

**Evaluation of the First Year of the
ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project**

**Paul R. Brandon
Brian Lawton
Waldtraut Krohn-Ching**

**Curriculum Research & Development Group
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa**

August 2004

This report was prepared to meet the requirements of a U. S. Department of Education Grant to the Hawai'i Alliance for Arts Education to implement and conduct research on the ARTS FIRST program. The grant project is a collaboration between HAAE and Curriculum Research & Development Group, with HAAE implementing the program and CRDG conducting the research and evaluation activities under a Memorandum of Agreement with HAAE. Paul Brandon, PhD, is the research Principal Investigator, Brian Lawton is the Project Manager, and Waldtraut Krohn-Ching, PhD, is the project formative evaluator. The interpretations expressed in the report are solely the authors'.

Contents

Introduction	1
Project Rationale	1
Evaluation Design and Questions	2
Participating Schools	3
Description of the ARTS FIRST Program	3
Overview	3
Professional Development	5
Full-day institutes	5
Three-hour ancillary PD sessions	5
In-class residency and mentoring sessions	7
Evaluation Methods	7
Evaluation Questions 1 and 2	7
Student achievement	7
School Attitude Survey	9
Interest in the Arts Questionnaire	9
Student behavior	9
Evaluation Question 3	9
Evaluation Question 4	10
Attitudes Toward Teaching with the Arts Survey	10
Project teacher interviews	10
Evaluation Questions 5–8	10
Professional Development Quality Survey (open-ended response section)	10
Weekly teacher log	11
Project student focus groups	11
Project teacher interviews	11
Evaluation Question 9	11
Project principal and teacher interviews	11
Evaluation Question 10	12
Evaluation Question 11	12
Students exposure to the arts: Parent survey	12
Project and control principal interviews	12
School Context Survey	12
Results	12
School Attitude Survey	12
Grade 3	15
Grade 2	15
Project teacher interviews	15
Initial opinions about the arts	16
Prior exposure to the arts	17
Opinions about the current reading and mathematics programs	17

Students' exposure to the arts	17
Factors that influence the use of the ARTS FIRST strategies	18
Observed effects of the program	18
Other factors that might influence student performance	18
Potential of the program	19
Attitudes Toward Teaching with the Arts Survey	19
School Context Survey	19
Quality Professional Development Survey	21
Weekly teacher logs	23
Principal interviews	23
Student Focus Groups	26
Parent Questionnaire	26
Discussion	30
Evaluation Questions 1 and 2: Student Outcomes	30
Students' reading and mathematics achievement	30
Students' attitudes toward school	30
Students' interest in the arts	31
Student behavior	31
Evaluation Question 4: Changes in Teacher Skills and Attitudes	31
Evaluation Questions 5–8	32
Students' perceptions of the program	32
Teachers' perceptions of the program	32
The extent to which the program was implemented	33
Teachers' opinions about program improvements	33
Evaluation Question 11	34
References	36
Appendix A. Description of the Implementation of the ARTS	
FIRST TOOLKIT at Three Windward Schools	37
Full-Day Drama Institutes	39
Three-Hour Ancillary Workshops	43
In-Class Residency/Mentoring Sessions	44
La'ie Elementary School: first two classes	45
La'ie Elementary School: second two classes	46
Ben Parker Elementary School	47
Keolu Elementary School	48
Table A1. Drama Mentor Interview Comments, School Year 2003–04	51
Appendix B. Outline of Research and Evaluation Methods	55
Student Achievement Data	57
Student Attitude Survey	57
Student Interest in the Arts Questionnaire	59
Attitudes Toward Teaching with the Arts Survey	60
School Context Survey	60

Professional Development Quality Survey	61
Project Teacher Log	61
Parent Survey	61
Project and control school principal interviews	62
Project school teacher interviews	63
Project school focus groups	63
Appendix C. Qualitative Findings on Interviews and Focus Groups	65
Table C1. Content Analysis of 2003–04 Teacher Interviews	67
Table C2. Teacher Interview Comments, Classified by Theme or Level of Exposure, School Year 2003–04	69
Table C3. Teachers’ Comments Made in Response to the Open Ended Questions about the Quality of the ARTS FIRST Professional Development, School Year 2003–04	76
Table C4. Principal Interview Comments, School Year 2003–04	78
Table C5. Student Focus Group Responses, School Year 2003–04	81
Appendix D. Data Collection Instruments	83
Student Interest-in-the-Arts Questionnaire	85
School Attitude Survey	87
Attitudes Toward Teaching With the Arts	89
School Context Survey	91
ARTS FIRST Professional Development Quality Survey	92
ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project, School Year 2003–04 Children’s Participation in the Arts: Parent Questionnaire	95
ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project Weekly Teacher Log for School Year 2003–04	98
2003–04 ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project Student Focus Group Guide	99
2003–04 ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project Project Teacher Interview Guide	107
2003–04 ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project Project School Principal Interview Guide	113
2003–04 ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project Control School Principal Interview Guide	119

Evaluation of the First Year of the ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project

**Paul R. Brandon, Brian Lawton, and Waltraut Krohn-Ching
Curriculum Research & Development Group
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa**

August 2004

Introduction

Under a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Hawai'i Alliance for Arts Education (HAAE) dated December 31, 2003, Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG), University of Hawai'i at Mānoa has provided formative and summative evaluation services to Year 1 of the ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project (AFWRP), a three-year endeavor funded by the U. S. Department of Education (USDOE) Model Development and Dissemination Grant Program. HAAE is implementing the project in three randomly-assigned public schools on the island of O'ahu. A group of three randomly assigned control schools also are being studied. In this report, we present and discuss the results of the evaluation of Year 1 of the project, including

- 1) an overview of the ARTS FIRST program, with emphasis on the components of the elementary teacher professional development;
- 2) an overview of the evaluation and an explanation of the methods;
- 3) results from student, teacher, and parent questionnaires, teacher and principal interviews, project school teacher logs, and project student focus groups; and
- 4) a discussion of the results and their implication for the ARTS FIRST program and the research project.

The intended audiences of the report are HAAE, the Hawai'i Department of Education (HDOE), and the USDOE.

Project Rationale

ARTS FIRST is a model for infusing standards-based arts into the K–5 program. It is intended to positively affect student achievement and education reform in Hawai'i. Student learning opportunities in the fine arts significantly declined in the state during the past decade. Beginning in 1994, state budget cuts removed arts specialists from the HDOE districts and schools. In 1998, the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts conducted a survey of Hawai'i's public schools and found that none of the elementary schools were offering a standards-based arts curriculum. ARTS FIRST

is intended to address these deficiencies and to show that use of the arts can help improve student achievement in basic subjects.

ARTS FIRST is designed for Grades K–5 students and teachers. AFWRP focuses on a group of students and teachers in Grades 3–5. In Year 1 (School Year [SY] 2003–04), the project provided services to Grade 3. Next year it will add Grade 4, and in the third year it will add Grade 5. There is an arts focus in each grade level: Grade 3 focuses on drama, Grade 4 focuses on music and dance, and Grade 5 focuses on the visual arts. The intended outcomes of the project are to improve students' achievement, as well as their attitudes toward school and school behavior, by improving their interest and engagement in school after providing their teachers with learning strategies to infuse the arts into the curriculum.

Evaluation Design and Questions

Using a pre/post control design, the evaluation reported here addresses 11 questions. Some of these questions focus on the extent to which ARTS FIRST materials and methods have merit and worth, as shown by changes in student achievement, attitudes toward school, behavior, and so forth. Others address the implementation of the program. Finally, some questions focus on the project, teachers, students, schools and other characteristics that affect project outcomes.

The evaluation questions are:

1. To what extent do students show improvements in reading and mathematics achievement, attitudes toward schools, interest in artistic activities, and behavior?
2. To what extent are changes in project students' achievement, attitudes toward school, interest in (and prior exposure to) artistic activities, and behavior different from changes shown by students in comparison schools?
3. What is the relationship between (a) student characteristics such as gender, interest in (and prior exposure to) artistic activities, and (b) their improvements in achievement and their attitudes toward school?
4. What changes are shown in teachers' skills in implementing the project and their attitudes toward the arts in the classroom?
5. Which activities and aspects of the project are received most favorably by the students and which are received least favorably?
6. Which activities and aspects of the project are received most favorably by the teachers and which are received least favorably?
7. Which activities and aspects of the project are most fully implemented and which are least fully implemented?

8. How might the project activities be improved?
9. To what extent does the project have unintended consequences?
10. To what extent is the project sustainable over time?
11. What aspects of school context, if any, effect the findings?

We use the evaluation questions to help structure this report. In the methods section, we describe the study's procedures for each evaluation question, and in the discussion section, we summarize the findings addressing all questions except numbers 3, 9, and 10, which are to be addressed in the final year of the evaluation.

