Education, Art, and Freedom:
An Exploration of Philosophy and Pedagogy

Photo: John Forasté

Providence, Rhode Island

May 7 & 8, 2004

This publication contains a transcript of the comments made by Theodore Sizer and Deborah Meier during a Public Forum at the Rhode Island School of Design Auditorium on May 7, 2004. A transcript of the question and answer session that ensued and a listing of suggested reading are also included.

Education, Art, and Freedom was conceived and sponsored by Community MusicWorks, and made possible in part by a grant from the Rhode Island Council for the Humanities, an independent affiliate of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Introduction

Sebastian Ruth
Executive-Artistic Director, Community MusicWorks

Socrates told us that "an unexamined life is not worth living." In more contemporary times, Maxine Greene has reminded us that our lives are "narratives in the making," requiring constant attention to and examination of the new ideas that shape the direction of our lives. We planned *Education, Art, and Freedom* as a symposium in the spirit of Socrates, to ask questions, to explore ideas, and to inform the educational practice of Community MusicWorks and our colleagues concerned about freedom.

Community MusicWorks has, at its core, the question of how to create an educational experience in music for young people growing up in urban communities that leads them to a greater experience of freedom. What kind of freedom? The ability, as Paulo Freire describes, to understand oneself to be free to imagine what kind of life you want to lead, and to feel the agency to be able to live up to the possibilities you imagine.

In his own work with rural poor communities in Brazil, Freire realized that literacy was the most important vehicle for people to become free. Without being able to, even at the most basic level, participate in the running of government through reading and writing, people had no agency to change their society and therefore their life condition.

In many ways, the role Maxine Greene gives to the experience of art is parallel to the role Freire gives to literacy. Maxine talks about moments in experiencing art that take you outside the normal "rules" of society and of your experience in it. Suddenly, as she calls it, you have an "opening," or a vista of a completely different way of living life, of life having a set of parameters very different than the one you experience. Maxine argues that these openings are an essential ingredient in a young person's path toward understanding themselves as free.

In our exploration of these ideas, Community MusicWorks has been experimenting with how to develop a "curriculum" of discussions, performances, and weekly instrument lessons that leads young people to the "openings" and the experience that Ted and Nancy Sizer call the "*ah-ha!* moments" – the experience of greater freedom in their lives.

And in so doing, we're not simply teaching kids to play music, but we're working with them in music so that they'll have experiences that are bigger than their existing world, and they'll reflect on these experiences as they imagine their futures.

We organized the May 2004 Symposium to stimulate a discussion about Freire, and the ever-current idea of changing society through education. I am so grateful to Ted Sizer, my mentor and advisor as I developed the ideas for starting Community MusicWorks, and to Deborah Meier for sharing their experiences and ideas. Both Ted and Debby are people who have lived and worked in the ideas of freedom as educators and writers for many decades, and we are lucky to have their musings on the subject.

It is in Community MusicWorks' spirit of experimentation and reflection that we present this transcript, with the hope that it inspires further ideas in your educational practice!

Providence, Rhode Island
December 2004

Public Forum

Sebastian Ruth:
Good evening. I'm Sebastian Ruth, Executive-Artistic Director of Community MusicWorks, and I am thrilled to be able to welcome all of you here tonight to participate in this very special opportunity: a Public Forum with Ted Sizer and Deborah Meier. Our distinguished guests are recognized in schools and classrooms across the country due to their significant and lasting contributions to the field of education; I will provide a few biographical details for those who are not yet familiar with their work.

Ted Sizer is Professor Emeritus at Brown University and Visiting Professor of Education at Harvard University, is the Founder and Chair Emeritus of the Coalition of Essential Schools. Having worked with hundreds of American high schools since the late 1970s, he has written a number of books on the subject of redesigning public schools, including *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School* and recently with Nancy Sizer, *The Students Are Watching*, and former director for the Annenberg Institute for School Reform.

Deborah Meier is founder of the Central Park East Schools in New York City and is currently co-principal of the Mission Hill School, a pilot elementary school in Roxbury, Massachusetts. She is a recipient of the prestigious MacArthur fellowship and is one of the most acclaimed leaders of the school reform movement having spent more than three decades working as a public educator, as a teacher, a principal, a writer, and an advocate. She is also the author of several books, including *The Power of Their Ideas*.

I wanted to note that there are several books of both Ted and Debbie's out in the lobby for sale. Please pick up a copy if you didn't already. I understand there's a book they are writing collaboratively, with Nancy, that's coming out later this year, so stay tuned.

I want to acknowledge some other people who helped make today possible. First of all, the Rhode Island Council for the Humanities (*www.uri.edu/rich*), which is an independent affiliate of the National Endowment for the Humanities. The Rhode Island Council of the Humanities put out a request for proposals last year about the topic of freedom. It got us thinking at Community MusicWorks (*www.communitymusicworks.org*) about that theme and how that's a real important part of our work in the community where we have a professional string quartet in residence with the urban communities in the South Side and West End of Providence; thinking about how these ideas of freedom are really why we do what we do.

We started to think about a way to convene people to have a discussion about these ideas; first to hear from experts and then to have more of a discussion together tomorrow morning. There are many educators in this room who probably have their own approaches and successes and challenges on this topic, so it would be great to hear from you. If you haven't already registered, there is still space available, and we are going to be at The Met School on Peace Street at ten o'clock in the morning.

I also wanted to thank Eileen Landay who helped publicize today's event, and Barbara Cervone who helped with ideas for it. Also our staff at Community MusicWorks, Anne Simmons and Heath Marlow, for doing a lot of the logistics to make this all possible.

There is a mailing list signup in the lobby. If you would like to know more about Community MusicWorks or be invited to other events like this and concerts, please sign up. An important part of this process is the evaluation, so if you don't mind taking a minute before you leave to fill that out, that would be great.

As many of you know, Maxine Greene was to have been here as well. She is ill so she couldn't make it. I spoke with her today and she had these words for us, to start us off:

> "In these dark times, what we're thinking about and working toward is the possibility of decency and freedom. I believe this could be achieved through a greater concern for the arts and aesthetic education. I feel privileged to share, even indirectly, (in that she is in New York and not here), this platform with Debbie Meier, who represents the effort to secure freedom and trust in America's classrooms. And as Ted Sizer knows, we've been on the same running track for years and years whether it be Horace or the problem of morality. Again, I'm privileged, even indirectly, to share this platform with him."

