Students interpreted their peer's work through their own means.

The interpretive part of the critique strategy was intended to invite students to go beyond mere observation into the construction of meaning. Finding meaning in visual form was the objective of the strategies. Broudy (1987) claims that all learning involves concepts, words, images, things that are all intermingled. Images can be brought to mind

by words, things, events, and feelings, and therefore imagery is involved in all learning, or in all learning that perception plays a role (Broudy, 1987, p. 199).

The "judgment" component of the critique was present in less obvious ways that in some methods that were listed. Judgment was involved in students determining their own effectiveness in communicating ideas. The peers observed one-another's reinterpretations while the original work was still on display and noted. Students were asked to compare and contrast the interpretations with the reinterpretations (Tollifson, 2008; Hartung, 1995). This provided an opportunity for students to judge the interpretation of the piece, and decide on their own terms if the pieces were successful. Learning to make responsible judgments by first observing and interpreting is an important part of peer critique (Barrett, 1991, 2003; Chapman, 1978; Venable 1998). This critique strategy would be a great way to warm students up the idea of critique, because the judgment component happens in more silent ways, and the students are left to judge their own work in the brief reflection activity at the conclusion of the strategy. The research strongly suggested that interpretation is the most important part of critique (Chapman, 1978; Anderson, 1986; Barrett, 1994; Smith, 1973). Their interpretations were based on observation and then were expounded on through the creation of a response in a separate form.

This critique strategy placed the responsibility in the student's hands. The teacher's involvement in this strategy was to moderate, facilitate, and support, rather than being the sole contributor to the critique. The research suggested that limiting student involvement and creating a student-centered environment was most conducive to actives student participation (Miles, 2010; Zander, 2004).

Implications for the field

Through the research conducted in this study, it was determined that criticism and critique experiences are necessary for student growth in secondary art education. Teachers who provide opportunities for students to have meaningful dialogue regarding works of art open possibilities for students to further their understanding and appreciation of art, while teaching them to be visually literate. Students and teachers can form respectful, honest relationships through critiques.

The result of the study is a comprehensive template that can be used in any secondary art curriculum to ensure that peer critique strategies are properly aligned with state and national standards. Four strategies, one for each level of art, were created to be both meaningful and practical for classroom use. The list of strategies provided can be incorporated into the template provided and used to create rich critique experiences for students. Teachers can easily adjust the objectives to meet the needs of a variety of learners, with a multitude of interests and strengths. Mindfully constructing critique strategies can enrich experiences in secondary art education.

Recommendations for further study

It would follow that the strategies created in this study could be implemented in a secondary art classroom environment and evaluated for their effectiveness. Criteria could be established to rate the effectiveness of critique strategies. Data could be collected from teachers and students to gauge the success of each critique strategy. Adjustments could be made to the current strategies based on data gathered from actual classroom experiences. Ideally all strategies provided would be fleshed out in the full template form.

Appendix A

Student Peer Critique Strategy Template

Strategy Title:

Approximate Time: About how long will it take? At what point in the lesson will this strategy be conducted?

Brief Description: What is the general purpose of this strategy and what does it entail? (Briefly describe in a synopsis format, longer steps will be listed under the "Procedures" section.)

Connection to the National Standards for Art Education: What anchor standards does this critique activity include? What level(s) in secondary art are best suited for this particular activity?

Connection to Virginia Standards of Learning: How does this critique activity comply with the Virginia Standards?

Essential Vocabulary: What vocabulary might students need in order to participate in dialogue? How will students know these vocabulary words before the activity?

Materials: What materials are necessary to successfully conduct the student peer critique strategy? What is needed in the physical environment in order to carry out this critique strategy?

Preparation: What does the teacher need to do ahead of time in order to be prepared for this critique activity?

Teacher Actions: What actions must the teacher take in order to facilitate this activity? What questioning strategies might be used to facilitate discussion? What is the teacher's role in this particular activity?

Student Actions: What actions must the student take in order to facilitate this activity?

Procedures: List, in detail, the steps that need to be taken in order to successfully conduct the strategy?

Assessment: How will students be assessed? How will student participation be gauged?

Strategies for Differentiation: How will a variety of learners participate in this activity?

Resources: List any resources that may be helpful to the teacher, or sources that were used in the creation of the strategy

Appendix B

Additional Strategies

The following list of strategies can be incorporated into the template provided for use with any existing secondary art lesson plan.