Participating Schools

Schools participating in AFWRP were assigned randomly. The HDOE enlisted the participation of all Title-I schools in its Windward District. From this list, the evaluation team identified three pairs of schools that were fairly closely matched on ethnic distribution, school size, socio-economic status (defined as percentage of students receiving free or reduced-price school lunches), and achievement on the 2002–2003 Hawai'i State Assessment. In Table 1, we show the schools' demographic characteristics. We then randomly assigned schools within each pair to the project and comparison groups. Project schools include Keolu Elementary, La'ie Elementary, and Ben Parker Elementary¹, and comparison schools include Ka'a'awa Elementary, Kāhuku Elementary, and He'eia Elementary.

Description of the ARTS FIRST Program

Overview

AFWRP is a project to implement the *ARTS FIRST Essential Arts Toolkit for K–5 Classroom Teachers*. The toolkit was developed as a supplement to the HDOE's Arts Instructional Guide in response to ARTS FIRST, a six-year strategic plan for arts education developed by a legislatively mandated partnership. The Fine Arts Toolkit focuses on the most essential arts content at each grade level and is aligned with the HDOE's Hawai'i Content and Performance Standards-II (HCPS-II), the Grade Cluster Benchmarks, and the Grade Level Performance Indicators (GLPI). The toolkit also offers suggested classroom assessment tasks and suggested instruction strategies and ideas for teaching the arts. It provides a framework that is designed to help connect key arts concepts with other academic subjects such as reading and mathematics in Grades K–5. It is the intent of the *Fine Arts Toolkit* to enrich teachers' knowledge in the arts by focusing on the most essential arts content

¹Ben Parker Elementary's 3rd-grade teachers did not participate in Year 1 of the project. Instead, the school's 4th-grade teachers participated because this year's 4th-grade teachers will be teaching 3rd-grade for SY 2004–05.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project Participating Schools (Project Schools in Bold Font)

School	Percent of students receiving free or reduced-price lunch	Ethnicity		Stanford Achievement Test (% average & % above average)			
		Hawaiian/ part-Hawa'ian	Other	Reading		Mathematics	
				Grade 3	Grade 5	Grade 3	Grade 5
Keolu (237 students, 15 teachers)	44.4%	44.6%	55.4%	78.8	86.1	75.0	86.1
Ka'a'awa (145 students, 11 teachers)	53.1%	55.7%	44.3%	83.4	62.5	94.4	68.8
La'ie (600 students, 40 teachers)	64.0%	28%	72%	91.0	85.5	94.8	86.6
Kahuku (554 students, 33 teachers)	61.4%	42.6%	57.4%	91.3	79.3	92.6	73.9
Parker (466 students, 41 teachers)	56.5%	53%	47%	78.2	69.1	75.9	75
He'eia (612 students, 40 teachers)	51.1%	42.2%	57.8%	86.6	78.4	86.4	81.4

and to assist them in linking essential arts learning to other classroom instruction. The toolkit addresses teachers' lack of knowledge and preparation time for teaching the performing and visual arts effectively in the classroom.

In order to address the HDOE's Performance Indicators for Grades K–5, the *Fine Arts Toolkit* uses all the Hawai'i Fine Arts Content Standards for drama, dance, music, and the visual arts and intertwines them with its three “big idea concepts;” including how the arts are organized, how the arts communicate, and how the arts shape and reflect culture. For each grade level, the *Fine Arts Toolkit* presents the standards and the performance indicators and aligns them with sample assessment tasks and sample instruction strategies. It also introduces art terms appropriate for each grade level. Art concepts (elements and principles), thinking skills (responding), and artistic skills and techniques address the appropriate art terms.

Professional Development

The core of AFWRP is a series of group professional development (PD) institutes, followed at each participating project school by residencies and mentoring. The interaction between the classroom teachers and artists is intended to give teachers opportunities to fully comprehend the elements and principles of the various art forms. All participating AFWRP school teachers were expected to participate in the ARTS FIRST PD, which addresses the objectives and vocabulary for the appropriate grade level.

The program's PD consists of full-day training institutes, three-hour after-school ancillary workshops, and a minimum of five hours of in-class residency/mentoring sessions. In Year 1 of the project, all PD components took place from late January through early June 2004. Teachers and others involved in the project took part in all or some of these sessions. In Table 2, we show the schedule of the professional development for Year 1. A full account of each of the sessions, as observed by an evaluation team member, is presented in Appendix A.

Full-day institutes. The primary focus of Year 1 of the project was on the elements of drama education. The PD sessions were built on the reciprocal relationship between the classroom teachers, with subject-matter and classroom knowledge, and the artist mentors, with arts knowledge. The sessions were facilitated by a mainland consultant, who led the teachers in activities designed to help develop a deeper understanding of how to strengthen student learning through active participation. The major goals of the institutes were for the teachers to explore their classroom content and identify areas in which drama could be infused into the curriculum. In addition, the drama mentors were learning with the teachers about how to use the arts in the identified subject areas. These sessions were as much an exploration as to how and when the arts could be used as they were teacher training institutes. The overall context was to create an environment that would develop and strengthen the teachers' effectiveness in improving students' reading and mathematics skills through the use of the arts.

Three-hour ancillary PD sessions. Additional arts training in dance, music, and the visual arts were provided to the 3rd-grade teachers in ancillary after-school institutes. The purpose of these institutes was to broaden the teachers' awareness of other major art forms. Their primary focus was on providing the teachers with some general activities which could be shared with their students. At times, they also provided instruction about how to infuse the art forms into other parts of the curriculum. The institutes were led by community professionals and art education specialists. The sessions were entitled "Overcoming the Fear of Drawing," "Music with a Math Mind," and "Poems that Dance: Combining Poems, Writing, and Dance."

Table 2. ARTS FIRST Professional Development Calendar for School Year 2003–04

Professional development for teachers		
Date	Agenda/purpose	
January 30 Friday 9am–4pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to Drama • Powerful Learning Protocol • Drama lessons and unpacking • Links to reading & math Profiles of Learners 	
January 31 Saturday 9am–4pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institute 2003 sharing • Drama lesson and unpacking • Links to reading & math • Mentor scheduling 	
February 26 Thursday 3:15pm–6:15pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Music with a Math Mind 	
March 4 Thursday 3:15pm–6:15pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overcoming the Fear of Drawing 	
March 11 Thursday 3:15pm–6:15pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poems That Dance: Combining Poetry, Writing, and Dance 	
March 31 Wednesday 9:00am–4:00pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looking at student work (writing) • 6-trait writing rubric • 6-trait drama rubric • Drama lessons with focus on math; unpacking the lesson 	
April 1 Thursday 9:00am–4:00pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math and Drama intersections • Looking at student work (math) • Drama lessons with focus on math; unpacking the lesson 	
May 25 Tuesday 9:00am–4:00pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson sharing • Reflection on the year 	
Performances		
February 17 Tuesday 10:45am LCC Theater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Honolulu Theater for Youth’s NEW KID 	
April/May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Ohi‘a Production’s FUN WITH FABLES 	
In-class residency/mentor sessions ^a		
<i>Ben Parker School</i>	<i>Keolu School</i>	<i>La‘ie School</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • February 9 • February 23 • March 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • February 6 • February 27 • March 5 • March 19 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 23 • May 5 • May 14 • May 20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March 15 • March 8 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • February 12 • March 12 • March 19 • April 2 • April 9
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 3 • May 4 • May 10 • May 11 • May 17

^a All teachers received a minimum of five in-class residency/mentor sessions.

In-class residency and mentoring sessions. A key component of the ARTS FIRST professional development was the series of in-class residency/mentor sessions. The primary goal of the sessions was to provide teachers with a model for using drama in their classrooms. During these sessions, the artist mentors led classes using a variety of drama techniques. The lessons were built on the previous instruction and were intended to provide the students with an appreciation of the art of drama. This was done by the teaching the history and cultural of drama and by acting out stories. The drama mentors worked closely with the classroom teachers, who provided them with lesson plans that the mentors used to prepare instruction, thereby modeling the infusion of drama into regular classroom curriculum. The students engaged in activities designed to make them aware of their environments as well as the effect that focus and body position can have on conveying the meaning of a story or feeling. The teachers observed how to manage the classroom during the drama instruction, and how to apply drama to their everyday curriculum. All teachers received a minimum of five in-class sessions.

Evaluation Methods

The description of the data collection methods and instruments described in this section are organized according to the evaluation questions. In Table 3, the instruments used in data collection are shown. The study's methods and instruments are briefly described in this section; for the reader seeking technical information about the development and administration of the instruments, a detailed outline is given in Appendix B. Complete copies of all the data collection instruments are presented in Appendix D. As this section shows, data addressing some questions (or parts thereof) will not be reported this year because they are currently unavailable from the public schools or because instruments for collecting data to address them were developed in Year 1 for use in Years 2 and 3 of the evaluation. Data for some other questions will be analyzed only in the final year of the project.