So without further ado, let me introduce Ted and Debbie. Each will speak for short time and then we'll open it up for discussion. There's a microphone in the audience. Please give a warm welcome to Ted Sizer. [applause]

Ted Sizer:
Thank you, Sebastian. It's wonderful to be back in Providence, at RISD [Rhode Island School of Design], and at Brown [University]. To speak about and to pretend to understand Paulo Freire is a demanding task. Those of you who have read his work realize that in English it's very dense, and tight, and difficult. Those who read it in Portuguese, and other languages into which it has been translated, might find it easier.

What I'd like to do, for a few brief minutes, is to pick up on just one theme. And read to you carefully a few words by Freire, and then to tell you two stories.

> "Education is cultural action for freedom, and therefore an act of knowing and not of memorization. This act can never be accounted for in its complex totality by a mechanistic theory. Such a theory reduces the practice of education to a complex of techniques, naively considered to be neutral, by means of which the educational process is standardized in a sterile and bureaucratic operation. Unlike men, animals are simply in the world, incapable of objectifying either themselves or the world. They live without time, properly speaking, submerged in life in no possibility of emerging from it, adjusted and adhering to reality.
>
> "Men, on the contrary, who can sever this adherence and transcend mere being in the world, add to the life which they have the existence which they make. Only beings who can reflect upon the fact that they are determined are capable of freeing themselves. To transform the world is to humanize it."

Let me reread it, just a few sentences:

"The reduction of the practice of education to a complex of techniques naively considered to be neutral by means of which the educational process is standardized in a sterile and bureaucratic operation." This is Freire's challenge to formal education in the West.

"Men, if they transcend their mere being in the world (transcend just being animals), add to the life which they have the existence which they make." So it's this addition, this transformation which so illumines Freire's work. It's that extra transcendence which makes us humans, if we take advantage of it. And it is that extra step towards transcendence, which we as teachers must provoke and support in our own kids.

So, two stories:

The first starts here in Providence. My wife Nancy and I, for a good many years, had a traveling Brown course largely taken by undergraduates and a few M.A.T.s. What we would do is pick a topic for a year, you know, the "Moral Moment." When does a kid have a "Moral Moment," the *ah-ha!* moment? What happens when a kid says, "Oh, I got it!"?

Then we would arrange with friends in school in the region, get up at four o'clock in the morning and drive all over the place. We would pick up kids and each of us would shadow a kid all day long, from the moment she got off the bus or came in the door, to the moment she left. All the time, [we were] listening and watching and surreptitiously making little notes around what we were looking for, the *ah-ha!* moment. When is it that this kid, and maybe the others around her in the class, appeared to have the constructive recoil of "Oh!"?

We would all rush home and write short field notes, portraits of the *ah-ha!* moment; then we would gather of an evening in our living room and we'd read these things and try to ascertain from their collected wisdom what we might have learned about youngsters learning, and thus about teaching.

One year we went to the Walnut Hill School (*www.walnuthillarts.org*), which is a school of the arts in Massachusetts, just to the west of Boston. The youngster that I was shadowing was a cellist and so I went with her to a masterclass. Its teacher was somebody many of you heard of, Benjamin Zander. You probably know him best as a conductor. He was leading this masterclass and he had maybe ten kids in a semicircle, each with his or her cello. He had a chair in the middle, and behind that his piano. He'd have the students come and play. He would accompany and he'd comment.

There was one youngster, quite terrified. They all were; he's a pretty scary guy, anyway! [laughter] She sat down; I forget the portion of the piece that she was to do. She did it; it struck my ears she did it very well. Ben Zander was at the piano in accompaniment and he would say, "Again!" and she would do it again. And he'd say, "Again!" and she'd do it again. He said, "*Again!*" and to my ear, it was terrific! He finally sort of banged on the piano and came up and said, "There must be someone in this class you love." This girl sort of said, "Yeah, that one over there." He dragged a chair over and put it down for this cellist's beloved and then Zander said, "You play for her, you play for her." She played this portion and he said again; there was a little bit of giggling and then "Again!" And then "*Again!*" and you could hear the difference, a subtle difference. She had transcended the mechanics of that piece.

Another story, quite different:

My father was a professor of the history of art at Yale University, and Director of the Yale Art Gallery. He had been briefly in the army during the First World War; he had never gone abroad. But on December 8, 1941, he signed up again. Many of his generation did that even though they were in their fifties. The Army, in its wisdom, said, "Ah, this fellow knows about art," and so he was assigned to the military government Arts and Monument section. This section was made up of people like my dad, drawn from the United States and the United Kingdom primarily, whose job it was to negotiate with Germans and Italians over what they would agree no one would shoot at. Dad went in with the landings in North Africa and the armies: the Afrique Corps [*Corps Franc d'Afrique*] coming from the east and British and Americans from the west. They had one major success there: they agreed not to fight in Carthage. The armies went right around Carthage.

Dad's job was to go out in the no man's land, by agreement, and talk to his German counterparts. He had studied art in Munich so he actually knew some of these people, the Germans. He then was part of the Sicilian invasion and then across to the boot of Italy, and then up the coast when he was pulled out and sent

to England to get ready for the Cross Channel assault. He had a minor stroke there and was sent home; he was deeply depressed.

One of his sidekicks from Yale had also been in the same unit. He was a portrait painter called Dean Keller, professor of painting at Yale. When Dean returned, they had a lot to talk about, particularly the Italian campaign and the great success of saving Rome, and the failure of not being able to save the great library at Monte Cassino. Dean recognized that Dad was quite depressed and said, "All right, I'm going to paint your portrait, in your uniform." As Dad was still a little confused, in a sad way, the uniform still was sort of attached to him.

They asked me, at age thirteen, to join them, and I was to paint Dad's portrait alongside Dean Keller. I went morning after morning, sat next to Dean and tried to paint and listen to these two men talk about the war, and about painting, and about other things. Clearly, they were kind of decompressing from what must have been hellish experiences. When you go into no man's land, you see the worst. My dad, who was a very sensitive man, was deeply, deeply depressed by this. He never talked to us about it, but you could tell.

So Dean painted his portrait, and I saw it as perfect and I thought he'd stop. But he said, "No! More, more, more." He came morning after morning, and I thought the portrait would have been finished. Dean Keller would just work at a little bit here, a little bit there; he'd talk a little bit, he'd look at my dad and talk to my dad and do a little bit more. And sure enough, in time, the mechanically perfect portrait of my father was transcended with a sort of haunted, depressed look, which in fact was there.

Both these stories are of transcendence; both these stories are something about that which must go beyond mechanical learning. Both are examples of humans going beyond the obvious and finding something deeper. Both these examples I've given you are in the arts, and the arts are the quintessential vehicle for the kind of transcendence that Paulo Freire described.