- The teacher could ask students to find an artwork from a specific period of art history that addresses a similar theme from a different angle or in a different medium.
- The teacher could ask students to translate the work into a different medium and then explain their piece to the class. How did the change in medium change how it is interpreted?
- The teacher could break the classroom into groups of three and have them discuss the possible interpretations of the work, taking on three entirely different aesthetic positions.
- The teacher could find artworks that have been written about by professional critics. Ask students to write responses to the critics by taking on a different point of view.
- The teacher could ask students to write letters to critics from the artwork's perspective as to how they would like to be interpreted.
- The teacher could ask students to describe, analyze, interpret, and judge their own artwork using a traditional model.
- The teacher could ask students to try to conduct interpretive critique without teacher intervention.
- The teacher could ask students to write about what comes to mind when viewing a work of art without punctuation, editing, or censorship in stream-of-consciousness style.
- The teacher could ask students to pose questions they would like their peers to answer about their artwork.
- The teacher could print out essential vocabulary from the lesson plan that students are required to use when writing or speaking about works of art in critique.
- Students could be given 3-5 index cards on which to write words that could be used to describe artwork before seeing the works of art to be critiqued. Students would then place the cards by artworks that match the descriptions.
- The teacher could ask students to exchange artwork with a peer in the middle of the art making process and ask the peer to do an evaluation of the formal and expressive elements of the work. The teacher could provide a list of question or writing prompts for the students to use when evaluating their peer's work.
- The teacher could write questions on notecards that correspond with the number of students in the class before critique begins. Students could be asked to draw a card and answer the question on the card about their own work or about the work of a peer.
- Students could be asked to write one positive comment and one constructive suggestion about peer artwork.

- The teacher could ask the English teacher to teach students how to write a five-paragraph essay in response to an artwork.
- The teacher could ask students to take on the role of a professional critic and write a review of a collection of work by their peers.
- Students could write anonymous letters about their peers' work to the teacher or to the artwork itself.
- The teacher could use learning goals from the existing lesson plan to create a questionnaire students use to fill out during critique with regard to their own experiences with the project.
- Students could be given checklists for topics of discussion and broken into pre-arranged groups that include diverse viewpoints and styles.
- Students could write a poem, short story, play, or essay about their peer's work.
- The teacher could use an established criticism model to teach students how to write visual analyses of their peer's work.
- Students could orally present their peer's work as if it were their own, explaining artistic choices, including formal qualities, design, expression, and concept.

Appendix C

State and National Standards Pertaining to Art Criticism and Student Peer Critique

The Visual Arts Standards of Learning state the need for specific objectives: "Knowledge and skills that students acquire through fine arts instruction include the abilities to think critically, solve problems resourcefully, make informed judgments, work cooperatively within groups, appreciate different cultures, exercise imagination, and be creative." The purpose for standards is to "state the minimum requirements in the fine arts, setting reasonable targets and expectations for what teachers need to teach and students need to learn" (Virginia Standards of Learning 2013). The Virginia SOL's for fine arts outline goals for students including the ability to "Interpret, reflect on, and evaluate the characteristics, purposes, and merits of personal work and the work of others."

The following standards have been pulled from the body of state standards because of their connection to art criticism and peer critique:

Art I
Analysis, Evaluation, and Critique

AI.15   The student will use art criticism skills to interpret, analyze, and evaluate works of art.

AI.16   The student will evaluate how social, cultural, and historical context contribute to meaning in works of art and design.

AI.17   The student will analyze how media and visual organization in works of art affect the communication of ideas.

AI.18   The student will develop constructive approaches to critique (formative, peer-to-peer, self-reflective, summative) that are supportive in intent and that offer alternative points of view.

Aesthetics

AI.19   The student will articulate the difference between personal preference and informed judgment when discussing works of art.

AI.20   The student will describe aesthetic qualities found in works of art.

AI.21   The student will analyze the functions, purposes, and perceived meanings of works of design.

AI.22   The student will formulate a definition for *art* and defend that definition in relation to objects in the world.

AI.23   The student will use personal criteria when making visual aesthetic judgments.

Art II
Analysis, Evaluation, and Critique

AII.17   The student will use art criticism skills when analyzing, interpreting, and evaluating personal and professional works of art and design.

AII.18   The student will participate in art criticism processes based on one or more established models.

AII.19   The student will evaluate the effectiveness of the communication of ideas in personal works of art and design.

AII.20   The student will define and practice ethical behaviors when responding to works of art and design.

AII.21   The student will use constructive critical approaches to critique (formative, peer-to-peer, self-reflective, summative).

Aesthetics

AII.22   The student will describe how the perception of quality in works of art shifts over time.

AII.23   The student will demonstrate the ability to reflect on and analyze personal responses to works of art and design.

AII.24   The student will describe personal responses to aesthetic qualities found in works of art and design.