Evaluation Questions 1 and 2

The first two evaluation questions are, "To what extent do students show improvements in reading and mathematics achievement, attitudes toward school, interest in artistic activities, and behavior?" and "To what extent do these changes differ among project and comparison schools?" These questions are designed to answer an important goal of the project, as reflected in the USDOE's Request for Proposals, which is to show significant improvement in student performance (particularly reading comprehension), behavior, and positive attitudes.

Student achievement. To address student achievement, we will obtain students' scores on the Hawai'i State Assessment (HSA), which is administered statewide by the HDOE in Grades 3 and

Table 3. Data Collection Methods: SY 2003–04

Instrument or data collection method	Evaluation question the instrument addresses	Respondents
<i>Student Interest in The Arts Questionnaire</i>	Evaluation Questions 1, 2, 3	Keolu and Laie schools' 3 rd -grade students
<i>Student School Attitude Survey</i>	Evaluation Questions 1, 2, 3	Project and control school 2 nd and 3 rd grade students
<i>Teacher Attitudes Towards Teaching with the Arts Survey</i>	Evaluation Question 4	Project 3 rd and 4 th grade and control school 3 rd -grade teachers
<i>School Context Survey</i>	Evaluation Question 11	Project school 3 rd and 4 th -grade and control school 3 rd -grade teachers
<i>Professional Development Quality Survey</i>	Evaluation Questions 6, 8	Project school 3 rd and 4 th -grade teachers
<i>Project student focus groups</i>	Evaluation Question 5	6 randomly chosen students from each of the project school classes
<i>Project teacher interviews</i>	Evaluation Questions 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	Project school 3 rd and 4 th -grade teachers
<i>Project and control principal interview</i>	Evaluation Questions 10, 11	Project and control school principals
<i>Student exposure to the arts: Parent survey</i>	Evaluation Question 3	Project and control school 3 rd -grade students' parents
<i>Weekly teacher logs</i>	Evaluation Questions 4, 7	Keolu and Parker 3 rd -grade teachers
<i>Artist mentor interviews</i>	Evaluation Questions 8, 9, 10	2003–2004 drama mentors

5. In Appendix B, section 1, information about the assessment's scoring procedures is presented. Currently, the scores for SY 2003–04 are not available from the HDOE. We will submit a supplemental report, which will report baseline mean reading and mathematics scores for Grade 3, when the scores become available in late November of 2004.

At the end of the project we will compare students' 2003–04 3rd-grade scores with their 2005–06 5th-grade scores and will identify the significance of the difference in gains, if any, between the project and comparison schools. Students will be tracked longitudinally. Because the sample sizes per grade might not be sufficiently large for adequate statistical power, the practical significance of the gains will be examined by calculating effect sizes.

School Attitude Survey. In Year 1, we assessed students' attitudes toward school by using the School Attitude Survey, which is a revised and modified version of the School Attitude Assessment Survey–Revised (SAAS–R) (McCoach & Siegle, 2003). (See Appendix B, Section 2 for a description of how we identified and modified this instrument.) We administered the survey to all project and control school 2nd– and 3rd–grade students at the end of May 2004. Data will be collected with the instrument every spring. Spring-to-spring changes in scores will be analyzed in our Year 2 report, and the differences among project and comparison schools will be compared.

The School Attitude Survey addresses two major constructs—attitudes toward school and academic self-concept. Attitudes toward school has three subcomponents, including overall attitudes toward school, attitudes toward reading, and attitudes towards mathematics. Academic self-concept also has three subcomponents, including overall academic self-concept, reading self-concept, and mathematics self-concept. The reading subcomponents are based on Chapman and Tunmer (1995). The mathematics subcomponents were developed in conjunction with the reading items. While McCoach and Siegle (2003) stated that attitudes toward school have only a moderate influence on academic achievement (as cited in Majoribanks, 1992), they cited several references showing that self-concept has a significant influence on academic achievement (e.g., Lyon, 1993; Marsh, Chessor, Craven, & Roche, 1995; Wigfield & Karpathian, 1991).

Interest in the Arts Questionnaire. We developed and pilot tested the Interest in the Arts Questionnaire during Year 1 of the project. The steps involved in the instrument development are explained in Appendix B, Section 3. The questionnaire will be administered to all project and comparison schools at the beginning and end of SY 2004–05. The differences among project and comparison schools will be analyzed.

Student behavior. We will obtain data on student behavior from the HDOE's Chapter 19 program, which collects school-reported data on disciplinary infractions. Only Class C infractions, such as class cutting, insubordination, truancy, and so forth, will be collected. Currently the results for SY 2003–04 are not available. We will submit a supplemental report comparing the differences between project and comparison third-graders when the data become available. Differences in gains between project and comparison schools from the beginning to the end of the project will be reported in Years 2 and 3 of the project.

Evaluation Question 3

Relationships between student characteristics, such as gender and interest in (and prior exposure to) artistic activities, students' improvements in achievement, and in their attitudes toward school will be examined at the end of the three-year evaluation to help determine the extent to which the

program accounts for change. Regression analyses will be used to show the extent to which student characteristics explain gains in achievement scores in the final year of the project.

Evaluation Question 4

The fourth question addressed in this study has to do with the changes shown in teachers' skills in implementing the project, as well their attitudes towards the arts in the classroom.

Attitudes Toward Teaching with the Arts Survey. Attitudes towards the arts in the classroom were assessed using a slightly modified version of the Teaching With the Arts Survey (TWAS) (Oreck, 2001). The Attitudes Toward Teaching with the Arts Survey addresses four constructs, including the importance of the arts, self-efficacy and self-image, support, and constraints. These constructs were validated using principal component analysis (Oreck, 2004), which is a method for examining the extent to which the responses to questionnaire items cluster statistically in a manner consistent with the constructs that the instrument is intended to measure. Appendix B, Section 4 explains the instrument development process. Changes in perceived skills and attitudes toward the arts will be examined annually over the course of the project.

Project teacher interviews. We conducted teacher interviews to collect data on teachers' prior exposure to the arts, factors that they believed affect program implementation, and other information that might affect teachers' skills in implementing the project or might affect the success of the project in general. Themes identified in the teacher interview responses will help us modify our survey questionnaire for SY 2004–05. Development of the teacher interview guide is presented in Appendix B, Section 10.

Evaluation Questions 5–8

The fifth through the eighth evaluation questions address the extent to which students and teachers looked favorably upon aspects of AFWRP and the extent to which these aspects were fully implemented. Findings about the activities that are most liked, and about those most fully implemented, as well as insights into improvements, will allow the development team to make the appropriate changes to the program, if necessary. This is important for the program to be sustainable over time, as well as to maximize increases in student achievement, student and teacher attitudes, and student behavior.

Four data collection procedures, including student focus groups, project teacher interviews, a teacher log, and a project teacher PD questionnaire were used to collect information to answer these questions.

Professional Development Quality Survey (open-ended response section). The primary purpose of the Professional Development Quality Survey is to collect teachers' opinions about various

aspects of the PD and its quality. In addition, the survey included a section in which the teachers were asked to respond to aspects of the program that they thought were most and least helpful and to make suggestions for program improvement. The survey was administered during the final full-day PD institute at the conclusion of SY 2003–04. The development of the survey is described in Appendix B, section 6.

Weekly teacher log. The level of implementation of program activities was tracked using the weekly teacher log. The development of the log is described in Appendix B, section 7. Results from the Year 1 log are given in this report. Changes in the level of implementation will be examined over the course of the project.

Project student focus groups. Information about the aspects of the program that the project students received most and about the aspects they received least favorably was gathered during focus groups that took place in May 2004. In the focus groups, students discussed their overall perceptions of the project, their perceptions of the changes in their teachers’ practices, and their observations of overall classroom effects. In Appendix B, Section 11, the development of the student focus groups is outlined.

Project teacher interviews. In the teacher interviews, we gathered information about activities and aspects of the project that the teachers received most and least favorably. The themes identified in the teachers’ responses will help us produce quantitative survey items next year to track teachers’ opinions over the course of the project.

Compilation of information gathered from the student focus groups and teacher interviews will be used to help program improvement over the course of the project. Final analysis of the information at the end of the third year will be used to report the overall success of program implementation.

Evaluation Question 9

Sometimes new, innovative programs have unexpected effects. Evaluation Question 9 asks, “To what extent does the project have unintended consequences?” A qualitative method was used in Year 1 of the project to help us identify areas that may cause unintended consequences. These results will be consolidated over the course of the project and reported in the Year 3 evaluation report.

Project principal and teacher interviews. Information about the unintended consequences of the program was collected by interviewing the project schools’ principals and teachers. Baseline information gathered in SY 2003–04 will allow us to recognize if any of these consequences occur over the course of the project. Development of the principal interviews is described in Appendix B, section 9.