Thank you. [applause]

Deborah Meier:
I was just looking to see if he kept to his fifteen minutes. I regret to say he did, so I have to do the same. [laughter]

My stories are mostly not about "The Arts." But I was thinking, when you told that last story, that many years ago I applied for a job at a school, which became known as P.S. 3 in New York. Part of what appealed to me, about it, was that it was a big building and they weren't intending to have a lot of kids in the building so it would have a lot of extra space.

The parents who were starting this school were New York City Village parents, but that wasn't the most appealing part to me. The appealing part was that they might like my idea, which was that we should use the entire first floor to be free artists' studios. These people would not teach children art; they would simply allow children to hang around while they were doing art because the nourishment, which, as you shall see, fits in with what we are going to talk about, of what it means to learn in the company of, to be joined by adults, and for children to be joined with adult activity, is what I want to talk about today, and is, I think, essential for the kind of culture that Freire describes.

I want to say, also, that it intrigued me to think about, when I was rereading Freire, that the parts that (not surprisingly) particularly overlap or have special meaning for me, are parts that connect and disconnect with

two other important figures in my life: John Dewey and Eugene V. Debs. As I make my remarks, I'll tell you a little bit more about both of them.

Dewey, you probably know about, but I don't know how many of you know much about Eugene Debs. I want to bring him up a bit because I think there's an overlap that has been important in my life, both the similarities and the differences. The similarities largely relate to a certain view of human beings, as Freire calls them, as subjects, not as objects, not as instruments for other people's purposes and agendas, but with intentions and purposes of their own agenda, of their own design.

It's related to a view of democracy as a form of self-rule, of collective, communal self-rule, in which all citizens are members of a shared ruling class. These two views underpin our shared view of schooling – Ted's and mine –- even as there are differences in our views. Schooling as a way of support, such a view being a member of a community, membership in a community; to support the exercise of judgment in open and public ways, to make everyone part of, a member of, included within the body of people who count when important stuff is under review and being decided.

We're studying next fall in our school – we all study the same curriculum from K through eighth grade in our school – on election year, the big presidential election year, we focus on the political process. Since kids stay in our school for eight years, they get the "same" curriculum twice. We decided that the focus of the discussion next fall is "Who counts?", "Who matters?" and what can we discover in exploring what happens next fall? "Who it is who feels in and who feels out?", "Who is a member of the ruling class?" and "What are the signs and symbols of our society of who has been excluded?"

This same question of how we view "ordinary" people and "ordinary" decisions in our society, that odd view we have of jury duty which, in many ways, is an anachronism in a society that, in so many other places, does not accept the idea of every citizen being a powerful judger. It's a new idea, though, in some ways, in its expanded form, because when the ideas of our own nation were first developed, they had many of the same words that Dewey, and Eugene V. Debs, and even Freire bring up.

There's a wonderful quote by Jefferson, which I didn't write down and I'm terrible at remembering quotes. Ted, I didn't bother to look it up because I was sure that you would remember it. I was counting on you! [laughter]

> ["I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them but to inform them of their discretion."]

The implication of the quote is that, at the depository of decision-making, the people who have to make the decision are the people, and if they don't know enough to make wise decisions, then they need to learn how to do so, not to have the power taken away from them. Nevertheless, it's important to remember that when Jefferson said that, a very small minority of American people was included, even in his notion of power.

It's startling, in some ways, to realize how contemporary are the slogans, "All Children Can Learn" or "Everyone Should Be a Member of a Political Body." What an enormously narrow period of our history those ideas have existed! Yesterday someone was complaining about how many teachers still have elitist ideas about who can learn and who can't, and I said that it would be amazing to me to think anything other.

After all, I was steeped in reading, in growing up, in reading 19th century literature. I still love it, but it *assumes* the vast majority of the human race is not meant to have finer feelings or deep sensitivities, or to be well educated, or to rule the world. A mere hundred years ago, few Americans considered schooling, academia to be a desirable goal even; just as academics considered it too high, beyond the reach of ordinary people. Even [James] Conant, President of Harvard at the time – a mere fifty years ago – thought that only twenty percent, this was a very generous view, of the American public ought to be able to go to college, or have the smarts to go on to college. But the ordinary people were not terribly offended at that idea because, in fact, they considered these academics to be too *effete*, too academic in the sense of irrelevant and moot; and both may have been right. [laughter] That's the pity of it. The question is how to bring those two together in a more productive way?

Higher education – which meant beyond grade school when I was born – a majority of American people didn't start high school, much less graduate or drop out of it. They hadn't yet, on the whole, dropped *into* it, and while I'm very old, that's still within our human memory. [laughter] Higher education was intended as preparation either for teaching in higher education itself, the teaching profession or to be a member of the leisure class who needed to defend its story of the world, its rightful place in it, and the arts and cultures, which represented its highest yearnings.

As such, for at least the past hundred years, others have both scorned it and envied it, shunned it and sought it, seen it as an obstacle as they sought to enter fully into membership of the ruling class, and saw it as an undesirable trait of the ruling class. It suggested a pace of life that few had access to and which was painful to consider what it might be like to have such space and such freedom of time.

The fight for the forty-hour week, of which Eugene V. Debs was a part, was a fight also for citizenship; for the time to imagine you could think, for the time it takes to be imaginative, for the leisure that marks a ruling class.

Today's ruling class seems to very busy; sometimes I think they have even lost one of the advantages of the ruling class. But at least, I say to myself sometimes, they have the money to pay others to do their thinking for them. [laughter] It's not a small price, and I would like to have a few people like that around me.

Ted and I picked some of the same language from Freire, but I have a few others to add to this. I was thinking, in connection with it, of Dewey's concept of schooling and his notion of citizenship as an occupation, and the realization that people often don't remember that Dewey's notion of doing things was not merely that kids needed to keep their hands busy, but that they needed to keep their minds on the task. It was, I used to joke, about the "hands on, minds off" nature of too much of schooling. It isn't a question of "hands on" or "hands off;" it's the connection between our hands and our ideas.

And the world of work was not only, for Dewey, that which paid a wage but all those tasks needed to further the human condition: the task of mothering, the task of raising a family, the task of being a member of a community, and the task of being a member of a larger world. Dewey and Freire took Jefferson's vision of education and democracy to the next stage: that it belonged to all people.

We need this renewed conception of education; it's absolutely disappeared from the conversation we are having today in America. Freire's conception, Dewey's conception, and Debs's picture of our solidarity: "While there is a lower class, I am in it… while there is a soul in prison, I am not free." That conception of our ties and connection to each other has disappeared. It has disappeared from the schoolhouse and, to a large extent, from the larger society.

