

MUSEUM AND GALLERY INSET: TEACHERS' ATTITUDES AND PRIORITIES

Vicky Woollard and Kate Pontin

ABSTRACT:

In the last few years museums and galleries have noted a significant fall in the number of teachers attending museum and gallery INSETs. This paper looks at the issues involved and considers the reasons why this loss of numbers may have occurred. Results from a questionnaire, sent out to primary and secondary schools in London and the South East, indicate that attitudes, perceptions and practices of teachers towards museums and gallery INSET differ widely. Over half of the schools taking part had staff who were both attendees and non- attendees. The staff were divided in their understanding of budgets and the contribution museum INSET can make towards teaching across the curriculum. The paper ends with a discussion regarding underlying factors which may contribute to some teachers' positive interest in museum and gallery INSET and which will force museums and galleries to rethink the purpose and content of their INSET. (149)

Introduction

When discussing the range of services offered to the formal education sector, many museums and galleries would include the provision of INSET (In service Training for Teachers). This service may take the form of a day's session linking the collections to an aspect of the National Curriculum, or it may be in the form of practical workshops to develop new skills for the classroom, for example batik work. It can also be an early evening session (Twilight) offering teachers the opportunity to make themselves familiar with the education service and how it can be adapted to their needs.

However in the past few years, the number of teachers attending such sessions has fallen. There are no national statistics available to support this, but from the perspective of the education staff within the galleries and museums, numbers are reducing and consequently sessions have been cancelled or not programmed for the following year. The question 'do teachers think there is a need for such INSETs?' is therefore raised. In order to answer this, a research project was set up and this paper looks at the findings from a questionnaire sent out to schools in London and the South East.

It is helpful to first examine the context of INSET as seen by both museum and main stream educators. However reviewing a significant number of books on the subject, it can be seen that INSET has been, and one could argue still remains, different things to the two groups. Thus a history of In-Service Training /Education for teachers and the specific role of museum INSET is summarised below. This history raises issues that are included in the survey and, also, form the basis of current concerns on the role of Museum/Gallery INSET and teachers today.

INSET in Main stream education

In the 1970s, for mainstream educators INSET was primarily for keeping up to date with new initiatives in classroom practice. A leaflet, *INSET and Change* (1978) from Advisory Committee on the Supply and Training of Teachers Training, described sessions as offering career development and providing opportunities for innovation and policymaking. But INSET gradually

moved from being “ a course directed at the individual teacher who operated as an autonomous individual..”(Goddard 1989:) to placing the teacher’s continuing professional development into a broader context of the school. INSET was to become concerned with school focused work rather than class focused and whole school improvement.

A key project which created the change was set up between 1975-1981 by the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI) (Hopkins 1986). A definition of INSET was given as “ an attempt on the part of teachers and external consultants to direct professional development efforts towards the identified needs of the school with the major goal of improving the quality of life within the classroom.” What followed was the setting up of a Government funded programme named GRIST (Grant related INSET) in 1986. It consisted of four principles which shifted the emphasis away from the individual teacher to the requirements for achieving political and national aims. The principles were:

- 1) to promote the professional development of teachers
- 2) to promote more systematic and purposeful planning of INSET training
- 3) to encourage more effective management of the teacher force
- 4) to encourage training in selected areas, which are to be accorded national priority. National priority was decided by Government and would receive financial support of 70% where as locally assessed needs were supported by a grant of only 50% (McBride 1989):

Here we see a clear political link between INSET, the government and the school, and in particular to the management of policy making for the medium and long term planning to the overall aims and objectives of the school. Following the 1988 Education Reform Act and Local Management for Schools, the role of LEAs and their Professional Development Centres came into competition with other agencies such as Consultants and Universities who can offer a more varied and tailor-made selection of training and educational facilities for individual schools. With budgets of up to £500 million placed within the DfEE’s Standard Fund, it is not surprising to find that Continual Profession Development and training is a major education industry. Courses are designed to support schools in raising standards in the core subject areas of numeracy, science and literacy, and in the management of children’s learning through target setting and monitoring. According to the Report *All Our Futures* (National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education 1999), the consequence of prioritising subjects is that none of the funding has been set aside for teaching humanities, the arts, creative teaching or thinking skills which are part and parcel of museum and gallery INSET. As noted in the Report the only current priority which includes these areas is the all-embracing one of general school improvement. (NACCE 1999:159)

Museum and Gallery INSET

We have found when looking back through the literature on museum and gallery INSET, museums and galleries seem to have focused on three main areas when planning programmes for such sessions. We found that there are particular focii

- an object focus - information on the collections and their direct relevance to the curriculum
- a management focus - information on the organisation of the visit
- a transferrable skills/ knowledge focus - using the collections as a means to developing

- skills and creative interpretation.