Evaluation Question 10

Evaluation Question 10 is, “To what extent is the project sustainable over time?” In the final project evaluation report, we will summarize what we know about the various aspects of the project, including costs, additional resources that the schools most devote to the project to ensure is success, and so forth, as well as the overall acceptance of the program by school administration, teachers, and students. These results will be used to examine the likelihood that the project can be sustained over time.

Evaluation Question 11

The final question addresses the aspects of school context, if any, that might effect the research and evaluation findings.

Students exposure to the arts: Parent survey. We obtained information about students’ prior experience in and exposure to the arts by administering a questionnaire to project and control school 3rd-grade parents. The questionnaire will be administered each year of the project to all the parents of incoming 3rd-graders. Development of the parent questionnaire is described in Appendix B, Section 8.

Project and control principal interviews. School contexts at both the project and control group schools were examined by conducting interviews of project and control group principals. The results for this year are discussed in this report. Based on the results of the interviews, survey items will be developed to monitor changes in aspects of school context that may affect program implementation. Project and comparison schools will be compared to identify and isolate program specific changes that are found as a result of program implementation.

School Context Survey. Teachers’ perception of school context was assessed using the School Context Survey. Development of the survey is outlined in Appendix B, section 5. The differences between project and comparison schools will be used to help interpret differences in test scores and other questionnaire findings at the end of the project. Cronbach’s alpha will be calculated to determine item reliability.

Results

In this section we provide an overview of the data collected with each of our instruments. Our interpretation and discussion of the results is given in the Discussion Section of the report.

School Attitude Survey

The School Attitude Survey was administered in Spring 2004 to collect baseline data addressing the evaluation question about the effects of the project on student attitudes. Descriptive statistics for each of the schools and for the total project are presented in Table 4 (Grade 3) and Table 5 (Grade

Table 4. Project and Control School Results on the School Attitude Survey, Grade 3, School Year 2003–04

School, by construct	Mean ^b	St. dev.	S.e. _M
<i>Project schools</i>			
<i>Ben Parker Elementary (N=38):</i>			
Attitude	29.18	4.04	0.65
Academic self-concept	36.93	5.82	0.94
<i>Keolu Elementary (N=29):</i>			
Attitude	29.07	4.22	0.78
Academic self-concept	38.04	4.13	0.77
<i>La'ie Elementary (N=58):</i>			
Attitude	30.96	2.58	0.34
Academic self-concept	37.93	4.90	0.64
<i>All project schools combined (N=125):</i>			
Attitude	29.98	3.58	0.32
Academic self-concept	37.65	5.02	0.45
<i>Control schools</i>			
<i>He'eia Elementary (N=82):</i>			
Attitude	29.48	3.98	0.54
Academic self-concept	37.82	5.61	0.77
<i>Ka'a'awa Elementary (N=20):</i>			
Attitude	27.10	5.16	1.49
Academic self-concept	36.63	5.38	1.55
<i>Kāhuku Elementary (N=81):</i>			
Attitude	29.21	4.15	0.54
Academic self-concept	36.49	5.85	0.76
<i>All control schools combined (N=183):</i>			
Attitude	29.87	3.82	0.28
Academic self-concept	37.35	4.60	0.34

^a The attitude construct consists of Items 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, 17, 22, 23, and 25. The academic self-concept construct consists of Items 1, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, and 26.

^b The reported mean is the mean of all the items for each construct added together. Maximum total score for attitude is 33 and the maximum total score for academic self-concept is 45.

Table 5. Project and Control School Results on the School Attitude Survey, Grade 2, School Year 2003–04

School, by construct ^a	Mean ^b	St. dev.	S.e. _M
<i>Project schools</i>			
<i>Ben Parker Elementary (N=27):</i>			
Attitude	28.80	4.90	0.94
Academic self-concept	38.28	4.57	0.88
<i>Keolu Elementary (N=27):</i>			
Attitude	30.79	2.27	0.44
Academic self-concept	38.12	3.62	0.70
<i>La'ie Elementary (N=54):</i>			
Attitude	28.97	4.19	0.57
Academic self-concept	37.57	4.64	0.63
<i>All project schools combined (N=108):</i>			
Attitude	29.38	4.06	0.39
Academic self-concept	37.88	4.36	0.42
<i>Control schools</i>			
<i>He'eia Elementary (N=53):</i>			
Attitude	29.48	3.98	0.54
Academic self-concept	37.82	5.61	0.77
<i>Ka'a'awa Elementary (N=12):</i>			
Attitude	27.10	5.16	1.49
Academic self-concept	36.63	5.38	1.55
<i>Kāhuku Elementary (N=59):</i>			
Attitude	29.21	4.15	0.54
Academic self-concept	36.49	5.85	0.76
<i>All control schools combined (N=124):</i>			
Attitude	29.12	4.18	0.38
Academic self-concept	37.07	5.70	0.51

^a The attitude construct consists of Items 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, 17, 22, 23, and 25. The academic self-concept construct consists of Items 1, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, and 26.

^b The reported mean is the mean of all the items for each construct added together. Maximum total score for attitude is 33 and the maximum total score for academic self-concept is 45.

2). The structure matrix from the factor analysis, which was conducted using the combined second- and third-grade results, is shown in Table 6. The factor analysis results validate the attitudes-toward-school and academic self-concept constructs. Cronbach's alpha, a measure of the reliability, or internal consistency, of the items, for all project and control students combined was 0.86. Cronbach's alpha was 0.83 for the attitudes-toward-school construct and 0.83 for academic self-concept construct. These are sufficiently high to analyze items together as scales.

Grade 3. The project schools' mean total score² on the items addressing the attitudes-toward-school construct was 29.98 (maximum total score of 33), with a standard deviation³ of 3.58. For the academic self-concept construct, the mean score for the project schools was 37.65 (maximum total score of 45), with a standard deviation of 5.02. The control schools' mean total score on the two constructs was 29.87 (st. dev.= 3.82) and 37.35 (st. dev. = 4.60), respectively. The results of a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA)⁴ indicated no statistically significant difference between the project and control schools' mean total score on the school attitude survey ($F=0.14$, $df=2$, $p>0.05$). Given this result, no subsequent analyses was conducted of the individual attitudes-toward-school and academic-self-concept constructs.

Grade 2. The project schools' mean total score on the attitudes-toward-school construct was 29.38 (maximum total score of 33), with a standard deviation of 4.06. The academic self-concept construct mean total score for the project schools was 37.88 (maximum total score of 45), with a standard deviation of 4.36. The control schools' mean total scores for the two constructs were 29.12 (st. dev. = 4.18) and 37.07 (st. dev. = 5.70), respectively. The results of a MANOVA indicated no statistically significant difference between the project and control schools' mean total score on the School Attitude Survey ($F=0.73$, $df=2$, $p>0.05$). Given this result, no subsequent analyses were conducted of the individual constructs.

Project teacher interviews

A content analysis was conducted of the project teacher interview results. This procedure was carried out by identifying themes in the teachers' interview responses. The process went through several stages to cluster as many comments as possible within category themes without losing the

² The mean total score reported is the sum of the item means.

³The standard deviation is a statistic that tells us how tightly the various scores are clustered around the mean. The displayed standard deviation is the standard deviation for the mean total scores.

⁴ MANOVA is a method for calculating the statistical significance of the difference between group means over multiple dependent variables.

Table 6. Factor Loadings for the School Attitude Survey^a, School Year 2003–04

Item stem	Factor	
	Attitudes toward school	Academic self-concept
13. I like being at school.	0.79496	
22. School is fun.	0.74866	
2. I am glad I go to this school.	0.70295	
4. This is a good school.	0.63948	
17. I like to learn at school.	0.62150	
7. Reading is fun.	0.58609	
25. I don't like to come to school.	0.54296	
9. I don't like this school.	0.50614	
3. Reading is boring.	0.42697	
23. Math is fun.	0.42291	
12. If I try, I can get good grades. ^b	0.39241	0.19760
11. Math is boring.	0.35875	
18. I understand everything I read. ^b	0.28818	0.25883
15. I am not good at math.		0.68306
20. I am not a good reader.		0.59630
24. I do not understand what I read in school.		0.58906
14. Reading is hard for me.		0.58058
19. I do not understand math.		0.58043
16. I am not good at learning new things.		0.55649
21. Math is easy for me.		0.52117
6. Math is hard for me.		0.50981
10. Reading is easy for me.		0.46726
1. I am smart.		0.43083
26. I can figure out most math problems.		0.37565
8. School is easy for me.		0.37507
5. In school, I learn new things fast.		0.34649

^a Rotation method: promax

^b Items 12 and 18 were designed for the academic self-concept construct; however, loaded heavier on the attitudes toward school construct. We may omit these items from future surveys based on these results.

overall contextual meaning of the complete responses. The number of comments within the categories were summed, thus providing quantitative summaries of the results of the interviews. The results of the content analysis for the project teacher interviews are given in Appendix C, Table C1. The categories assigned to each of the sentence strands are presented, along with their corresponding verbatim interview responses, in Appendix C, Table C2. An explanation of the findings for each of the question topics is described as follows.