Most of the time, the schoolhouse is thought as a place to train the future professions of America, to strengthen our economy, to strengthen our competitive place within the world. This isn't said with any shame or embarrassment. It is the proclaimed vision, the purposes of school, which can now be measured by one single instrument: a test.

We need to scrutinize our daily practice with an eye on how it impacts on the aspirations that Freire, and Dewey and Debs had for us. All the little parts of schooling which cripple kids for the tasks we had in mind, and I believe in the long run, cripple us even as an economic enterprise. It's easy for policy experts who genuinely believe they are *Freireans* and *Deweyans*, and yet it should be up to them to make decisions that ordinary people would mess up.

Friend after friend of mine, who generally, politically speaking, may be my allies, consider me naïve for persisting in believing that, foolish as the people may be, we need to leave the education enterprise close to where children are. The judgments and decisions must be made by the people, the children, who know the children best and who best know the children.

To quote Freire, "Some folks of power are sympathetic to the oppressed," (and I would add "to anyone they have power over"), "but they bring with them the marks of their origin which include a lack of confidence in the people's ability to think, to want and to know. They believe they must be the executors of the transformation; they talk about the people but they do not trust them. A real humanist can be identified more by his trust in the people, which engages him in their struggle, then by a thousand actions in their favor without their trust. Leaders for change cannot think about the people or for the people, but only with the people."

My favorite quote from Eugene V. Debs is "I would not lead you to the promised land if I could, because if I could lead you there, others could lead you back again." The transformation must come from the children, from their families, from their communities, and from their teachers. We could add many a quote from Piaget now also…

Like Ted, I've been focusing on adolescents for the past twenty years, about the nature of adolescence and the kind of institutional surround we have created for them, and what it means to their becoming members of society. All of the natural ways in which youth became adults for thousands and thousands of years in the past have become passé; we structure their lives for them so that only the media, the virtual reality of TV and computers, introduce them into adulthood and all its complexity. The closer they come to being grownups, the fewer grownups they keep company with; the fewer memberships they are involved in that include anyone but their own peer generation.

I've been startled to realize though, in the last year, how much ground we have lost at the other end, and I want to conclude by considering the risk we're taking in what's happening to children from the age of zero to six, the disenfranchisement of our children – in the deepest sense of the word – from infancy to school age. Children have always been born into a community of family, of family extended beyond their immediate, and the surrounding neighborhood within which the family lives.

The mother and child, the mother, father and child, the grandmother and grandfather, aunts, uncles and neighbors; that's the company they keep, that's the company that teaches them what it means to be a human being. It's the company in which they are safe enough to explore, to take risks, to imitate and to try out something utterly novel. To be one day a dog and an hour later an airplane, having entered into both the animate and inanimate.

Up until quite recently, this not only took place within the home setting where children both observed what adults were like and also imitated, in their own way, the possibilities. Sometimes they went to nursery school, or play groups and maybe to kindergarten which were themselves gardens for similar, informal play; where they dug tunnels and made tree houses, made up worlds and make believe friends, and engaged in storytelling.

None of these [activities] are honored any more in the life of so many of our young children. I see children, all the time, who from the age of two or three on, spend most of their waking hours in the company of strangers in institutional settings in which they are expected to produce, to perform, to achieve on measurable goals.

This winter, I visited a school in the Northwest – I'm too embarrassed to tell you about it because I didn't tell them what I thought, so I feel I shouldn't tell you what I thought – this was a school for children from the age of a few months old until they were six; it was a very wealthy school connected to a university and had more resources than you and I could ever imagine giving our own children. There was one adult for every two or three children.

I spent three hours observing and I never saw any case in which children talked to each other, any group activity between children. They were all on task set for them by adults. Every six weeks, the children were given a new I.E.P. about what they should work for the next six weeks; every piece of material in the room had a sign on it explaining what tasks this piece of material was useful for.

I never saw a giggle, a hug; it was something out of some terrible science fiction movie. But the people who were showing us around were extraordinarily pleased with themselves; they told us they had an atrium that children could go out and play in at recess time. "But we don't even waste time at recess," she said, "every single piece of material in that yard has a purpose." Children are made sure they use the materials appropriately. My colleague, from Bank Street (*www.bankstreet.edu*), asked at one point to the woman who was bringing us around, "What about creative play?" She replied, "Oh, some of the materials you see here are designed for creative play." [laughter]

Someone reminded me recently that you don't really need real blocks, there are things are television, on computers now, where you can simulate block building. Since block building, we're told, was for the purpose of learning about the manipulation of space and early geometry and all that stuff – which we were told to say when people asked us why we allowed children to play with blocks – you can do that now three dimensionally. You don't have to dig up a worm and try to taste it because you can do that on a computer. Is there a loss? Prove it. Prove it to me. Find me a test that can tell us whether there's a loss or not.

The sheer sense of time has changed for young children; everything moves quickly, is solved immediately or by tuning into Google. Children, at two and three, become experts at using Google. What does it do to small children when they no longer have the time and space for them to explore in, to find out whether the world is or isn't trustworthy, whether our own senses and experiences are trustable? What happens when there is no longer the time and space for that repetitive, seemingly endless exploration of possibilities? I hear people tell me that little children don't have long attention spans, and I remember, as a mother and a kindergarten teacher, how hard it was to drag them away once they were engaged. They once all had very long attention spans. They lost it in first grade, or as they now lose it in pre-kindergarten because they're not engaged in tasks of their choice; tasks they have an investment in. They're not in pursuit of answers; the engagement doesn't fit into the schedule of the school, and time is not self-managed.

Even when we have reading periods in my wonderful school, it takes ten minutes to really get into a book and it takes some time to pull yourself out of a book if you're engaged in it. But, you know, we have twenty, thirty minutes of sustained silent reading periods. What vision does that have for children of what reading is about?

That comes back to my story about the artist. I wanted those artists in that school so children would experience that art was not something you went to the art room and did for forty minutes. Then at the end, someone said, "Oh, how lovely," put it up on the wall, put your name on it, and that was done. Maybe you would take it home and Mother would put it on the refrigerator.

The notion that an artist might go back to the same work over and over again – that transcending experience of the artist – I wanted children not to have to follow it but be in the company of people who engage in it, that quality of ingenuity, of imagination that distinguishes human life from most other animals. I say *most* because I'm not absolutely certain about all the other animals; maybe some of them do some things we're not so sure about ourselves.

Whether we call these creative acts "The Arts" or not, they're essentially human. Progressive education is not a single entity. Ted and I, who are often identified with that term, know how many different strands that it grew out of, how much of vocational education and even testing, and how much of racist education had roots also in progressive education.

