

## Acceptance Address Enid Zimmerman

It is a great honor to receive the NAEA Women's Caucus Mary J. Rouse Award. This award is particularly meaningful since Mary Rouse was both my mentor and friend when she was a faculty member and I was a doctoral student at Indiana University. Guy Hubbard, who nominated me for this award, was once my teacher and is now a colleague at I.U. His professional and personal relationship with Mary Rouse makes this award have more meaning than it might otherwise.

After attempting several drafts of this acceptance speech, with little success, I realized that the most efficient means of completing this task was to interview myself. Most interviews start with a question about family background. I shall begin there.

**Q. What can you tell me about your family?**

A. I am first generation American on my father's side of the family and second generation on my mother's. My father came to this country from Bialistock on the Polish-Russian border as an adolescent, in 1915. He worked at many jobs including managing Luna Park Circus in Coney Island and being a strong man in this circus. He studied at the Art Student's League in New York City and made many motorcycle trips around the United States. He always had wonderful stories to tell about his childhood in Russian Poland and his early years in the United States. He met my mother later in their lives and settled down to a middle-class existence making a living from his business in the garment district in New York City. My mother worked as a bookkeeper-accountant for a firm in Lower Manhattan. Since my childhood, I always thought mothers worked and raised families simultaneously. I have a younger sister who lived in Mexico for a decade. She has now returned to the States and is a high school social studies teacher.

**Q. Did you draw and paint when you were young?**

A. I always was drawing. My mother had the foresight to send me to the local Y to junior high school. Frances Avery was my art teacher at the Y. She lived in Greenwich Village and traveled to the Bronx to give art lessons. She was inspiring both as a teacher and as a "real" artist who lived a bohemian artist's life.

**Q. Where were you educated?**

A. I was fortunate in being able to go to Music and Art High School in New York City. I went there after spending two miserable years in a special Progress Class in which the average IQ was 155 and I was a year younger than the others and not a very highly competitive student. Music and Art High School allowed me to be in contact with other students who were both academically able and involved in the arts as an integral part of their lives. I met students from varied backgrounds who lived in many different environments in New York City. I traveled an hour each way to get to Music and Art and never regretted my decision to go there as I ran past my local high school on a one mile trek to the subway each morning.

After graduating from Music and Art, I attended City College in New York. I started out as a pre-med major but was discouraged by my family from pursuing a career as a medical doctor and I changed my major to fine art. Jacob Rothenberg,



who was on the art faculty at CCNY, was such an inspiring art history scholar and teacher that I decided to double major in art history and fine art. I was the first student at CCNY to graduate with honors in art history after spending three semesters writing a research paper about the Utrecht Psalter. The die was cast for my career as an art educator because my desire to do research has always rivaled my desire to create art. I received a fellowship to teach art history at CCNY and study at an institution of my own choice. I studied at the Art Student's League for one year and attended Columbia University for the next year. I left Columbia University during a three hour lecture about who painted one of the Madonnas' feet in a 16th century Renaissance painting.

I decided I needed to become part of the "real" world and the feet with which I then became concerned belonged to the students I taught from the "ghetto." For ten years, I taught art as an elementary level special teacher in the East Bronx, Brooklyn, and the Lower East Side of New York City. During this time, I completed my Masters Degree in painting at Hunter College under the direction of Don Judd. I also married and had my first child during those years.

**Q. What led you to Indiana University?**

A. My first husband was a school psychologist who decided to become a clinical psychologist. He received a scholarship to study at I.U. and I went along without considering what my role would be in a small college town in the Midwest. During our first year in Indiana, our second child was born. I took some art education courses at I.U. and was grateful to receive funding to work on a project in the Art Education Department. When my husband finished his degree, our family moved to Ithaca, New York where I established the fine art program in an arts school that continues to this day. I returned to I.U. with my children, during the summers, to continue my studies in the Art Education doctoral program. Our family decided to move back to Bloomington and we bought a house there. Unfortunately, my husband died shortly after we moved and I was left a widow with two small children.

**Q. Can you tell me more about Mary Rouse and your association with her at I.U.?**

A. Mary Rouse was a dynamic and inspiring woman. She treated doctoral students as colleagues and often engaged in heated debates with them. She and I were attending a class in theory construction taught by Elizabeth Steiner. We spent many hours discussing June McFee's Perception-

Delineation Theory and how we were going to analyze it for Steiner's class. Mary was quite definite about her beliefs, but was always open to suggestions and could be convinced to change her position by a good argument. She was a woman who was intellectually astute, creative, thorough, and dedicated to teaching, service, and research. She valued me and my opinions. I last remember her stopping by my house right after my husband's death to see what she could do to help. I never saw her again. I left for my husband's funeral and when I returned, Mary was in a coma and she died a few months later. Her death left an emptiness that still reverberates in the halls at I.U. I completed my doctoral dissertation in 1979, with Steiner and McFee's theory a significant part of this research.

**Q. Why did you stay at I.U. after you completed your doctorate?**

A. When I was completing my doctoral work at I.U., Gilbert Clark became a member of the I.U. faculty. We worked on a project together and eventually decided to pool our talents under a common roof. We married and found it difficult to move to another university or community in which we both could find employment in the field of art education. It is not easy being on the same faculty as your spouse at an institution where you have been a student. It takes time and proven accomplishments to demonstrate that you are a worthwhile person in your own right.