Initial opinions about the arts. This topic was examined to identify changes, if any, in teachers' attitudes toward and perceptions of, the arts. Teachers' primary concerns about implementing the project when it began were time commitments and confidence in teaching the arts. The comments that clustered under the time category had to do with concerns about using personal time for PD or

about doing additional tasks in extraordinarily busy classrooms. The comments about confidence generally had to do with being afraid to act in front of other people.

Other prevalent themes identified in the content analysis were that the teachers were interested in a program that would benefit students but questioned the effectiveness of integrating the arts into the curriculum. One interviewee was simply interested in having the arts back into the classroom because they are being pushed out of the curriculum.

Prior exposure to the arts. Project teachers were asked about their prior exposure to the arts so that the evaluators could gauge the extent to which previous experience might affect project implementation. Teachers' prior exposure to the arts was divided into high and low exposure. This division was based on general cutoff statements that grouped statements in either the high or the low categories. For example, comments such as, "Not much—a couple of classes in college," were placed in the low category, and comments such as, "I was in drama through high school and college," were placed in the high category. The category classification for the interview responses is presented in Appendix C, Table C2. The results of the content analysis can be found in Appendix C, Table C1. Teachers' exposure to the arts was, generally speaking, fairly equally divided among high and low levels. All the teachers mentioned that they enjoyed at least one of the four major art forms and that their interest and enjoyment in the arts had positively influenced their participation in the study.

Opinions about the current reading and mathematics programs. Because ongoing school efforts to teach reading and mathematics might have an effect on the extent to which ARTS FIRST can be implemented and affect student achievement and attitudes, we asked teachers about their current reading and mathematics programs. The analysis of this interview topic revealed four categories about the perceived strengths of the reading programs and four categories about perceived weaknesses of the programs. These categories are presented in Appendix C, Table C1. For program strengths, the top two categories had to do with the program's comprehensiveness and the ability for students to move at their own pace. Comments categorized under comprehensiveness focused on teachers' comments about the variety of strategies and tools that are used to increase student reading performance. For the programs' weaknesses, a majority of the interviewees thought at times that the programs were restrictive in some manner, from not providing enough creativity to limiting or not including components, such as grammar and writing, that are central to overall reading development. Also, the teachers tended to state that the programs addressed too narrow a range of student performance levels and lacked the sensitivity to detect slight improvements in student progress.

Students' exposure to the arts. This question asked the teachers to describe how often their students were exposed to the arts in the classroom. By getting a sense of the students' current level

of arts exposure in school, we will be better able to interpret the changes in students' attitudes and interest in the arts over the course of AFWRP. In addition, this adds to our contextual understanding of factors that might affect program implementation.

The teachers' responses about how much their students were exposed to the arts were divided into high and low levels of exposure. The comments were categorized by how much the teachers made an effort to expose their students to the arts. For example, comments such as, "We are only allotted a period a day to teach the rest of the stuff; art, PE, social studies, science, character education," was categorized as low and comments such as, "We have music class once a week," was categorized as high. The results of our analysis are presented in Appendix C, Table C1. Comments tended to cluster slightly more under the low exposure category. Appendix C, Table C2 presents the categorization and verbatim comments of this topic.

Factors that influence the use of the ARTS FIRST strategies. This topic summarizes the findings on the interview questions about the reasons for variations in the use of the ARTS FIRST strategies, challenges that the teachers found when trying to implement the strategies, and other factors that determine use of the strategies. This information can help the AFWRP development team identify reasons for the variation in the levels of use of the ARTS FIRST strategies. Also, it might suggest project improvements and might hint at the feasibility of sustaining the program over time. By far, time and confidence were the two issues that teachers perceived to have the greatest effects on the use of the ARTS FIRST strategies. The comments displayed in Appendix C, Table C2 show the categorization of comments under these two themes. Additional themes that influence the use of the strategies are also presented in Appendix C, Table C1.

Observed effects of the program. Two interview questions were grouped under this topic: "What have you noticed about the students' reaction to your use of the arts?" and "What are some of the pedagogical changes you have made as a result of the PD?" These were used to gather information about teachers' perceptions on how the ARTS FIRST project effected them and their students. The teachers' perceptions of the effects of the program are categorized as student benefits and teacher benefits. The primary student benefits were internalization, which included comments highlighting a change in some academic aspect of student performance, understanding, and so forth. Enjoyment, confidence, the closing of performance gaps, behavior improvements, and group interaction were also identified as program effects. The teacher benefits were confidence, and pedagogical insight, which included comments highlighting a change or reinforcement in a teaching strategy.

Other factors that might influence student performance. Examining this topic will allow us to address Evaluation Question 11, which has to do with the aspects of school context that might affect

the evaluation findings. Teachers' perceptions of other factors that might influence program effectiveness were identified as parent involvement in students' academic success, the demographics of the student populations, students' behavior, and the programs' PD.

Potential of the program. The teachers' perceptions of the program's potential helps us address Evaluation Question 10: "To what extent is the project sustainable over time?" Over half of the comments suggest that the teachers believe that the program will improve student achievement. Conversely, two of the teachers' questioned whether the program will effect student scores on the HSA. Teachers identified increases in student self-concept and positive attitudes as another potential effect of the program. Results of the content analysis for this topic are shown in Appendix C, Table C1. The category classification and verbatim comments are in Appendix C, Table C2.

Attitudes Toward Teaching with the Arts Survey

The Teaching with the Arts Survey was administered to address Evaluation Question 4, which is about teachers' implementation of the project. The mean total score for project school teachers was 76.88 (108 maximum), with a standard deviation of 11.01. The control schools' mean total score was 65.57, with a standard deviation of 11.69. Cronbach's alpha was 0.84. Descriptive statistics are given in full in Table 7. The results from an analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between the mean total scores of the project and control school teachers' attitudes toward teaching with the arts ($F=3.97$, $df=1$, $p>0.05$). However, a substantial effect size⁵ (Cohen, 1988) was found, with $d=0.996$.

School Context Survey

To learn about aspects of the school that might have affected program implementation, we asked project and control teachers to answer six rating-scale items about the context within which the program was implemented. The items had to do with the administration's *emphasis on using* the arts to increase reading and mathematics achievement, the administration's *support for implementing* the arts to increase reading and mathematics achievement, the level of the administration's *communication about implementing* the arts to increase reading and mathematics achievement, the *conduciveness of the facilities* for using the arts to increase reading and mathematics achievement, and the availability of *adequate classroom space* for using the arts to increase reading and mathematics achievement. The descriptive statistics are presented in Table 8. The mean total score for the project teachers was 21.25 (30 maximum), with a standard deviation of 5.04. The control

⁵Effect sizes are calculated as the mean of the project group minus the mean of the control group divided by the average of the standard deviations of the two groups. In contrast to a test of statistical significance such as analysis of variance, it is a measure of *practical* significance.

Table 7. Project Teachers' (N=8) and Control Teachers' (N=8) Results on the Teaching With the Arts Survey^a, School Year 2003–04

Item	School	Mean ^b	St. dev.
1. I think using <i>drama</i> when teaching helps children learn reading and mathematics.	Project	5.63	0.74
	Control	4.00	1.41
2. I think using <i>music</i> when teaching helps children learn reading and mathematics.	Project	5.00	1.07
	Control	4.63	1.06
3. I think using <i>dance</i> when teaching helps children learn reading and mathematics.	Project	4.75	1.16
	Control	4.13	1.36
4. I think using <i>visual arts</i> when teaching helps children learn reading and mathematics.	Project	5.00	0.93
	Control	4.88	0.83
5. I think it is important for students to view a videotape of a dance.	Project	4.00	1.41
	Control	3.63	1.60
6. I am confident in my ability to use dance when teaching.	Project	2.75	0.71
	Control	1.75	1.75
7. I consider myself a visual or performing artist.	Project	2.75	1.16
	Control	2.75	1.83
8. I am concerned that music, dance, and drama activities are <i>too noisy or disruptive</i> for the classroom.	Project	2.00	0.93
	Control	2.50	1.51
9. I feel confident in my ability to facilitate music activities.	Project	3.38	1.30
	Control	3.38	2.00
10. I have enough space to use movement effectively in the classroom.	Project	4.75	1.28
	Control	2.88	1.96
11. I am confident in my ability to facilitate visual arts activities.	Project	3.50	1.60
	Control	4.13	1.89
12. My students <i>have trouble concentrating</i> on other work after I use the arts to teach.	Project	3.13	1.25
	Control	1.94	0.87
13. I am confident in my ability to facilitate drama activities.	Project	4.50	1.07
	Control	2.63	1.60
14. In general, my school is supportive of innovative teaching approaches.	Project	5.50	0.76
	Control	4.25	0.89
15. I think there are many students in my class who would especially benefit from more arts activities in the curriculum.	Project	5.75	0.46
	Control	5.00	1.20
16. I am free to use new teaching approaches in my classroom as I see fit.	Project	4.00	0.46
	Control	4.38	1.51
17. I consider myself a highly creative person.	Project	4.00	1.20
	Control	3.63	1.19
18. <i>I am constrained</i> by the demands of the curriculum I have to teach.	Project	4.75	1.39
	Control	5.13	0.83
Total score ^c	Project	76.88	11.01
	Control	65.57	11.69

^a Modified version of the *Teaching With the Arts Survey (TWAS)* (Oreck, 2004).