Nevertheless, the thing we're trying to preserve – whatever name it goes by – is this picture of what it's like, what the impact of childhood is on the capacity of our human beings to step into the shoes of others, to empathize, to imagine being something different, to care enough to imagine it. These qualities take training, both the natural kind that young children imbibe from their mother's milk, and the imitation and observation that happens around their family, and followed – if we really care about democracy – by schooling consistent with these same ideas.

Democratic habits are, in short, natural and unnatural; we can cut them off both ways. We can deprive them of their roots and we can not nourish them through our schooling. The price we'll pay for having abandoned children to institutional priorities and efficiencies is hard to fathom. I don't know what they are, I don't know when we'll see the symptoms, I don't know what they will look like. We may already be seeing some of them – I'm talking about a trend that has been going on for twenty, thirty years – but I believe it's been picking up in pace today and that we're at a time, a dark time as Maxine reminds us, when we need to put our mind to where it can be stopped.

One place that I'm urging us to rethink and focus our energies on is our young children, and the capacity of a society to survive and experiment in which children do not have childhood, in which they are alienated almost at birth. I'll end with this quote from Freire:

> "Instead of being an alienating transference of knowledge, education can be action for freedom, the authentication of knowledge by which learners and educators join in the quest for new knowledge, a language of critique joined to a language of possibilities of what could be."

Thank you. [applause]

Questions and Answers

Sebastian Ruth:
This is the time to open it up for questions, but at about 8:30, we'll break because we'll start showing the film on Maxine Greene (*Exclusions & Awakenings: The Life of Maxine Greene*) at that point. If people choose not to see the film, we will be selling books outside in the lobby.

Audience Member 1:
I'd like to tell a little story as opposed to ask a question. Is that okay? It relates to this.

I'm Barbara Cervone from an organization called What Kids Can Do (*www.wkcd.org*). One of the things that we are trying to support is the same idea about what young people can accomplish when they're given the supports and opportunities that they deserve, and what they can contribute when we take their voices and ideas seriously. That's sort of our "elevator speech" about what we do.

Last week I was in Oakland and had the opportunity to visit a high school, Oakland Technical High School (*www.oaklandtech.com*). Some of you may roll your eyes if you know this school because it's been on the cusp of reform for a long time but never quite getting there. I went there to see a particular class taught by a man who had graduated from Oakland Tech. This is a largely African American, now increasingly Latino high school in the middle of Oakland. He had gone on to U. C. Santa Cruz where he'd actually studied sociology and had fallen in love with Paulo Freire and particularly the sociology of oppression. When he graduated from there, he decided to go work in the juvenile detention system in California, the antithesis of what he was trying to bring to society.

After a year, he decided that he really wanted to go back to Oakland, to Oakland Tech specifically, and he wanted to teach, especially young African American male students there to be "freedom fighters." Those were the words he used to describe this; so that their life wasn't in jail but rather that their life was one of freedom and choice. And he wanted to teach them the sociology that he had fallen in love with. So he went to the school but he had no teaching certificate. He goes to the school and says, "Can I teach a course on the sociology of the oppressed, Paulo Freire and others?" And they say, "No," of course. [laughter] So he set up a classroom on the front stairs of the school. The first day he got four guys to come and he had Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and said let's read some pages from this. The next day, each boy brought back a friend. And then he had about twenty guys who started hanging out after school reading these books with him. Then the girls started to say, "We want to be part of this too."

Pretty soon, he had about forty-five kids and the school said, "Okay, you can come inside. We'll give you a classroom so that you can do this as an after school club." So he starts doing that and by the end of the year, there are ninety kids in the after school club and there wasn't room enough. So they said he could do it in the morning too at 7:30 a.m. So the next year, he's got kids coming in at 7:30 in the morning to read Freire and other folks. Michael Moore's *Idiot Nation* was a favorite among this group. Finally the school said, "Okay, you can teach this as an elective. You're not a certified teacher, we don't know who's going to pay you, but if you want to teach it as an elective, you can come in and do it."

So now, he actually teaches this course to hundreds of kids who pass through and they can take the same elective year after year after year because it's not something you learn once. Critical consciousness needs to be refreshed constantly. So he has created this small community within this larger school and they speak of themselves as being "freedom fighters" because what they're fighting for is the freedom of ideas and freedom of choice in their own lives. It happens in all kinds of places, but I think one thing that he would

say is, "Don't wait for someone to give you permission to do these things, to think these things, to behave in this way." In his case, it was, "Act and maybe good things will happen along the way."

Any comments, questions?

Deborah Meier:
If he wants to come to Boston, maybe we could even pay him! [laughter]

Audience member 2:
Thank you, thank you very much, both of you. You've really been very inspiring and it's exciting to hear you speak. My name is Sonya White and I'm the string teacher at the Boston Latin School in Boston, and also a doctoral student in Music Education at Boston University. I'm interested in the subject of assessment, in particular assessment models, because assessment is so prominent in our experience as educators at the turn of this new century.

If you could speak to the subject of assessment models in the context of freedom education and specifically, if you might address the role of arts education and arts education assessment models?

Ted Sizer:
There is a passion these days to assess everything the moment after it happens and if you don't do that, you're for low standards. The qualities of mind and spirit, which I think you're talking about in the arts, just don't work that way. Teachers have to be very trusting, and schools have to be trusting, and let the work proceed. It's a long way from my dad's friend Dean Keller [see page 4] to a kid in school, but there is no way that Dean Keller would have been able to say, "Well, I can do it in two days or two weeks." You play with it, and play with it, and play with it until reasonable outsiders, as well as yourself, can say, "Yeah, that approach is what you had in mind."

The most important quality in assessment is restraint on the part of the assessor, and that's countercultural now. But I think we all should push it, and I think those who work in the arts, who are not as saddled with standardized tests as some of the rest of us, have a particular role in making this point. People will tell us that if we're against testing, we're against assessment, and that's absolutely wrong. I think we all should be self-assessors and should be assessed, but that is different than the standardized, timed, "We will check you out at this point" kind of assessment.

Deborah Meier:
I was thinking that some times people say to me, "Well, if we don't have tests in art, then it will always be dropped from the curriculum." There is some truth to that, but I tell you the truth: I would rather have it dropped from the curriculum than destroy the art.