The INSET may only concentrate on one of these areas, or more likely, to cover all three but with one as the priority.

Object Focus

The majority of writing considers this focus, the object, central to the *raison d'être* of museums. We can see this in the 1931 Board of Education Pamphlet No. 87 which gave various examples of teachers' courses run by a number of museums in London (Hooper Greenhill 1991). These courses concentrated on the collections and the links with the school curriculum. To encourage further links and greater use of museums by teachers, the London County Council's Education Committee created a unique post of a Museum Services Organiser in 1935, whose responsibilities included training for teachers across London. (Woollard 1996).

In later decades, one of the main agents for promoting training for teachers was the Department of Education and Science, through Her Majesty's Inspectors. They made it quite clear that the purpose of INSET was that:

“ .. teachers need to be informed about the educational facilities which museums have to offer and to have guidance on the best way of using museums as a source of material for teaching purposes.” DES (1973:41)

The educational facilities offered included guided tours, films, worksheets, lessons and object handling. In many museums, the responsibility of the visit and its outcomes was divided between the museum educators, who organised the structure and delivered the content of the visit, and the teachers, whose task was to transfer the knowledge and interest gained from the museum back into the classroom. Her Majesty's Inspectors recognised that there needed to be a greater impact on further professional development, and encouraged an increase in the number of short courses run by museums in conjunction with local education authorities. There was also a long-term approach to museum INSET through the recommendation of both secondments of teachers into museums (the Greater London Council and its two museums the Horniman and Geffrye ran such schemes) and courses integrated within initial teacher training. Many years later, H.M.I.s continued to advise that INSET provided by museums should focus on a high quality, active, learning experience (1990)

Management Focus

We see an example of this focus of INSET appear in a review of the Board of Education pamphlet (as mentioned above) in the *Museums Journal* of 1932 (p.506). The review author noted that the “importance of securing the interest of the teachers is emphasised;...we have to teach the teachers and it is they who must handle the pupils”. This recognises the significance of the teacher in the organisation of the visit, but also that the teacher exerts that control beyond the museum context, particular in the classroom.

Transferrable skills

For some, the planning and management of the visit was secondary to pedagogical concerns. Harrison, a trained teacher cum curator of the LCC's Geffrye Museum and museum education pioneer, wrote in her chapter *Museums and Young People*:

“ In those museums in which practical methods are used, lectures have regularly been given in recent years to students in training and to other groups of interested adults; these lectures have dealt, not with the museum material, but with the methods developed for the children’s use and their possible application to other spheres.” (1952:72)

By the late 1970s there is a shift in emphasis. The acceptance that teachers would automatically receive direct museum staff support when visiting was going to change. This was due to museum education and curatorial staff were overwhelmed by large numbers of school parties. Teachers with their groups were expected to be leading groups independently, without the intervention of museum staff.

“Training classroom teachers how to use museums effectively is felt to be very important, not only because the class teacher knows the pupils and the curriculum best, but also because demand for museum education programmes is outstripping the museum staff’s capacity” Olofsson (1979:21)

Gradually we see museums and galleries forming links with Local Education Authorities’ (LEAs’) Teachers’ Centres and their professional development programmes. (Museums Association 1981, Airey 1980) This relationship brought with it an awareness by museum and gallery staff that ...

“ Teachers are busy people under very great pressure. Anything that is offered as an in service training must be seen to be both valuable and useful. It should be remembered that $\frac{3}{4}$ of all learning is through seeing, so courses should offer maximum practical participation and should be closely geared to what is currently going on in schools, or should seek to explore the development of new but relevant areas of the widening curriculum.” (Heath 1985: 31)

However, any opportunity to provide a national strategy for museums and galleries to link in with LEA providers for the further professional development for teachers was lost in 1988. Following the Education Reform Act, museums and galleries are now more likely to arrange INSETs on “.. an ad hoc basis responding to requests from a variety of quarters to provide a day or a half day training session in this, that, or some other aspect of education work in museums”. (Talboys 1996:ix). Though this is not strictly accurate. One can argue that whole school INSET rose out of the 1988 Act, when many museums responded to the newly introduced Baker days and teachers’ needing additional resources to support the new national curriculum programs of study.

Museums and galleries are now concerned with balancing their programme between sessions which look at collections which have direct link with the National Curriculum and those which make indirect links e.g using the collection to support literacy and numeracy. But the marketing of all programmes tend to be focused on the individual teacher and his /her classroom practice. Whereas schools themselves and other providers of school INSET are concerned with whole school effectiveness and therefore further professional development must be seen clearly to help the process of raising standards, for this is where government funding is being directed.