^b The maximum possible item score was 6.

^c The maximum possible total score was 108.

Table 8. Project Teachers' (N=8) and Control Teachers' (N=8) Results on the School Context Survey, School Year 2003–04

Item	School	Mean ^a	St. dev.	S.e. _M
1. To what extent does your school administration emphasize the <i>importance of using</i> the arts to improve students' achievement in reading and mathematics?	Project	4.13	1.25	0.44
	Control	2.00	0.76	0.27
2. To what extent does your school administration support the <i>implementation</i> of arts activities designed to improve students' achievement in reading and mathematics?	Project	4.88	1.64	0.58
	Control	3.63	1.69	0.60
3. To what extent does your school's administration, faculty, and staff <i>communicate</i> about the implementation of arts activities to improve students' achievement in reading and mathematics?	Project	2.88	1.36	0.48
	Control	1.63	0.74	0.25
4. To what extent are the <i>facilities</i> you operate in conducive to using the arts to improve students' achievement in reading and mathematics?	Project	4.38	1.06	0.38
	Control	2.50	1.20	0.42
5. To what extent is your <i>classroom size</i> adequate for using the arts to improve students' achievement in reading and mathematics?	Project	5.00	1.07	0.38
	Control	2.50	0.93	0.33
Total score	Project	21.25 ^b	5.04	1.78
	Control	12.25 ^b	3.28	1.16

^a The maximum possible item score was 6.

^b The maximum possible total score was 30.

schools' mean total score was 12.25, with a standard deviation of 3.28. The results from an ANOVA indicated a statistically significant difference between project and control school teachers' perceptions of support for use of the arts in the classroom ($F=17.93$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$). The scale reliability (Cronbach's alpha) was 0.88, and a large effect size of $d=2.12$ was found.

Quality Professional Development Survey

The intent of this survey was to evaluate the quality of the ARTS FIRST PD and provide the AFWRP team information for making changes, if needed, in their instruction. The results on the open-ended response section of the survey also addresses Evaluation Question 6: "Which activities and aspects of the program are received most favorably by the teacher and which are received least favorably? The mean total score for the set of items asking the project teachers about the quality of the PD was 148.50 (168 maximum) (st. dev. = 14.79). Cronbach's alpha = 0.92—a high value for this index. In Table 9 we give the item means. The second part of the survey allowed the teachers to comment about what aspects of the PD were most helpful and what aspects were least helpful. Teachers were also asked to offer suggestions for improvement. Generally, the responses to the open-

Table 9. Project Teachers (N=8) Results on the Professional Development Quality Survey, School Year 2003–04

Item ^a	Mean ^b	St. dev.	S.e. _M
1. To what extent were the issues explored in the ARTS FIRST seminars relevant to your professional responsibilities?	5.00	0.93	0.33
2. To what extent were the instructors of the seminars knowledgeable and helpful?	5.75	0.71	0.25
3. To what extent did you have adequate opportunities to explore the theory and the supporting research about the benefits of integrating the arts into the curriculum?	4.25	0.89	0.31
4. To what extent did the instructional techniques facilitate your learning?	5.00	1.07	0.38
5. To what extent was the content discussed in the ARTS FIRST workshops <i>confusing</i> to you?	5.25	0.46	0.16
6. To what extent was the leader or group facilitator well prepared?	5.88	0.35	0.13
7. To what extent does integrating the arts into the curriculum address an important need?	5.38	1.19	0.42
8. To what extent was the session leader credible?	5.88	0.35	0.13
9. To what extent did the professional development sessions <i>fail</i> to create a climate of professional community?	5.63	0.52	0.18
10. To what extent did you have access to all the necessary materials and resources?	5.00	1.20	0.42
11. To what extent were the strategies presented by the seminars and the in-class mentoring sessions <i>difficult</i> to understand?	5.50	0.53	0.19
12. To what extent did the materials enhance your learning?	5.13	0.99	0.35
13. To what extent was the content of the professional development <i>irrelevant</i> to your classroom?	5.38	0.52	0.18
14. To what extent were the activities in which you engaged carefully planned and well organized?	5.63	0.74	0.26
15. To what extent was your time well spent?	5.63	0.74	0.26
16. To what extent were the goals and objectives <i>vague</i> when you began the ARTS FIRST project?	4.63	1.19	0.42
17. To what extent did the professional development sessions include collaborative discussion about professional practices?	5.25	1.39	0.49
18. To what extent was your understanding of the arts enhanced as a result of the workshops?	5.38	1.19	0.42
19. To what extent were new practices <i>rushed</i> and <i>not</i> thoroughly explained?	5.13	0.83	0.30
20. To what extent did the professional development sessions support opportunities to network and learn from colleagues?	5.13	1.25	0.44
21. To what extent was <i>insufficient</i> time provided for the completion of the tasks?	4.75	1.49	0.53
22. To what extent will the strategies you learned be useful to you?	5.50	0.93	0.33
23. To what extent was time organized efficiently and effectively?	5.63	1.06	0.38
24. To what extent were the activities relevant to the purpose of the project?	5.63	0.74	0.26
25. To what extent will you be able to apply the strategies you learned in the seminars and mentoring sessions?	5.38	0.74	0.26
26. To what extent did your experience include a variety of learning activities?	5.38	0.74	0.26
27. To what extent did the professional development sessions <i>not</i> achieve an appropriate balance between presentation and interaction?	5.25	0.71	0.25
28. To what extent has the workshop changed your overall pedagogical approach to teaching reading and mathematics?	5.25	0.89	0.31
Total score	148.50 ^c	14.79	5.23

^a Items 5, 9, 11, 13, 16, 19, 21 & 27 were reverse coded for analysis. ^b The maximum possible item score was 6. ^c The maximum possible total score was 168.

ended questions showed that the teachers felt that the professional development sessions allowed them a chance to collaborate with other teaching professionals as well as provided a hands-on learning environment. When asked about program improvements and aspects of the project they would like to learn more about, the teachers repeatedly mentioned that they would like to learn how to integrate the arts more into mathematics. Other comments about specific aspects of the ARTS FIRST PD are presented in Appendix C, Table C3.

Weekly teacher logs

The weekly teachers logs will be used to address Evaluation Question 7: “Which activities and aspects of the project are most fully implemented and which are least fully implemented?” The results on the number of instances in which ARTS FIRST strategies were used indicate that there was an overall low level of implementation across all teachers tracked over a 15–week period. Table 10 shows the results for the two schools that were implementing the program in Grade 3 in 2003–04. As seen in the table, the implementation was consistently low for each school. ARTS FIRST techniques were used about 1/3 of an instance per week in language arts, about 1/10 of an instance in mathematics, and practically not at all in social studies and science. These results could be due to incomplete data collection, in that teachers did not always complete the logs, but despite this caveat we believe that implementation levels were low. Furthermore, teachers rarely assessed their students when using the ARTS FIRST strategies, as shown in Table 11. Across teachers, the self-reported comfort level when using the strategies were 2 on a scale from 1 to 3, as shown in Table 12. The teachers’ perceived a relatively high level of student comfort in taking part in activities that used the ARTS FIRST strategies (see Table 13).

Principal interviews

An examination of the principal interviews will help us determine which aspects of school context, if any, affect the findings of the evaluation. The results show no overall outstanding differences between the project and control group schools. All but one of the principals stated that they believe their reading programs were effective in increasing student reading achievement, and all but one of the principals commented that they view their current mathematics programs as ineffective and were changing these programs in one way or another. Another topic of the principal interview asked about the principals’ view of the grade level student cohort effects and how these might effect program implementation and outcomes. Due to the sensitive nature of these comments, we did not report them here. These comments will be tracked over the course of the project and be used to interpret student results in our final report. The verbatim comments of the principal interviews are presented in Appendix C, Table C4.