AII.25   The student will investigate how art and design can be viewed from a variety of aesthetic stances/theories.

Art III
Analysis, Evaluation, and Critique

AIII.16   The student will compare and contrast two or more points of view when interpreting works of art.

AIII.17   The student will interpret works of art for symbolic and metaphorical meanings.

AIII.18   The student will evaluate the effectiveness of the communication of artistic vision/voice in personal works of art.

AIII.19   The student will use a critique process (formative, peer-to-peer, self-reflective, summative) to reflect on and inform personal artistic vision/voice.

AIII.20   The student will view art exhibitions and write reflections about them.

Aesthetics

AIII.21   The student will describe how the purpose of works of art shifts over time.

AIII.22   The student will analyze how the attributes of works of art and design may evoke viewer response.

AIII.23   The student will compare and contrast the aesthetics of two or more artists.

AIII.24   The student will research aesthetic stances/theories to inform personal artistic voice/vision.

AIII.25   The student will explain the functions and purposes of personal works of art.

Art IV
Analysis, Evaluation, and Critique

AIV.13   The student will interpret works of art, including personal work, in order to construct meaning.

AIV.14   The student will analyze contrasting reviews of art exhibitions or works of art.

AIV.15   The student will view art exhibitions and write personal criticisms about them.

AIV.16   The student will conduct a criteria-based portfolio review.

Aesthetics

AIV.17   The student will explain how personal experiences and values affect aesthetic responses to works of art.

AIV.18   The student will explain aesthetic positions regarding personal works of art.

AIV.19   The student will justify personal perceptions of an artist's intent, using visual clues and research.

AIV.20   The student will justify the functions and purposes of personal works of art and design.

The following standards are from the National Coalition for Core Arts Standards (NCCAS) National Visual Arts Standards (2014). The standards outlined below were chosen because of their connection to art critique and student peer critiques:

Anchor Standard 3: Refine and complete artistic work
Enduring Understanding: Artist and designers develop excellence through practice and constructive critique, reflecting on, revising, and refining work over time.
Performance Standards for High School:
Proficient: Apply relevant criteria from traditional and contemporary cultural contexts to examine, reflect on, and plan revisions for works of art and design in progress.
Accomplished: Engage in constructive critique with peers, then reflect on, re-engage, revise, and refine works of art and design in response to personal artistic vision.
Advanced: Reflect on, re-engage, revise, and refine works of art and design in response to traditional and contemporary criteria aligned with personal artistic vision.
Anchor Standard 7: Perceive and analyze artistic work
Enduring Understanding: Individual aesthetic and empathetic awareness developed through engagement with art can lead to understanding and appreciation of self, others, the natural world, and constructed environments.
Performance Standards for High School:
Proficient: Hypothesize ways in which art influences perception and understanding of human experiences
Accomplished: Recognize and describe personal aesthetic and empathetic responses to the natural world and constructed environments
Advanced: Analyze how responses to art develop over time based on knowledge of and experience with art and life
Anchor Standard 7: Perceive and analyze artistic work
Enduring Understanding: Visual imagery influences understanding of and responses to the world
Performance Standards for High School:
Proficient: Analyze how one's understanding of the world is affected by experiencing visual imagery
Accomplished: Identify types of contextual information useful in the process of constructing interpretations of an artwork or collection of works
Advanced: Analyze differing interpretations of an artwork or collection of works in order to select and defend a plausible critical analysis
Anchor Standard 8: Interpret intent and meaning in artistic work
Enduring Understanding: People gain insights into meanings of artworks by engaging in the process of art criticism.
Performance Standards for High School:
Proficient: Interpret and artwork or collection of works, supported by relevant and sufficient evidence found in the work and its various contexts
Accomplished: Determine the relevance of criteria used by others to evaluate a work of art or collection of works
Advanced: Construct evaluations of a work of art or collection of works based on differing sets of criteria

Anchor Standard 9: Apply criteria to evaluate artistic work
Enduring Understanding: People evaluate art based on various criteria
Performance Standards for High School:
Proficient: Establish relevant criteria in order to evaluate a work of art or collection of works
Accomplished: Determine the relevance of criteria used by others to evaluate a work of art or collection of works
Advanced: Construct evaluations of a work of art or collection of works based on differing sets of criteria
Anchor Standard 11: Relate artistic ideas and works with societal, cultural and historical context to deepen understanding
Enduring Understanding: People develop ideas and understandings of society, culture, and history through their interactions with and analysis of art
Performance Standards for High School:
Proficient: describe how knowledge of culture, traditions, and history may influence personal responses to art
Accomplished: Compare uses of art in a variety of societal, cultural, and historical contexts and make connections to uses of art in contemporary and local contexts.
Advanced: Appraise the impact of an artist or group of artists on society's beliefs, values, and behaviors

References

Anderson, T. (1986). Talking about art with children: From theory to practice. *Art Education, 39*(1), 5.