The Museum INSET project

Following the success of the East Midlands Area Museums Service project – see Improving Museum Learning (Hooper Greenhill 1996) where a group of museum educators carried out evaluation on their own practice, it was felt that a similar evaluation group could be set up to serve London and the South East. Kate Pontin initiated a meeting of interested people by advertising in the GEM Newsletter and the local London and South East England GEM Groups.. The group had no formal affiliation and was run in an informal way. It aimed to provide a forum for the communication of new research, as well as undertake evaluation projects itself. The group consisted of participants, largely education officers, from diverse backgrounds including national, local government museums and art galleries.

A number of research topics were discussed amongst members of the group. It was decided that the area of most concern to many people was the reduction of attendees to museum INSET programmes. It was therefore decided to develop a project, which attempted to find out why teachers were not participating in such sessions. The findings would encourage debate and reflection on INSET and look at ways to improve or change such courses to provide a service that teachers would find useful.

Methodology

After much discussion, the evaluation group decided to develop a quantitative research program, through a questionnaire. Quantitative methodology was chosen as the most appropriate way of answering our research questions.

TABLE 1. Survey design

Questions	Sources of Data
Do teachers go to INSET?	Questionnaire / national statistics
Do teachers go to museum INSET?	Statistics from museum records
If teachers do not go to museum INSET Why not?	Questionnaire/interview of teachers
What would make teachers go on such INSETs?	Questionnaires/interviews
Do they use museums with their classes And / or to visit on their own?	Statistics from museums/questionnaire
What is the most effective way of publicising INSET programmes (content)	Questionnaire/interviews

Two questionnaires were planned, one for attendees and another for non-attendees. After a number of drafts, they were piloted with a group of teachers to check if the questions were written and presented in an accessible format.

Both questionnaires were sent to named teachers, who had already attended museum and gallery INSET and on a number of museum mailing lists. The named teacher was asked to pass on the second, non-attendees questionnaire to a colleague who had not attended a museum or gallery INSET. Although it was realised that mail-out questionnaires have a low response rate, this seemed the best method considering the limited time members of the group had available for research and evaluation. It was hoped that the project would qualify for a small grant for postage but applications were unsuccessful, and so it was left to individual museums to pay for mailing themselves. All letters requesting teachers to complete the questionnaires included a stamped

addressed envelope to increase the percentage of returns. A number of organisations used internal council mailing systems to reduce costs. (See list of participants in Appendix)

Findings

216 completed forms were returned, of which 111 forms were from attendees and 105 from non-attendees. The two groups shared a number of similarities, most importantly, nearly 50% of both attendees and non-attendees came from the same schools or, to put it another way, 58 schools were mentioned on both lists. So for the purposes of the research, the professional context for half the respondents was the same (e.g. budgets, school development plans and priorities). The findings therefore allow us to look more closely at specifics of attitudes and perceptions.

Characteristics of the two groups:

Tables 2 and 3 show the range and type of schools of the respondents.

Table 2. Status of school

	Non attendees %	N (105)	Attendees %	N (111)	% Difference between Non – As and As
State	74%	78	69%	77	-5
Grant Maintained	13%	14	16%	18	+3
Independent	12%	13	14%	16	+2

Table 3. School by Age Group (multiple answers)

	Non attendees %	N	Attendees %	N	% Difference between Non – As and As
Nursery	8%	9	10%	15	+2
Primary	51%	59	45%	67	-6
Middle *	5%	6	11 %	16	+6
	64%	74	66%	98	
Secondary	27%	31	22 %	33	-5
6th Form	3%	3	5 %	7	+2
FE	1%	1	3 %	4	+2
	31%	35	30%		
SENS	5%	6	4%	6	-1
No Reply			1	2	
* (inc. 3% preparatory)					

The non attending portion in Primary Schools being 6% greater than the Attending portion may well be due to the reduction of Key Stage 1 teachers attending INSET as seen in Table 4 below.

Key Stages and Subject areas Taught

When considering the teachers' role and responsibilities we see more variation between the two groups. The first difference to be noted is the proportion of pre KS1 teachers not attending

INSET. This may well be influenced by a perceived and actual lack of programmes and facilities offered by museums and galleries for this age group (Anderson 1997:12-13).