Table 10. Average Number of Instances of Using the ARTS FIRST Drama Strategies Reported on Weekly Teacher Logs for Four School Subjects During a 15–Week Period (February–May 2004)

Teacher by school	Language arts		Mathematics		Social studies		Science	
	<i>N</i>	Average/week	<i>N</i>	Average/week	<i>N</i>	Average/week	<i>N</i>	Average/week
Keolu 1	5	0.33	0	—	1	0.07	0	—
Keolu 2	4	0.27	3	0.20	0	—	1	0.07
Keolu total	9	0.30	3	0.10	1	0.03	1	0.03
La'ie 1	12	0.80	3	0.20	1	0.07	0	—
La'ie 2	0	—	0	—	0	—	0	—
La'ie 3	6	0.40	2	0.13	2	0.13	0	—
La'ie 4	1	0.07	1	0.07	0	—	0	—
La'ie total	19	0.32	6	0.10	3	0.05	0	—

Table 11. Average Number of Instances of Teachers Assessing Students After Using the ARTS FIRST Drama Strategies During a 15–Week Period (February–May 2004)

Teacher by school	Language arts		Mathematics		Social studies		Science	
	<i>N</i>	Average/week	<i>N</i>	Average/week	<i>N</i>	Average/week	<i>N</i>	Average/week
Keolu 1	4	0.27	0	—	1	0.07	0	—
Keolu 2	2	0.13	1	0.07	0	—	0	—
Keolu total	6	0.20	1	0.03	1	0.03	0	—
La'ie 1	3	0.20	0	—	1	0.07	0	—
La'ie 2	0	—	0	—	0	—	0	—
La'ie 3	1	0.07	1	0.07	0	—	0	—
La'ie 4	0	—	1	0.07	0	—	0	—
La'ie total	4	0.07	2	0.03	1	0.02	0	—

Table 12. Teacher Comfort Level When Using the ARTS FIRST Drama Strategies During a 15–Week Period (February–May 2004)

Teacher by school	Language arts	Mathematics	Social studies	Science
	Average ^a	Average	Average	Average
Keolu 1	2.4	—	2.0	—
Keolu 2	1.33	0.67	—	1.0
Keolu total	2.0	0.67	2.0	1.0
La‘ie 1	1.58	2.0	2.0	—
La‘ie 2	—	—	—	—
La‘ie 3	2.10	1.0	2.0	—
La‘ie 4	3.0	2.0	—	—
La‘ie total	1.87	1.75	2.0	—

Table 13. Perceived Student Comfort Level When Teachers Used the ARTS FIRST Drama Strategies During a 15–Week Period (February–May 2004)

Teacher by school	Language arts	Mathematics	Social studies	Science
	Average ^a	Average	Average	Average
Keolu 1	3.0	—	3.0	—
Keolu 2	1.67	0.67	—	3.0
Keolu total	2.50	0.67	3.0	3.0
La‘ie 1	1.90	2.25	2.0	—
La‘ie 2	—	—	—	—
La‘ie 3	2.40	1.50	3.0	—
La‘ie 4	3.0	3.0	—	—
La‘ie total	2.15	2.25	2.67	—

^a Range of scores was 1=low, 2=medium, and 3=high.

Student Focus Groups

The student focus groups were used to address Evaluation Question 5: “Which activities and aspects of the project are received most favorably by the students and which are received least favorably?” Very few comments were made about specific aspects and activities received most and least favorably. As the students become more familiar with the program, and as more focus group sessions are held, it is likely they will be able to distinguish differences and articulate about what they like and dislike about the program. Reviewing the results of the 2003–04 focus groups, the children seemed to enjoy the time they spend using the new drama and art activities and looked forward to interacting with the drama mentors. Students tended to perceive that drama was being used for its own sake—that is, to teach them more about drama. Students’ comments also reflected the lack of use of drama by their teachers, apart from when the mentors were in their classrooms. The strategies the students most reported were the managerial-type drama strategies intended to control inappropriate behavior (e.g., “freeze” and “on–off”). The responses from the student focus groups are presented in Appendix C, Table C5.

Parent Questionnaire

The results of the parent questionnaire on student participation in, and exposure to, the arts are presented in Tables 14 and 15. The purpose of collecting these data was to help determine the extent to which there are contextual differences between the set of project schools and the set of control schools. The results on parents’ perceptions about the art forms offered in their communities are presented in Table 16, and the results on art forms that the parents would like their children to know more about are presented in Table 17. It is important to note that the response rates for the parent questionnaires were low and unbalanced: The project school parents returned 19 questionnaires of 125 distributed, for a response rate of 15%, and the control school parents returned 51 out of 183 distributed, for a response rate of 28%.

To calculate the statistical significance between groups, a χ^2 (chi-square)⁶ analysis was conducted for each of the four art forms. The responses to all the items for each art form were collapsed and analyzed as a whole. Due to the low response rate and the high amount of non-participation in the specified arts activities, the responses on the four-point scale (where 1 = not at all and 4 = a lot) were collapsed into two categories including none (not at all) and some (a little, some, and a lot). No significant between-group differences were found between the project and control students’ participation in the arts outside of school (for student participation in drama, $\chi^2=1.73$, $p>0.05$; for

⁶ χ^2 (chi-square) analyses are used to determine the between-group differences in the frequency of responses.

**Table 14. Project (N=19) and Control (N=51) School Parent Survey:
Level of Child Participation in the Arts Outside of School**

Art activity		Level of participation				
		School	None		Some	
			N	%	N	%
Drama	Acting in a play	Project	15	79%	4	21%
		Control	38	75%	13	25%
	Writing a play	Project	19	100%	0	0%
		Control	45	88%	6	12%
	Watching a play	Project	0	0%	19	100%
		Control	12	24%	39	76%
	Helping with the production of a play	Project	14	74%	5	26%
		Control	43	84%	8	16%
Other drama activities	Project	11	58%	8	42%	
	Control	43	84%	8	16%	
Music	Music lessons	Project	10	53%	9	47%
		Control	27	53%	24	47%
	Community choir	Project	17	89%	2	11%
		Control	45	88%	6	12%
	Church choir	Project	12	63%	7	37%
		Control	32	63%	19	37%
	Attending a concert	Project	10	53%	9	47%
		Control	18	35%	33	65%
Other music activities	Project	10	53%	9	47%	
	Control	35	69%	16	31%	
Dance	Ballet	Project	17	89%	2	11%
		Control	44	86%	7	14%
	Modern dance	Project	14	74%	5	26%
		Control	36	71%	15	29%
	Polynesian dance (hula, Tahitian, etc.)	Project	10	53%	9	47%
		Control	23	45%	28	55%
	Cultural dance (Chinese, Filipino, etc.)	Project	16	84%	3	16%
		Control	38	75%	13	25%
Attending a dance recital	Project	13	68%	6	32%	
	Control	32	63%	19	37%	
Other dance activities	Project	13	68%	6	32%	
	Control	41	80%	10	20%	
Visual Arts	Painting/drawing	Project	1	5%	18	95%
		Control	6	12%	45	88%
	Sculpture or ceramics	Project	9	47%	10	53%
		Control	27	53%	24	74%
	Weaving or other crafts	Project	10	53%	9	47%
		Control	20	39%	31	61%
	Visited a museum	Project	5	26%	14	74%
		Control	9	18%	42	82%
Attended an art show	Project	13	68%	6	32%	
	Control	29	57%	22	43%	
Other visual arts activities	Project	14	74%	5	26%	
	Control	41	80%	10	20%	

**Table 15. Project (N=19) and Control (N=51) School Parent Survey:
Level of Parent Participation in the Arts**

Art activity		Level of participation				
		None		Some ^a		
		School	N	%	N	%
Drama	Acting in a play	Project	17	89%	2	11%
		Control	38	75%	13	25%
	Writing a play	Project	18	95%	1	5%
		Control	45	88%	6	12%
	Watching a play	Project	5	26%	14	74%
		Control	23	45%	28	55%
	Helping with the production of a play	Project	15	79%	4	21%
		Control	39	76%	12	24%
Other drama activities	Project	18	95%	1	5%	
	Control	41	80%	10	20%	
Music	Music lessons	Project	14	74%	5	26%
		Control	30	59%	21	41%
	Community choir	Project	15	79%	4	21%
		Control	44	86%	7	14%
	Church choir	Project	14	74%	5	26%
		Control	33	65%	18	35%
	Attending a concert	Project	7	37%	12	63%
		Control	20	39%	31	61%
Other music activities	Project	11	58%	8	42%	
	Control	35	69%	16	31%	
Dance	Ballet	Project	17	89%	2	11%
		Control	46	90%	5	10%
	Modern dance	Project	14	74%	5	26%
		Control	36	71%	15	29%
	Polynesian dance (hula, Tahitian, etc.)	Project	12	63%	7	37%
		Control	29	57%	22	43%
	Cultural dance (Chinese, Filipino, etc.)	Project	16	84%	3	16%
		Control	38	75%	13	25%
Attending a dance recital	Project	11	58%	8	42%	
	Control	32	63%	19	37%	
Other dance activities	Project	15	79%	4	21%	
	Control	41	80%	10	20%	
Visual Arts	Painting/drawing	Project	6	32%	13	68%
		Control	23	45%	28	55%
	Sculpture or ceramics	Project	12	63%	7	37%
		Control	34	67%	17	33%
	Weaving or other crafts	Project	9	47%	10	53%
		Control	24	47%	27	53%
	Visited a museum	Project	6	32%	13	68%
		Control	14	27%	37	73%
Attended an art show	Project	10	53%	9	47%	
	Control	28	55%	23	45%	
Other visual arts activities	Project	16	84%	3	16%	
	Control	43	84%	8	16%	

Table 16. Parents' Perceptions of the Arts Available in their Community^a

	School	Drama	Music	Dance	Visual arts
Project	Keolu (<i>N</i> =7)	3	3	2	5
	La'ie (<i>N</i> =8)	2	2	4	5
	Ben Parker (<i>N</i> =4)	2	2	0	3
	<i>Total</i> (<i>N</i> =19)	7	7	6	13
Control	He'eia (<i>N</i> =23)	14	8	5	17
	Ka'a'awa (<i>N</i> =6)	3	1	1	4
	Kāhuku (<i>N</i> =22)	17	8	8	19
	<i>Total</i> (<i>N</i> =51)	34	17	14	40

^a Numbers reported are actual number of responses for each art form. For example, 3 out of 7 parents from Keolu think that their community offers drama activities.