I think there are worse things than not doing art in school, and that's doing the kind of art we too often do in school. The danger, of course, is that we have dropped art from so many places in children's lives. I've seen some of the art tests and art standards that California developed, and this was done by rather good people. I sat in hysterics thinking, "Are they talking about a six-year-old?" It would say things like, "A six-year-old will know about three genres of something or other, they will be able to distinguish between 17th and 18th century, and know the difference between landscapes and seascapes and so forth." I thought, "Who cares?" There was nothing about children being able to explore art.

The other thing is that I like that comment by Freire about "critique" because it seems to me that the culture of critique is what we mean by building standards. We have our own standard, but our standard is part of a community. When I say we're born into a community, we're influenced by our community, and the opening ourselves up to the views other people have of our work is an important part of a good education. But it requires a certain setting that is sufficiently safe even though it will always feel a little hurtful. I tell the kids in my school that when I send my copy of an article to my editor, I would really like him just to write back and say, "This is perfect, don't change a comma." But the fact of the matter is that I'm not insulted when he writes back and says, "It gets very weak in this part here, it gets stronger again there, I love the way you started it off."

A culture of critique in our schools is hard for us as adults; we haven't developed a culture of critique between the adults in the school and therefore haven't modeled for kids what it's like to have a good critique. I think it's at the heart of what our tasks are for the building of standards. There's a wonderful book by Ron Berger, a wonderful man. It's the only book he's written, and you get just get it on Amazon.com (*An Ethic of Excellence: Building a Culture of Craftsmanship in Schools*). He actually wrote a pamphlet for the Annenberg Foundation years ago; it was wonderful. But he's now written a book, expanding on the pamphlet and describing in it the work of sixth grade students and other kids around the country that he's been visiting through Expeditionary Learning (*www.elob.org*), and I really strongly urge you to use it in courses and read it for your own sake. This is what Ted and I mean when we talk about standards, and the building of standards, not just in the arts.

Next week our eighth graders, the seniors in my school, are presenting themselves for graduation. Our graduation standards are portfolios in the arts and it consists of their presenting; we have a whole first floor filled with the work of the eighth graders over the last few years. The committee for my student Matthew will meet and look at his work, and he will talk to them about the work, about the changes in his work, and about the different styles and ways that he has played with the visual arts. Then, one evening next week, all the students will present a performance art; anything they want to present to an audience. The week is a celebration of the artwork of our students, and for the kids, having this opportunity to explore, explain, describe, and get responses to themselves as artists is a form of assessment that we use in our school in all fields, but also in the arts.

Ted Sizer:
I would underscore "in all fields." What Debbie's describing for her eighth graders, we've just done at Parker School (*www.parker.org*) with our seniors with graduation exhibitions that are public and hordes of people come, including grandmas and strangers, and the seniors have to explain and clarify and rejoice. It's very different than the timed test.

Audience member 3:
I'm not sure how articulate I can be in my question, but it's about the freedom to fail. I struggle with this when I'm working with kids and I'm watching them… When I say "fail," I'm using it knowing that I have my own definition of failing. Everyone here probably has a different definition.

I'm wondering what your thoughts are on this with regard to exhibitions, with teaching one kid at a time, with allowing students to take an art project and go on and on and on with it until they feel they're done. Whatever the process is, as a teacher, as a child advocate, if you see a kid failing—whatever that looks like to you (sometimes it looks like teenage pregnancy, sometimes it looks like throwing it all away over drugs, or it could be something a lot simpler)—but there's still freedom. I'm just wondering what your thoughts are on that?

Ted Sizer:
You need an adult community. You need friends, probably teachers who know the same kids, and you have to have a lot of time for "kid talk" because your impression through teaching the subject that you teach may be different than your colleague's perception in the subject she teaches or the way the kid acts.

Good schools have multiple communities: there's you, the teacher and your kids, and then there's you, the teacher and the other teachers who teach the same class of kids. But there also has to be an adult culture. An adult culture should be full of critique. Not only of the adults' work but also judgments about what's going on with kids. Very few schools give time for that. That's supposed to happen by osmosis. [laughter] But, thank God, the medical community doesn't operate that way! The notion of consultation, of rounds; in fact, when I was here at Brown University, I took rounds with a friend, a professor of medicine, just to see what it was like and whether there was an analogous way of applying it in schools.

Deborah Meier:
I think you may or may not be asking another question as well. That is, whenever I see the words, "This is guaranteed to work," we need to "guarantee" that schools are going to teach all children well, and that all children are ready to go on and so forth... "Can you assure me?" people say when I talk about our approach. "Can you give a guarantee or insurance that your way will work?" I'm left with the dilemma you're talking about.

In some ways, I can't even do it for my own three children; I suspect that if I had only one of them, I wouldn't be able to guarantee that they won't fail. And maybe fail in some very critical ways, not just fail to be a great musician, but maybe fail at some critical moment in life that maybe I could have prevented, maybe I couldn't.

In some ways, part of the human condition is that if we can empathize and care about our fellow beings, we also feel the pain of our limitations. The fact is that, if we respect other people, we respect that in the end, they can choose to fail or they could fail because they didn't know something and didn't want to hear it.

I always want to take credit for all the things my children did well, whether in school or at home, and I tried to figure out whether it was their father who was to blame for the things they fail at. [laughter] But the fact of the matter is that we are, in some ways, both culpable and not culpable for both. We're not responsible for the fact they're wonderful and successful and marvelous. As I fail over my granddaughter, I have to remind myself that it's a surprise, it's unknown how it happens, and I don't know what will be happening five years from now for her.

I think there's an element that is very hard in our field and I think it's the pain. The permanent pain of being a teacher and a parent is that if you accept responsibility, there is that other side of the coin, which is that it comes with a very heavy price at times.

As you were talking, I'm thinking about a kid for whom we did all the things Ted's describing. We all sat around talking about this kid, and we did this and we did that. And this is about the fourth time he's been with us since first grade and he's now in fifth grade. There are some kids for which the change has been remarkable, but for this kid, I realized as I started going through the folders that we haven't figured out a way in which we can make a serious difference, enough for me to feel there's a good shot that he won't fail. You have to accept that at some point. It's finding that space as teachers where you both accept responsibility but can sleep at night. That's part of the art of teaching.

Ted Sizer:
This discussion reminds me of the abrupt change for many teenagers from good schools where adults have their eyes on them and talk about them during first year at universities where there's a radical change. And I always feel sorry for the deans who take care of the first year students when they hit the dorms for the first time. It would be interesting to see how college administrators and faculty would talk about what we're talking about now with the seventeen and eighteen-year-olds who may come from very different, very sheltered, and very watched-over places and are sort of dropped into…

Deborah Meier:
I think what you are talking about is one reason that some teachers don't want to have small schools and small class loads. Because as long as you have a hundred and twenty kids, and they change every semester, and you see them always in packs of thirty, you can't reasonably take much responsibility. Which also means you don't wake up at night feeling as much pain.