Anderson, T. (1988). A structure for pedagogical art criticism. *Studies in Art Education, 30*(1), 28-38.

Anderson, T. (1993). Defining and structuring art criticism for education. *Studies in Art Education, 34*(4), 199-208.

Anderson, T. (1995). Toward a cross-cultural approach to art criticism. *Studies in Art Education, 36*(4), 198-209.

Barnes, N. S. (2009). Hands-on writing: An alternative approach to understanding art. *Art Education, 62*(3), 40-46.

Barrett, T. (1988). A comparison of the goals of studio professors conducting critiques and art education goals for teaching criticism. *Studies in Art Education, 30*(1), 22.

Barrett, T. (1989). A consideration of criticism. *Journal of Aesthetic Education, 23*(4), 23-35.

Barrett, T. (1991). Description in professional art criticism. *Studies in Art Education, 32*(2), 83-93.

Barrett, T. (1994). Critics on criticism. *Journal of Aesthetic Education, 28*(2), 71.

Barrett, T. (1994). Principles for interpreting art. *Art Education, 47*(5), 8-13.

Barrett, T. (1997). *Talking about student art. art education in practice series*.

Barrett, T. (2000). Studio critiques of student art: As they are, as they could be with mentoring. *Theory into Practice, 39*(1), 29.

Barrett, T. (2003). Interpreting art: reflecting, wondering, and responding. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Barrett, T. (2004). Improving student dialogue about art. *Teaching Artist Journal, 2*(2), 87-94.

Barrett, T. (2012). *Why is that art? : Aesthetics and criticism of contemporary art / terry barrett* New York : Oxford University Press, c2012; 2nd ed.

Basile, J.J., & Waters-Eller, S. (Eds.). (2013). *Beyond Critique: Different ways of talking about art.* College Park, MD: Maisonneuve Press.

Blandy, D., & Congdon, K. G. (1991). *Pluralistic approaches to art criticism*.

Brocato, K. (2009). Studio based learning: Proposing, critiquing, iterating our way to person-centeredness for better classroom management. *Theory into Practice, 48*(2), 138-146.

Broudy, H. S. (1987). Theory and practice in aesthetic education. *Studies in Art Education, 28*(4), 198-205.

Broudy, H. S. (1951). Some duties of a theory of educational aesthetics. *Educational Theory, 1*(3), 190.

Broudy, H. S. & Getty Center for Education in the Arts, L.A. (1987). The role of imagery in learning. The Getty Center for Education in the Arts Occasional Paper 1.

Buster, K. & Crawford, P. (2010). *The critique handbook: The art students' sourcebook and survival guide* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Carney, J. D. (1994). A historical theory of art criticism. *Journal of Aesthetic Education, 28*(1), 13.

Cotner, T. L. (2001). Why study classroom art talk? *Art Education -Reston-, 54*, 12-17.

Cromer, J., & National Art, E. A. (1990). *History, theory, and practice of art criticism in art education. point of view series*.

Dobbs, S. M., & Getty Center for Education in,the Arts. (1992). *The DBAE handbook: An overview of discipline-based art education*

Donmoyer, R. (1993). Art criticism as a guide to student evaluation. *Theory into Practice, 32*(4), 252.

Elkins, J. (2012). *Art critiques: A guide*. (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: New Academia Publishing.

Fehr, D. E. (1993). Mona lisa's millstone: The modern gods of criticism. *Art Education, 46*(1), 68.

Fehr, D. E. (1994). From theory to practice: Applying the historical context model of art criticism. *Art Education, 47*(5), 52-58.

Feinstein, H. (1989). The art response guide: How to read art for meaning, A primer for art criticism. *Art Education, 42*(3), 43.

Feldman, E. B. (1973). *The teacher as model critic* Journal of Aesthetic Education.

Feldman, E. B. (1973). The teacher as model critic. *Journal of Aesthetic Education,* (1), 50. doi:10.2307/3332109

Feldman, E. B. (1968). Some adventures in art criticism. *Art Education, 21*(3), 24.

Feldman, E. B. (1971). *Varieties of visual experience; art as image and idea*

Feldman, E. (1987). *Varieties of visual experience* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Garber, E. (1990). Implications of feminist art criticism for art education. *Studies in Art Education, 32*(1), 17-26.

Geahigan, G. (1983). Art criticism: An analysis of the concept. *Visual Arts Research,* (1), 10.