**Q. What do you view as your major professional accomplishments?**

A. I always have been interested in synthesizing information in different areas of research in the field of art education and creating models from which art curricula can be generated. My curricula concerns focus upon special populations such as women, the gifted and talented, and cultures other than the North American core culture. Several books and monographs I have co-authored reflect these concerns: *Art/Design: Communicating Visually*, a basic design textbook for high school students, with Gilbert Clark; *Artistrands: A Program of Individualized Instruction*, with Guy Hubbard; *Educating Artistically Talented Students*, with Gilbert Clark; *Women Art Educators I and II*, both dedicated to Mary Rouse, with Mary Ann Stankiewicz. I enjoy working with others and believe that collaboration can produce results that are not possible when working by myself. Exchange of ideas in a stimulating intellectual environment can produce a whole that is more than the sum of its parts.

I have written numerous articles utilizing historical and theoretical modes of inquiry, and two research methodologies that are becoming increasingly popular in the field of art education. I believe, to understand the present and predict the future, art educators should be aware of past frustrations and accomplishments as well as the theoretical bases in our own field.

I have received two awards, with Gilbert Clark, that are very meaningful to me. In 1979, we received the Manuel Barkan Memorial Award for our research in creating a content model for art education and in 1983, an honorary certificate from Ohio State University at Newark for our scholarship in gifted and talented research.

## Women's Caucus in Dallas

During the 1985 National Art Education Association conference in Dallas, the Women's Caucus presented some thought provoking sessions. As well as supporting new research on women in art and art education, sharing women's historical and present contributions, achievements and issues with students, men and women both contributed their own ideas about local and national concerns of women, art, and education.

The Women's Caucus came into being when NAEA met in Chicago in 1974. Coincidentally, two separate groups of women met to discuss ways to improve the status of women in art education. They

I have had opportunities to speak at local, state, national and international workshops and conferences. I also served as visual arts consultant for the Agency for Instructional Television "Arts Alive" series. I continue to do my art work which has evolved from abstract painting to figurative batik-stuffed sculpture. I have been involved in a number of art shows in the Midwest during the past five years. In these ways, I have met art educators and artists at many levels and in different environments. Their commitment to teaching art, in some cases in the most adverse circumstances, gives me hope at times when art education seems under so much threat. My two friends, Hana Shafir and Rina Vardy, at the Ashkelong Art Centre in Israel, have created a community and teaching art center in a small developing town in which there are no other arts resources. They have done this with very limited finances and physical facilities. Their love and dedication to their field serves as a model for me when my spirits begin to diminish.

One of my most rewarding experiences as a teacher is the support I have received from my students over the years. I am always gratified when I realize that I have served as a role model for young and returning women students who are embarking on a career in art education. My affiliations with NAEA Women's Caucus members have provided me with a network of support and belonging that I have not always found in other places in the art education profession. I was proud to serve as President of the Women's Caucus from 1980 to 1981. I am, therefore, most honored and moved by the NAEA Women's Caucus Mary J. Rouse award that I am receiving.



united under the co-leadership of Frances Heussenstamm (Teachers College, Columbia University) and Judy Loeb (Eastern Michigan University). Members of the Caucus have done research and scholarly writing on women in art education and published papers on feminist topics in art and education journals. Members have moderated panels, presented papers, and held discussions on such themes as "Strategies for Success," "Not for Women Only," and the "Future of Women in Art Education."

This year's sessions addressed the topic "A Question of Gender?—Style in Art Education." Panel members discussed both male and female issues in "Teaching Art in Elementary and Secondary Schools," (moderated by Marcia Friedmutter), "Patterns of Professional Behavior in the University (Jean Rush and Michael Youngblood), and "Styles of Coping with the Challenges of Administration" (moderated by Diana Korzenik). Georgia Collins and Renee Sandell held an Open Forum on "Revisionist Education: Building Sex Equity into the Art Curriculum," based on ideas in their recent book, *Women, Art, and Education*. Heather Anderson spoke on "Learning Styles of Returning Male and Female Students." Several pairs of art educators held a very insightful panel discussion on the advantages and disadvantages of professional collaboration. Leni Salkind's research was on "Perceptions of Men and Women by the Media and by Artists." Anne Gregory gave an excellent slide-presentation on "Women in American Calligraphy."

After these presentations, Maurice Sevigny did a skillful summing-up by mentioning some categories or tools for discussion he had discerned from the program. "These were not," he said, "rules for success" and they were not necessarily his categories, but ideas he had noticed in women's literature. In his view, women tend to be honest and open but it is also necessary to be selective when revealing information to the "troops"—trust and protection are important between colleagues. Women also demand much perfection from themselves and others and take criticism harder. Their modesty, patience, and quiet giving and sharing is admirable but does not lead up to the "ladder of success," Sevigny indicated, amongst other remarks.

In summary, the sessions on "A Question of Gender?—Style in Art Education," presented through papers and panels, proved to be interesting and inspiring.