And I know that's true of advisories. I'm thinking of schools like The Met School (*www.metcenter.org*), here in Providence, where one adult follows fourteen, fifteen kids for four years. One of the questions in their minds when they finish the four-year cycle, how many of them say, "No, I'm not ready to take another freshmen group on." At least not right away, because it's like raising fifteen kids and you want to pause before you decide to have another new family. [laughter] I always regret that I didn't have that fourth child, but there was never the right moment. [laughter]

Audience member 4:
I have a question, but I'm a little intimidated here because I'm not a teacher…

Ted Sizer:
We can make arrangements. [laughter]

Audience Member 4:
But in a way, I guess I am a teacher because I'm a parent. My kids are long gone, so I'm also a surrogate grandparent in the West End of Providence. We have had the great privilege of working with kids as they're coming through middle school, going into high school, and going out into the big world, whichever direction they're going in. This really has stimulated me to think more and more about how important it is for a kid to have an adult mentor, hopefully a parent but not necessarily, somebody or some group of adults whom they could go to. For one reason, the homework that I saw brought home by some of our surrogate grandkids from Central High School, I was having trouble doing, and these kids have parents who had dropped out of eighth grade. But the other reason is just to have a role model, to help them decide, help them create boundaries, and to help them explore new areas to just to grow in themselves. It seems to me that the parent, teacher, and student are really the triangle that's necessary there.

Ted Sizer:
There's some very interesting research on what you're describing. Many of you may know Robert Putnam's *Bowling Alone*, a massive research study which concluded that communities which are connected—nothing to do with social class, economics or anything else—places where the adults know one another, where they know each others' kids, where they go to church together, where they go to synagogue together, or they play soccer together, or where they play cards together, or where they show up when it rains in the same coffee shop, and where there are people who help other families' kids with their homework…

When there is what Putnam calls "social capital," all the indices are higher than one would normally expect when you control for social class. Which is to say, if these kids are growing up in a community of connected adults, their own families and their neighborhoods, they will have a much better shot in life. The public policy issue coming out of this is, "How do you create connected communities?"

Deborah Meier:
Yes, and it's part of the same point I was making about the lives of so many kids today. It's not simply that we've literally, deliberately restructured society so that families are not likely to have the circumstances that you're describing – not just poor people, not just the oppressed – but we really have reorganized the raising of children in ways in which they are very unlikely to see grownups engaged in grownup work. Not just grownups engaged in teaching them and judging them, but seeing grownups who are doing things as grownups.

Kids eat out more so they don't even see the family around the home as much. You just go through the daily lives of kids from a very early age until they're well into their teens and early twenties, [and you see] that we've structured a life in which we have kept them separate from the work of the world; and I use the word "work" in the broader sense.

And the work of the world doesn't always create community for the grownups. It's a grim picture to me and maybe it will have some positive implications that I haven't yet dreamed of. But I think it's a call for looking at our schools, because I do think they're a place where, if we reorganized around them, we could create a community for parents, teachers and kids. They are a potential source of a sort of artificial re-creation of communities, and I don't know another one like it that helps people also create and be part of communities in which everybody is not just like you. It's a possibility, and so I feel kind of blessed that I happen to be working in a field that offers that hope.

The other thing nice about working with kids is that you can't, in the darkest of times, focus too much on the dark because it not only doesn't work with kids, but that they refuse to be gloomy for too long! [laughter]

Audience Member 4:
You reminded me of my question. What I was really trying to ask was, "How would you restructure a school to incorporate the parents into it?" We have The Met School model, but what other models are there?

Deborah Meier:
Well, the schools I've been part of – you can read about them in the two books that you can purchase on the way out (*The Power of Their Ideas* and *In Schools We Trust*) – have really organized with that notion in mind. The parents have got to be part of the school so that we keep no secrets from each other that are relevant to raising that kid together. We are two overlapping systems: the family system and its community, and the schools, and in that overlapping place we have the same interest.

We have to figure out how to give ourselves enough time. It's the time part. I can see all the things to doing it, having lots of evening meetings. We have these meetings once a month, we provide suppers for families and they come in, they talk with one another, they can go into the children's rooms, and they can see little shows. It's a fairly low-key event, but seventy-five percent of the parents show up. We have a weekly family assembly for the sharing of things that kids could share. There's always a row [of parents] in the back and you know, it's a small school of 175 kids, kindergarten through eighth grade but there are always ten, fifteen, twenty parents who drop by and listen to this half hour of sharing. Parents drop in, and there's no big fuss

about when they drop in, what they do together. We're enormously accessible to each other. In addition, the teacher meets one-on-one with every family several times a year. It's very time-consuming and there is not enough time to do the job as well as we ought to.

The school that I was part of in New York, Central Park East, I went back last week because some people were retiring from that school. We have people who have been working in that school now for thirty-five years who are just now retiring. That's not as true for many schools now because they don't hold people through community. People came out for this retirement. I saw a kid I had in third grade. It was an outpouring of people who have stayed connected to each other over thirty-five years and who think of each other as their community, in some ways their community of origin. There are networks of these kids who can stay connected with each other now all around the country. When I go speaking, there is often somebody in the audience who says, "Remember me, Debbie?" It turns out he knows what happened to this kid and what happened to that kid… They have built their own networks, their own communities, and they come back home a lot. It's possible for us to have millions of such communities in America based on our schools that cross generations and roles: parents, grandparents, children.

Sometimes we have a kid whose parents are in terrible shape, but we can almost always find a grandmother, an aunt, an older brother or sister who are much older but have an investment in that child whom we can work together to build an alliance around. But it's not just a one-on-one alliance; it's that community and our school community. I don't think it's utopian, but it's very hard to do when you're always going against the grain.

Ted Sizer:
It's also hard to do when you're in a scattered community. Our school, a public charter school out in the boondocks in central Massachusetts, has kids from forty-two towns and cities. So the "drop in" [visit] is virtually impossible. A device that has worked well for us is that every student in our school is "special needs." Every kid is special; every kid has a personal learning plan. Not "special needs" in the technical sense, but that every student has a program that is worked through by an advisor, the student and the student's guardians or parents. As the youngsters move ahead on the basis of their exhibited performance and mastery of their work, the families come back and observe that. Even when you have a very widely spread population of families, it is possible to have practices in a school which respectfully bring parents and guardians back on a regular basis.