Geahigan, G. (1996). Conceptualizing art criticism for effective practice. *Journal of Aesthetic Education,* (3), 23.

Geahigan, G. (1997). The discipline of art criticism: Implications for practice. *Visual Arts Research, 23*(2), 145-57.

Geahigan, G. (1998). *From procedures, to principles, and beyond: Implementing critical inquiry in the classroom*

Geahigan, G. (1999). Description in art criticism and art education. *Studies in Art Education,* (3), 213.

Geahigan, G. (2000). Critical discourse and art criticism instruction. *International Journal of Art & Design Education, 19*(1).

Geahigan, G. & Wolff, T.F. (1997). *Art criticism and education*. University of Ill. Press.

Getty Center for Education in, the Arts. (1998). *Scope and sequence: A guide for learning and teaching in art*

Hickman, R. (1994). *A student centered approach for understanding art* doi:10.2307/3193500

House, N. (2008). Using critiques in the K-12 classroom. *Art Education, 61*(3), 48-51. R

Hubard, O. M. (2010). Three modes of dialogue about works of art. *Art Education, 63*(3), 40-45.

Ivashchevich, . (2012). Rethinking children: Power, pedagogy, and contemporary art education practices. *Art Education, 65*(1), 40-45.

Koroscik, J. S. (1984). Cognition in viewing and talking about art. *Theory into Practice, 23*(4), 330.

Lampert, N. (2006). Enhancing critical thinking with aesthetic, critical, and creative inquiry. *Art Education, 59*(5), 46-50.

Lankford, E. L. (1984). *A phenomenological methodology for art criticism* doi:10.2307/1320696

Lee, S. (1993). Professional criticism in the secondary classroom: Opposing judgements of contemporary art enhance the teaching of art criticism. *Art Education, 46*(3), 42-51.

Miles, A. P. (2010). Dialogic encounters as art education. *Studies in Art Education, 51*(4), 375-379.

Mittler, G. (1982). Teaching art appreciation in the high school. *School Arts, 82*(3), 36-41.

Mittler, G. A. (1980). Learning to Look/Looking to learn: A proposed approach to art appreciation at the secondary school level. *Art Education, 33*(3), 17.

Mittler, G. A. (1986). Toward a more complete introduction to art in the high school. *Art Education, 39*(6), 10.

National Visual Arts Standards. (2013). State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education (SEADAE) on behalf of NCCAS. retrieved from: http://www.arteducators.org/research/next-gen-arts-stds

Petts, J. (2004). Interpeting art: Reflecting, wondering, and responding (book). *British Journal of Aesthetics, 44*(2), 197-199.

Sandell, R. (2009). Using Form+Theme+Context (FTC) for rebalancing 21st-century art education. *Studies in Art Education, 50*(3), 287-299.

Simpson, A. V. (2013). Design structures: Improving the quality of in-class design critiques. *Art, Design & Communication in Higher Education, 11*(1), 63-80.

Smith, R. A. (1970). Editorial: On the third domain. the future and aesthetic education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education,* (1), 5.

Smith, R. A. (1973). Teaching aesthetic criticism in the schools. *Journal of Aesthetic Education,* (1), 38.

Smith, R. A. (1999). On the third realm-harry S. broudy (1905-1998): A life devoted to enlightened cherishing. *Arts Education Policy Review, 101*(2), 34.

Smith, R. A. (2008). Educational aesthetics and policy. *Arts Education Policy Review, 109*(6), 3.

Stout, C. J. (1995). Critical conversations about art: A description of higher-order thinking generated through the study of art criticism. *Studies in Art Education, 36*(3), 170-88.

Tollifson, J. (1986). A state art curriculum: A good or bad idea? *Design for Arts in Education, 87*, 11-16.

Tollifson, J. (1987). A balanced comprehensive art curriculum makes sense. *Educational Leadership, 45*(4), 18.

Tollifson, J. (2011). Enhancing students' responses to art through qualitative language. *Art Education, 64*(6), 11-19.

Venable, B. B. (1998). Questioning the assumptions behind art criticism. *Art Education, 51*(5), 6-9.

Visual Arts Standards of Learning for Virginia Public Schools. (2013). Board of Education Commonwealth of Virginia. Retrieved from: http://www.doe.virginia.gov/testing/sol/standards_docs/fine_arts/

White, B. (2011). Embodied aesthetics, evocative art criticism: Aesthetically based research. *Studies in Art Education, 52*(2), 142-154.

Zander, M. J. (2004). Becoming dialogical: Creating a place for dialogue in art education. *Art Education, 57*(3), 48-53.