Table 4: Key Stage taught by respondents (multiple answers)

	Non attendees %	N	Attendees %	N	% Difference between Non - As and As
Pre KS 1	9	17	4	8	-5
KS1	10	19	15	31	+5
KS2	28	55	28	57	0
KS3	18	34	19	39	+1
KS4	18	35	17	34	-1
Post KS4	14	27	11	23	-3
No Reply	4	7	4	9	

Secondly, when asked if participants held curriculum **responsibilities**, the respondents indicated marked differences in particular subject areas:

Table 5 Curriculum responsibility

	Non Attendees	N	Attendees	N	Difference between Non - As and As
Responsibilities for Art		14		29	+15
Science		14		7	-7
R.E		1		7	+6

All other subject areas had equal or up to a difference of 3 for both attendees and non-attendees. This difference in the three subjects raises a number of questions. The first question could be why are teachers of Art such high attendees of INSET? This may well be due to the interpretation of the word INSET which art teachers perhaps include attendance to private views of exhibitions held for teachers but which do not contain specific further professional development.

Another question is the position of science teachers, as 2/3rds in this sample of 21 teachers do not attend INSET. Is this due to a perceived lack of provision for them in London and the South East, with the exception of the Science Museum, Wellcome Institute and the Natural History Museum? Do science teachers feel confident about their subject and feel that the museums' displays and gallery interpretation is sufficient to deem INSET unnecessary? The Biologists did remark that they felt their subject content at A level was not available in museum displays, or at least they felt that there were not the appropriate displays and collections available besides the National Collections, for example evolution and genetics.

The explanation for high INSET attendance by RE teachers may be that many teachers double up on R.E with other subjects, such as humanities. They may well have included their attendance to a variety of museum and gallery INSETs which not only dealt with RE issues but other

curriculum areas for which they were also responsible. Or teachers perhaps perceive they have a lack of knowledge on how to use museums as a resource for the subject area.

Attitudes toward INSET

With regard to attitudes towards museums and galleries and to INSETS we see a complex picture emerging. Both attendees and non-attendees visit museums with their classes and non attendees were enthusiastic museum goers as individuals (90 % of them visited museums in their own time). Non attendees of museum and gallery INSETS do attend other INSET programmes provided by local authorities, consultants and others, with 50% of respondents replying that they had attended up to four a year. More significantly, 79% (N= 83 out 105) of non-attendees were aware of museums and galleries running INSETs. Turning to museum and gallery INSETs, attendees remarked that their schools placed a lesser value on the INSET than to the museum visit itself. (39% said their school placed a very high value on museum visits where as only 14% of school placed museum INSETs as very high). Equally significant was the attendees' response to the question, "Do you believe INSET is essential prior to a class visit?", 57% replied no, with only 35% saying a clear yes. However a number of respondents commented that what was essential was a prior visit to the museum or gallery made by the teacher. Regarding the issue of prior visits, many charging museums do offer free entrance, thus emphasising the need for planning. But this may be actually be the cause for the reduction of those attending an INSET for surely teachers may feel that making three visits, for the INSET session, a prior visit and the class visit is too much, both in terms of time and travel cost?

The value of INSET

Looking at the attendees' responses in Table 6, we can see what they felt they had gained from an INSET session.

Table 6: Value of INSET placed in rank order (multiple answer)

Ranking	Attribute	% & N of Responses	
1.	Ideas for future classroom work	24%	85
2.	Confidence in using displays	21%	77
3.	Broadening understanding of subject area	19%	70
4.	Knowledge of new subject area	16%	58
5.	Refining techniques and skills	10%	36
6.	Confidence in conducting school visits	9%	32
	<i>No Replies</i>	1%	3

Respondents also wrote down that other valuable outcomes were:
 Social interaction with other teachers and staff (3 teachers),
 information on resources (3 teachers),
 inspiration (2 teachers)
 visual recharge (1 teacher)
 support for those teaching children with SLD (1 teacher).

When asked what did the INSET session inspire the attendee to do? The responses were professionally, rather than personally, focused. However as can be seen from Table 7 museums and galleries should not assume a 100% rate of return of teachers coming with a class visit.

Table 7: Resulting from INSET (multiple answers)

Ranking	Attribute	%	& N
1.	tell other colleagues	23%	81
2.	use ideas in class room	22%	77
3.	return with class	21%	72
4.	visit other museums and galleries	13%	44
5.	return with family/friends	11%	40
6.	return on your own	9%	33
	<i>No replies</i>	1%	3

The interpretation of these responses to the two questions could be said to show that teachers are more likely to use ideas for INSET for classroom practice rather than to help prepare a museum visit. Whereas museums and gallery education staff are more likely to assert that INSET is for teachers to become familiar with the displays and hence prepare and manage more fulfilling visits for the students. This difference of intent may lead to misunderstanding and disappointment on both sides, and more importantly may be a key reason why the non-attendees chose not to come because they identified their need for resources for classroom practice rather than the need to improve their school visits and they perceive that the INSET will not deal with their needs sufficiently.