Audience Member 5:
This is a groping question because I'm trying to put several strands together that I wanted in connection with connecting communities. I wanted to pay tribute to the Providence String Quartet, and Community MusicWorks which has sponsored this event because I have been in a position to see, over the last couple of years, the kind of work that they do in building community with their teaching, and it's very extraordinary and it's made me feel that old thing that some people really have a gift to do this and some of the rest of us struggle with it for many years.

The question I'm really getting to has to do with the way in which teachers get prepared for this. Along the way, I just wanted to mention that, at the same time in the past two years, I've been appalled because I've been watching a student who's in her thirties return to graduate education in the fine arts.

In a very competitive, well-regarded program, they turned away numbers of applicants in order to take in the twenty-two people who came into this class, and they had an exhibition at the end of the semester for these new students. For the students, it was very exciting; they were so engaged with their work. Some of

them were freshmen in college, but more were in their thirties and forties and they were back in school, and I thought the show was absolutely fabulous!

Well, it turns out that they failed twelve of the people in the exhibition. And I thought, "What is going on here?" because the devastation of this [failure]… The teachers said, "Oh, it's alright, we'll have to come to your studio and examine you again in the spring." And somebody asked, "What if we don't pass then?" "Well, we might let you continue in the program or you might have to leave at that point." The devastation of what happened in this exhibition that the students had been so excited about…

There's such an incredibly important role for teachers and their response to the work of their students. If you're in a school that has got wonderful leadership and is well run, it's extraordinary what can happen. But what can we do, and do you have examples of educational practices for people who are going into teaching, that inspires them to understand about this kind of community, and the way to do it, and a way to support the learning process? Not for them to get hung up on this "rigor" thing, which I always think is really "*rigor mortis*" [laughter] because it's not rigor in the sense of growth, moving forward and developing, getting better in what you're doing, but, instead, is an act of oppression.

I guess what I'm looking for is to see if you are optimistic, can you be optimistic about the places where teachers are cultivated, are started, and sent forth into the schools?

Deborah Meier:
I'm not enormously optimistic about the human species, which is really what you're describing. [laughter] How many countries on this planet of ours have thriving democracies? So maybe democracy is therefore hopeless…

I have to say it's really a gamble. None of us will be around to find out whether the gamble works because there's no way to find out; it's a struggle to do these things. Unfortunately or fortunately, there's not an answer to that question. You just have to keep struggling at it. Let me say that I don't think that creating community is, so to speak, a gift of special people. It is part of our "possibility." It's the possibility, going back to Freire, which we all have within us. Since we have the possibility, I think it's quite possible that some day we'll figure out how to make it the norm. In other words, since it's possible, it may happen. It's not bound to happen, it's not inevitable that it will happen, but it's possible it will happen.

To get to the particular you're talking about, this question is about failure. I think it's something we ought to explore, those of you who come tomorrow. I'm appalled at your story because, what was it, twelve out of twenty-two students failed? What does that mean? But the question of how you can take seriously the motto of "You shall do no harm," at the same time that you won't be patronizing and accept poor work. I think it's a complicated issue and I would love to explore that together tomorrow morning. I hope we follow up. The people who are coming tomorrow morning, remember what you raised tonight because I think it's important.

Ted Sizer:
The optimism and pessimism issue… I think we're all necessarily influenced by how we spend our time. I spend my time very disproportionately among school people and their friends who are doing good things, often heroically against the odds. So I'm biased. I think there are more such groups out there then there were fifteen years ago. They're still small; they're still getting beat up. It isn't "No Child Left Behind" (*www.ed.gov/nclb*), it's something else in the past and it will be something else in the future. To give a credit to a colleague to my right, there's power in these ideas we're talking about, and the more of us get together in

meetings like this, in schools, in universities and on the street, in bowling leagues [laughter], we'll move it ahead. Then when outrageous things happen in our government, we will be "organized"—that's the wrong word; that's the loaded word—we will be "gathered" to protest.

Sebastian Ruth:
I want to thank Ted and Debbie for a very stimulating evening. [applause]

This project was made possible in part by a grant from the **Rhode Island Council for the Humanities**, an independent affiliate of the National Endowment for the Humanities. Any views, findings, conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication do not necessarily represent those of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Anchored by the permanent residency of the Providence String Quartet, **Community MusicWorks** builds sustained learning and mentoring relationships between families and professional musicians in urban neighborhoods of Providence, Rhode Island.

Sebastian Ruth founded Community MusicWorks in 1997 with the conviction that musicians can play an important civic role in creating and transforming urban communities. With start-up funding from the Swearer Center for Public Service at Brown University, Sebastian created a permanent residency for a professional string quartet to mentor, teach, perform, and ultimately become part of the fabric of an urban Providence neighborhood. Initially, Sebastian piloted a series of musical workshops to 15 children at local community centers to introduce the concept of an urban residency for musicians. Due to the overwhelmingly enthusiastic community response, he quickly developed a comprehensive set of music education and performance programs. Enrollment soon swelled to 65, with a sizeable waiting list.

Today Community MusicWorks is a thriving community-based organization. Based on the innovative model of a permanent urban residency for the Providence String Quartet, we offer exciting education and performance programs throughout the school year that inspire and empower urban youth and receive strong support from the community where we live and work.

Please visit **www.communitymusicworks.org** for further information.

Suggested Reading

Berger, Ron (2003). *An Ethic of Excellence: Building a Culture of Craftsmanship in Schools.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Freire, Paulo (2000). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group. [Thirtieth anniversary edition; first published in 1970.]

Freire, Paulo (1995). *Pedagogy of Hope.* New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Goldensohn, Ellen (2004). Storefront Strings: How the Providence Quartet Built an Inner-City Residency. *Chamber Music, Volume 21, No. 3,* 22-28. [Available online at www.communitymusicworks.org]

Greene, Maxine (1995). *Releasing the Imagination: Essays on Education, the Arts, and Social Change.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Greene, Maxine (1988). *The Dialectic of Freedom.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Luttrell, Sharron Kahn (2003). A Classical Move: How a String Quartet Binds an Urban Community. *The Boston Globe Magazine, September 28, 2003.* 14-15, 23-24. [Available online at www.communitymusicworks.org]

Meier, Deborah (1996). *The Power of Their Ideas: Lessons for America from a Small School in Harlem.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Meier, Deborah (2002). *In Schools We Trust: Creating Communities of Learning in an Era of Standardization.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Putnam, Robert (2001). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community.* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Sizer, Theodore (1997). *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School.* New York, NY: Mariner Books.

Sizer, Theodore, & Sizer, Nancy (1999). *The Students Are Watching: Schools and the Moral Contract.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Notes

Notes