

# Introduction from the Editors

**Gary D. Beckman and Josef Hanson**

Welcome to the second volume of the *Journal of Arts Entrepreneurship Education* (JAE). The astute reader will note the Journal is now under the auspices of the Society for Arts Entrepreneurship Education (SAEE) and will serve as the Society's primary method of furnishing a top-tier platform for scholarly discourse in the field. We are encouraging submissions at this time and trust that, as the Journal moves forward, it will become yet another aspect of the Society's critical support for its members and the field at large.

This issue focuses on helping set a foundation for the field's next (potential) scholarly trajectory: exploring the differences and similarities of arts training between disciplines and how they may impact the field's curricular development. Since many educators are trained in a single arts discipline, it becomes difficult in artistically diverse classrooms to leverage the unique capacities of our students' training despite the countless strengths they possess. However, the training demands, curricula and culture of different arts disciplines also produce inherent weaknesses when thrust together in our classrooms—as many have both suspected and experienced.

In an effort to both break down these barriers and (most importantly to) provide fodder for innovative curricular development and discussion about the training differences in arts higher education, we invited educators grounded in different arts disciplines to help explain arts entrepreneurship's pedagogical structure. While they vary in format (some formal and others somewhat informal) and methodology (some suggesting ways that idiosyncratic arts training can be leveraged in our classrooms and others providing a more open interpretation), what unites these thoughts is the impact of understanding what our students experience when they leave our entrepreneurial chambers. Our hope is that these articles shed some light on how the field's curricular, pedagogical and theoretical development can not only reflect the differences in arts training but (perhaps) help educators be more sensitive to the impact of existing entrepreneurial theory and curricular choices on our students.

Yet the result of this issue suggests far more than how the constellation of arts training in higher education can affect our curricular development. In fact, it suggests something far different for those in these artistically-diverse classrooms. The responsibility of learning about our student's training also demands we broaden our own artistic horizons. Having some basic knowledge of less familiar art forms is crucial when designing arts entrepreneurship curricula for artistically-diverse classrooms, as the issue's articles suggest. Indeed, it may be somewhat disorienting when one who is trained in music begins to explore the seemingly-remote discipline of fashion design, or one who earned

their degrees in dance assesses what is happening in the far reaches of architecture or design. Yet our role as educators is to always continue learning. Aesthetics (or beauty, if you will) permeates our constellation and learning about other beauties would serve us well if it could help us make a student's dream come true.

This issue begins with Jim Hart's detailed article on theatre training, the critical importance of the Stanislavsky system and how educators can use this knowledge to directly impact their pedagogy. Jeff Nytch's thoughts on music training for the arts entrepreneurship classroom are, in part, a more meta view focusing not only on the complicated experience of performing for music majors, but also the larger issue of its value for audiences and musicians alike. Though many arts entrepreneurship educators are only now seeing an increase in dance students interested in the topic, Tara Mullin's timely article questioning the ratio of hard and soft skills needed by emerging dance entrepreneurs is a thought-provoking and much-needed direct discussion about how curricular design impacts the sustainability of entrepreneurial desires. Stephen Rueff rounds out the traditional constellation of arts disciplines with a discussion of how the "culture of critique" and the Hasso Plattner Institute of Design's influence are integrated in the Minneapolis College of Art and Design's Entrepreneurial Studies major.

Wrapping up the issue are two topics seldom seen in our literature. The first from Joel Roberts discusses the role of libraries both in the field and the classroom. As academic libraries engage in their own form of entrepreneurial reinvention, they offer intriguing potential as hubs for arts entrepreneurship teaching, learning and research. Lastly, Katherine Annett-Hitchcock breaks new ground in her survey of female arts entrepreneurs. Her article reveals new issues for the field to both consider in the classroom and explore through our scholarship.

On behalf of the editorial board and SAEE, we hope you enjoy this issue of the *Journal of Arts Entrepreneurship Education* and those to come. We also hope you will consider submitting your work for publication. Our current open call for submissions runs through January 31, 2021.

Gary D. Beckman  
Editor-in-Chief, JAEE

Josef Hanson  
Managing Editor, JAEE