To the question “who do you think benefited from your attendance to the museum/gallery INSET ? ” the response can be seen in Table 8

Table 8: People benefiting from museum and gallery INSET (multiple answer)

Ranking	Attribute	% & N of Respondents	
1	Teachers themselves	33%	86
2	Their pupils	32%	85
3	Other staff	16%	42
4	School as a whole	11%	28
5.	Wider school community	7%	18
6.	Governors	0%	0
	<i>No replies</i>	2%	4

This outcome supports the above comments as to the priority given by teachers to classroom practice rather than benefiting the school as a whole. However perhaps museum and gallery staff should consider more carefully how INSET could have an impact on the whole school, to reinforce the claim that such museum and gallery INSET training is beneficial and is worth giving the time, effort and money to participate.

Thirty percent of the respondents answered that the decision to attend an INSET rested with the individual teacher, followed by the Head teacher and Deputy Head. Funding for the INSET came from various school budgets while 8% of the teachers paid the course fee themselves. But while half of these respondents had their INSET paid by the school, **non -attendees** from the same schools said that there were **no** available funds or the cost was too high. One could surmise that teachers who are interested to attend, are able to find funds to support their professional development.

Non-Attendees and Barriers to INSET

As has been discussed above, 90 % of the teachers (n = 95) visited museums in their own time and 76% (n = 80) had been on a school visit to a museum or gallery in the previous 2 years. Therefore we can say quite confidently that these teachers are aware of museums, enjoy them and use them for professional practice. Further more, 79% (n=83) said they knew that museums and galleries did run INSET, either through reading information or from hearing from colleagues. So the question is what is stopping them from attending INSET? Certain key factors were identified from the responses received. These key factors were either actual, or perceived, barriers to attending an INSET or the lack of components which had to be in place in order for them to attend. Or perhaps to put it another way it is to do with organisational priorities, perception and attitude.

Funding is inevitably a major issue for schools, and in the case of INSET the costs are the fee and the necessary supply cover for attendees, which is around £ 140 a day. The underlying factor which affects the allocation of the budget is inevitably based on the priorities set by the school and the individual. Thirteen percent of teachers said that the schools had no available funds, which we must interpret as no funds for museum and gallery INSET, as we know 90% (n=95) non-attendees participated in other INSETs. A smaller percent (11% , n = 45) of non-attendees believed that the cost of museum and gallery INSETs were too high. This is contrary to reality where most museums price their INSETs at between £25 - £75 which is considered as being moderate when compared to other INSET providers.

Time was raised as a problem in two ways, that of setting aside time to spend on museum and gallery INSET and secondly planning: the date and time of the course itself. The first relates very clearly to overall school priorities: how many days can be spent out of the classroom and on what aspects. Under planning we considered a range of comments; from the need for ample notice of INSET programmes, to the complex scheduling of INSET with curriculum topic and gallery visit. The timing of the INSET itself causes difficulties with regard to the month of the year and the time of day. However we have seen that the attendees (111 of them) are able to accommodate themselves to these planning issues. One could suggest that those who are convinced in the value of museum and gallery INSET will be attentive to information concerning museum and gallery events such as exhibitions, INSET, teachers' evenings and new publications. They are perhaps more likely to make time to arrange timetables and make bookings for trips and places for INSET.

Non attendees and their INSET needs

Non attendees, as with attendees, place great importance to the need for the subject covered by INSET to have significant and direct impact on the curriculum and the age and ability of their pupils. The word relevance was repeated continually in their responses, for example: “relevance to students with severe learning difficulties”, “activities relevant to KS1 pupils and their topics” “relevance to literacy and numeracy”. In response to the question “What would you like INSET to cover” many were very specific: Ancient Greece, local history, “for year 7 adaptation of animals”, “particular topics, especially at GCSE”. Other teachers asked for opportunities to work with artifacts and other resources, such as old photographs for investigative work (6 teachers), while others suggested emphasis on making multicultural links (2 teachers).

Another factor high on the agenda was the ‘packaging’ of services. It appears teachers would like the INSETs to provide ‘ready made’ visits and follow-up sessions for the classroom, perhaps similar to the Quality Curriculum Authority’s (QCA) scheme of work folders now available. Many museums and galleries however would claim that this list covers many of the services they are currently providing; making such links across the curriculum, selecting collections to highlight specific curriculum topics and preparing teachers’ resource packs with suggestions for gallery and classroom activities.

One area of response which raises a more fundamental point for museums and that is the individual interest in the museum or gallery collection chosen for the INSET. A number of teachers (n =8) made comments such as “if it interests me personally”, or “.. if I had a personal interest in the area covered “. It is not possible to delve further into this area with the evidence we gathered, but we feel it is significant enough to warrant further investigation. Teachers, as with others, are more likely to participate in activities which they can see benefit themselves, professionally or personally and perhaps many do not believe museums and gallery INSET will meet their expectations regarding such benefits.

Marketing

We can see from the paragraphs above that there are a number of issues which could be considered to be relevant to marketing. As reported above, 90% (n = 95) of non attendees visited museums and galleries privately in the last two years, while 79% (n = 83) knew that museums and galleries ran INSET. Here is an opportunity for the institutions to publicise INSETS in key public areas, such as the foyer, cafe and shop. As to which form of communication is most effective, 68% (n= 97) of the attendees said that they had found out about museum and gallery INSETs through publicity leaflets, while non attendees recommended such leaflets to be sent to curriculum coordinators. Publicity has to be sent out well in advance, for half the respondents said that at least a term’s notice is required. Some teachers mentioned the importance of the LEA’s professional development team in publicising courses.

Case study 1

Hillingdon Heritage Education Services

There has been a small drop in the number of INSET sessions provided by the service for local teachers. This partly due to the reduction in hours of the Local Heritage education officer. There has also been a slight drop in numbers of teachers attending each INSET

Service provided

There are no museums or galleries in Hillingdon, only temporary displays in libraries and those organised by the outreach services. Temporary exhibitions are publicised to schools and INSET provided if they are suitable for school groups. Otherwise INSET is seen as an opportunity to develop teachers' skills and awareness of what museums and primary sources can offer them

Courses can include:

Using Objects

Using archives

Developing the school museum

Oral History

Using the Manor Farm site in Ruislip (Medieval)

These courses have been running every year for seven years. Occasionally one is cancelled due to lack of number, but generally they continue to be popular. Part of their success is the fact that the skills taught are transferable to different situations. Adaptations to INSET take into account, current and new concerns of teachers. Daytime INSET is not done anymore, all INSET taking place after school. Current issues such as literacy and numeracy are being included in new INSET programmes for the year 2000/2001. The Education Service is also trying to develop support for teachers in other ways. These include the development of information sheets on INSET topics being made available through the free newsletter, individual source packs being made to order and hands on displays made available for loan.

Case study 2

Geffrye Museum - Schools Service

The Geffrye Museum contains a series of period rooms which range from the Late Elizabethan era to the 1990s. All classes visiting the museum receive a face-to-face teaching session from a member of museum staff or freelance teacher. These are based on National Curriculum topics and take a cross-curricular approach to the museum displays. .

Service provided

As gallery space is so short, some teaching sessions require that classes are split, with one half working in front of a period room while the other is engaged in an object handling session. In these cases, the teacher is expected to teach half the class herself and can choose between whether she prefers to work in the galleries or in an education room with the study collection. As a result, the Geffrye makes attendance at INSET a requirement for teachers bringing school groups which are going to be split in this way. These sessions are run after school from 4.30 - 5.30 approx. The museum makes a charge of £15.00 per teacher, which includes a set of resources to complement the chosen teaching session for use back in the classroom. Once they have been for INSET, teachers are not required to repeat the session if they wish to bring another group for the same topic. As this system has been running for ten years or so, the vast majority of teachers accept that it is part and parcel of working at the Geffrye and find it a very valuable experience. It makes the class visit run much more smoothly if all parties know what they are doing beforehand, both in terms of practicalities and teaching/learning content.

The Geffrye also runs whole school INSET on an occasional basis. These are based on using objects and period room displays to promote learning across the curriculum.

Case Study 3

Victoria and Albert Museum

The Victoria and Albert Museum is the national museum for art and design. Set up in 1854, the museum currently displays items from India and the Far East as well as Europe. Galleries are either dedicated to a geographical location (e.g. Korea) or a chronological period (e.g the Twentieth century) or by material (e.g Glass Gallery). Its education department have prioritised INSET for teachers and educational publications as the means to provide support and guidance for teachers to carry out their own independent class visits.

Over the past six years the INSET programme has been put together by one member of staff and includes day sessions on specific collections such as India or Islamic art, practical art activities and temporary exhibitions. Some sessions are more concerned with showing teachers the range of facilities the museum offers exam students, including the National Art Library and the Photographic Study Collection.

The department has regularly offered teachers Saturday courses and offering parallel sessions for family groups so a teacher with his/her family can spend a whole day at the museum.

There is a charge for INSET which includes a range of resource materials and lunch. Whole school INSETS are also available .

Discussion

There are a number of issues which arise from this study. Issues which are to do with museums and galleries themselves, others which focus on the policy and practice of formal education as led by the Quality Curriculum Authority, and others on the issue of cost.

Museums

The study findings show that the role of INSET needs to be further looked into by museum and gallery educators in order to examine the impact on school visits. We see that teachers take their classes on museum trips without having attended a museum or gallery INSET. Are these visits less effective in achieving learning objectives, than the visits made by teachers who attended such an INSET, or are the former group of teachers more experienced and confident? There is a view held by some museum and gallery educators, which is supported by this research, that the importance of the individual teacher's personal interests, either in a museum's or gallery's collections or not, is a key factor behind their decision to attend. This view is supported by 52% of those attending INSETs had been on 2 or more in the last 3 years, while the findings by non-attendees mentioned an interest in the subject would make them attend an INSET.

Museums and galleries will have to make decisions as to where to put their staff time and resources. Is it more appropriate for annual reports and performance indicators to run fewer INSETs a year but with larger number of attendants? Should resources be channeled elsewhere, for example to the Internet? The National Grid for Learning, which provides schools with easy access to the 24hour Museum and Cornucopia, may attract more teachers to use museums for school visits. Some museums and galleries are producing interactive web pages and supplying quality resources to download in the classroom for example the science Museum and the Public Record Office. It may be more appropriate to create 'distance learning packages' for teachers to use in advance of their trip to overcome some of the barriers which the survey highlighted; time, travel and cost. Or to arrange for teachers resources to be available at weekends and holidays at the information desk, well signed for those who are making a preliminary visit

Whole school benefit

This research did not consider other INSET providers to investigate what the situation has been for them in the past two or three years. Have other organisations reorganised their INSET provision to accommodate changes in teachers' needs or falling attendance? One would imagine that the answer would be yes to increase sessions on Literacy and Numeracy, as museums and galleries have done. But more significantly, are they increasing their provision of courses on target setting, monitoring and preparing schemes of work? These topics are not offered by museums and galleries due to lack of expertise and more realistically the yet unrealised links between the school development plan and the collections. However regarding the demands for whole school improvement, there is a case for the need for museums and galleries to demonstrate that the outcomes of an INSET, and the subsequent class visit, will not only benefit the individual teacher and their class, but also the school as a whole. As seen from the findings in this study, 16% (n= 42) of attendees felt that their INSET training benefitted other staff, while only 11% of attendees felt that INSET benefitted the school as a whole (see table 7). Thus an INSET which looks at issues which support schools' development plans will be attractive to both the teacher and the senior management team within the school.

However there may be a change in the air. In recent reports, such as *A Common Wealth* and *All Our Futures*, arguments are being eloquently made as to how the arts and museums can go further than providing subject content and that they do significantly contribute to schools as a whole. The DfEE has taken up these comments and in 1999 offered museums and galleries opportunities to demonstrate how they can support children's learning. One of the projects, set up by the Victoria and Albert Museum in partnership with the Institute of Education in January 2000, is to identify areas where museum and gallery INSET can help teachers make better use of museum and gallery resources for the classroom.

Finance

As we have seen finance was raised as a major factor for non-attendance to INSET, partly due to costs of supply cover. There have been moves to reduce costs, in indirect ways. For example in the 1999 Budget, the Government gave funds for national museums to provide free entrance for children, and numbers of schools parties appear have risen slightly in the last year. But this is for the nationals, many local authority and independent museums charge for lessons given by museum educators and schools still have to find funds for travel. However in March 2000, local education authorities have been permitted to hold back funds to pay for museum education services, for loan collections or subsidised school lessons. So there is anticipated a rise in the number of school visits, but will this also mean a rise in the number of INSET participants? Is there always a direct correlation between the rise and fall number of school visits and the rise and fall of teachers attending museum and gallery INSET? Also, are the situations of school visits and attending museum and gallery INSET directly affected by the increase in funding be it directly or indirectly to the school? Or is the question more about what the budget is spent on rather than how much? What are the priorities for each school? How are those priorities made?

Conclusion

We believe this study shows that there are reasons behind the attendance for museums and gallery INSETs which are complex and subtle; these reasons are concerned with personal interests rather than professional. This personal enthusiasm provides the teacher with the motivation to find time and formulate the arguments which will unlock funds for further professional development. Reasons for not attending a museum or gallery INSET, such as curriculum priorities and school improvement targets are formidable and museums and galleries should look to ways of demonstrating how school visits do impact on the whole school, rather than be narrowly focused on the visit itself. Museums and galleries will have to demonstrate what is an effective INSET, and should seek guidance from teachers, heads and advisors. If museums are learning resources, perhaps museum and gallery educators require a greater understanding of how the resources are used back in the classroom. Is there a call for museum and gallery educators making visits into school as well as visits being made by schools into the museum or gallery?

Recommendations

From the results of this first investigation, there are a number of points can be drawn from this research which museums and galleries could consider. We have put together a list of actions which museum and gallery educators may wish to consider:

- To explain the relevance of museum and gallery INSET (and visits) not only to the practice of the individual class teacher but also to the longer term impact on the school, for example ideas which stimulate 'awe and wonder' for assemblies.
- To target articles in teachers' journals, deliver papers at teachers' conferences and send displays to schools showing case studies of class work
- To encourage more consultation, for example with a panel of local teachers, in planning a year's INSET programme in advance. In discussing the content of temporary exhibitions, advisory groups can help find links with the curriculum.
- To understand the importance of resources for classroom use (see Hillingdon case study below) as well as for visiting the museum/gallery
- To provide clear publicity in the museum or gallery foyer spaces to catch teachers who visit museums in their own time and to inform the general public of such provision
- On occasion, some museums (such as Wandsworth Museum and the Geffrye) regularly require teachers to attend an INSET prior to a visit (see Geffrye Museum case study below).
- To try different formats e.g. Saturdays as carried out by the V&A (see case study below)
- To target INSET and curriculum co-ordinators as they are more likely to attend
- To reduce overall costs to schools as much as possible. For example, by offering after school sessions to avoid supply costs
- To give more thought on incorporating material/ INSET for teachers with children whom have special educational needs.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Dr. Paulette McManus, Hazel Moffat, Sue Morris and Alison James, museum education consultants for looking at the data and offering their valuable comments to the text. We would also like to thank Vicky Mills and Carole Mahoney for their contributions to the case studies.

Appendix

Participating Museums and Galleries

British Museum
Cabinet War Rooms
Croydon Clocktower
Epping Forest Museum
Forty Hall Enfield
Heritage Services, London Borough of Hillingdon
Horniman Museum
Museum of Domestic Design and Architecture (Middlesex University)
National Maritime Museum
Reading Museum
Royal Academy
Victorian and Albert Museum

REFERENCE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Advisory Committee on the Supply and Training of Teachers (1978) *Nature, Pattern and Professional Adequacy of Teacher Training Courses* Advisory Committee on the Supply and Training of Teachers
- Airey, V. (1980) 'The past twenty years' in *Journal for Education in Museums* 1. p.10-15
- Bryant, M. (1961) *Museum and the School* Historical Association
- DES (1971) *Museum in Education* HMSO
- DES/ ATCDE (1973) *Principles' Conference 3-6 April 1973 held at Lady Spencer Churchill College of Education* Oxford
- DES (1989) *A Survey of the Use Schools make of Museums across the curriculum* London: DES
- Donoghue, C & Ashton, P. (eds.) (1981) *In Service: The Teacher and the School* . OUP
- Glover, D. & Law, S (1996) *Managing Professional Development in Education*, London: Kogan Page
- Goddard, D (1989) 'GRIST: The Development of the design' in *The In Service Training of Teachers* Falmer Press
- Harrison, M.(1952) *Museums and Young People* ICOM chapter pgs. 55 –74 section VI
- Heath, A (1985) 'Train8ng Teachers to use historic buildings for education purposes' in *Journal for Education in Museums* 6 (p.28 – 35)
- Hooper Greenhill E (1991) *Museum and Gallery Education* Leicester University Press
- Hooper Greenhill, E Museum Education (pgs. 670-689) in Thompson, J.M (1992) *A Manual for Curators*. 2nd ed
- Hooper Greenhill, E (1994) *Museums and their Visitors* Routledge
- Hooper Greenhill E (ed) (1996) *Improving Museum Learning* East Midlands Service
- Hopkins, D. (ed) (1986) *In Service Training and Educational development- An International Survey* Croom Helm
- Joint working Party on Museums (972) *Pterodactyles and Old Lace* Evans Bros. Methuen
- McBride, R. (ed) (1989) *The In Service Training of Teachers* Falmer Press
- Morris, R. (1966) *The In-Service Education of Teachers* University of Exeter. Institute of Education
- Museum Association (1983) *Museums in Education* Museums Association
- Olofsson U.K.(ed) (1979)*Museum and Children* UNESCO
- **Standing Commission on Museum and Galleries 1978 HMSO p. 51-2
- Talboys, G. 1996 *Using Museums as an Educational Resource* Arena

Appendix 1. Participating Museums

Appendix 2. Questionnaire sent to attendees of INSET

Appendix 3 Questionnaire sent out to non attendees of INSET