Table 17. The Arts Parents Think Their Children Should Know More About^b

	School	Drama	Music	Dance	Visual arts
Project	Keolu (<i>N</i> =7)	1	2	3	3
	La'ie (<i>N</i> =8)	2	3	3	2
	Ben Parker (<i>N</i> =4)	0	1	1	0
	<i>Total</i> (<i>N</i> =19)	3	6	7	5
Control	He'eia (<i>N</i> =23)	6	6	8	6
	Ka'a'awa (<i>N</i> =6)	4	2	4	2
	Kāhuku (<i>N</i> =22)	9	4	7	8
	<i>Total</i> (<i>N</i> =51)	19	12	19	16

^b Numbers reported are actual number of responses for each art form. For example, 1 out of 7 parents from Keolu think their child should know more about drama.

student participation in music, $\chi^2=0.33$, $p>0.05$; for student participation in dance, $\chi^2=1.11$, $p>0.05$; and for student participation in the visual arts, $\chi^2=0.56$, $p>0.05$). Similarly, no significant between-group differences were found in levels of parent participation in the arts (for parent participation in drama, $\chi^2=2.03$, $p>0.05$; for parent participation in music, $\chi^2=0.50$, $p>0.05$; for parent participation in dance, $\chi^2=2.45$, $p>0.05$; and for parent participation in the visual arts, $\chi^2=0.12$, $p>0.05$). These results suggest that overall the level of participation in, and exposure to, the arts outside of school was the same for both the project and control school 2003–04 Grade 3 students and their parents.

Discussion

In this section, we summarize and interpret the results of the study and provide some recommendations for program improvement. We present few strong conclusions about the program's effects. The primary purposes of the first year of the evaluation as reported here was to develop instruments and collect baseline information. However, we believe that some findings about program implementation are useful for making program improvements. Other findings of the evaluation this year will be useful for helping us refine the evaluation instruments next year. We present the results for each of the study's evaluation questions except Nos. 3, 9, and 10, which will be answered in the final year of the evaluation.

Evaluation Questions 1 and 2: Student Outcomes

The first two evaluation questions are, “To what extent do students show improvements in reading and mathematics, attitudes toward school, interest in artistic activities, and behavior?” and “To what extent do these changes differ among project and comparison schools?” As explained in this section, to date we have collected baseline data on student attitudes and have developed instruments or made plans to collect existing data on student achievement, interest in the arts, and student behavior.

Students' reading and mathematics achievement. Statewide public-school achievement test results for 2003–04, which will serve as baseline data for the remainder of the study, will be available in November of 2004. At that time, we will prepare a supplemental report giving the baseline results and discussing the differences, if any, between project and control groups.

Students' attitudes toward school. To examine students' attitudes toward school and their academic self-concept, we developed the School Attitude Survey and administered it in May 2004. The results show no statistically significant differences between project and control schools in either Grade 2 or Grade 3. It is unlikely that the brief period of program implementation would have affected project students' attitudes toward school. Therefore, the School Attitude Survey results help confirm that we successfully matched schools before we randomly assigned them to groups.

It is possible that the School Attitude Survey might require modification before we use it again in 2004–05, for two reasons. First, the three-point scale used in the instrument might not have allowed for enough discrimination among groups. A four- or five-point scale might have provided a greater separation between the groups. Second, the high mean total scores for both groups might reflect a *ceiling effect*, which happens when high scores do not allow room for improvement in a later administration of an instrument. If there is a ceiling effect, notable increases in scores will not be found for either the program or control groups on subsequent administrations of the School Attitude Survey. Indeed, in part because of the ceiling effect, scores might be *lower* on the post than on the pre, a statistical phenomenon known as *regression to the mean*. In the second year of the evaluation, we will continue to review research that discusses indicators affecting elementary student attitudes toward school and academic self-concept and make changes in instrumentation, if necessary.

Students' interest in the arts. We will collect pre- and posttest data on students' interest in the arts next fall and spring, respectively, using the Interest in the Arts Questionnaire, which we developed and pilot tested during Year 1 of the project.

Student behavior. We will collect baseline data on student behavior from the HDOE's Chapter 19 program for the project and control groups once it becomes available in the fall of 2004 and will make and report comparisons between the groups at that time.

Evaluation Question 4: Changes in Teacher Skills and Attitudes

The fourth evaluation question asks, "What changes are shown in teachers' skills in implementing the project and their attitudes toward the arts in the classroom?" About one-quarter of the project teachers' comments about the effects of the program on their teaching suggested that they had increased their confidence levels. Furthermore, their written responses to a question in the Professional Development Quality Survey show that they believe they learned a useful number of techniques. However, the level of program implementation, as reported on the weekly teacher log, is low: In language arts, ARTS FIRST techniques were used less than 1/3 of an instance per week, and in the other subjects, they were used very little or virtually not at all. The teacher log findings tend to be confirmed by students' reports in the focus groups that only a few techniques were being used and that the teachers' techniques tended to be used most when the artist mentors were in the classes.

These results might be interpreted in two ways. First, teachers' confidence might have increased but might not be at the level necessary for consistent implementation. Second, as the teacher interview results suggest, the teachers might not have had sufficient time in the school day to use the

strategies frequently. The teachers reported in the interviews that they believed that more time spent with the artist mentors in the coming months would help increase their confidence. We will examine the effects of time constraints on teachers' use of ARTS FIRST techniques and the teachers' confidence in using the techniques during Year 2 of the project.

The results on the Attitudes Toward Teaching with the Arts Survey showed that the project group had a higher mean total score than the control group, but the difference between the two groups was not statistically significant. However, the test was conducted between small groups of teachers, and the likelihood of finding statistically significant results is diminished in this type of comparison. Therefore, we calculated the large effect size, finding a substantial (.996) difference. Given that the survey was administered after project teachers had been using ARTS FIRST techniques for some time, these results cannot be used to show equivalence between groups before the beginning of the program. It is reasonable to conclude that the program has improved project teachers' attitudes toward the arts. We will continue to monitor the differences among groups over the course of the project and determine the extent to which these differences change.

Evaluation Questions 5–8

The fifth through the eighth evaluation questions address the extent to which students and teachers looked favorably upon aspects of AFWRP, the extent to which the program was implemented, and how the project activities might be improved.

Students' perceptions of the program. The initial student focus group results do not provide clear findings highlighting the aspects of the project that the students received most and least favorably. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to conclude from the results that the students enjoyed their experiences with drama. We plan to conduct more than one focus group per class throughout the coming two years, thereby helping identify the specific aspects of the program that the students receive most favorably and least favorably.

Teachers' perceptions of the program. Information about the teachers' perceptions of the most favorable and least favorable aspects of the program were found in the Professional Development Quality Survey results. These results on this questionnaire show high average ratings of all aspects of the PD. All but three of the items on the survey (Nos. 3, 16, and 21) had mean scores over 5.0 on a 1–6 scale. The results suggest that the teachers believed that the PD workshops were of high quality. The results on the open-ended question strengthen these findings: All the teachers stated in one manner or another that working with the drama mentors helped increase their confidence and gave them evidence about the benefits of using drama in their curriculum.

The teachers had few comments about the PD components that were the least helpful. Some of

the teachers stated that they did not like to give up their free time and would like to have seen more accountability placed on their part when integrating the arts.

Project teachers expressed discomfort about using the strategies when they began the program. Their discomfort seemed to diminish, however, after they were fully trained and observed the drama mentors modeling the strategies in the teachers' classrooms.

Teachers' perceptions about the program were reported on the weekly logs. Project teachers reported moderate comfort levels in using the program. They also reported fairly high levels of student comfort with ARTS FIRST strategies.

Together, these sets of findings show generally favorable perceptions of the program. Appendix A gives an extensive description of program PD. To provide further understanding of our findings about the PD, we suggest that the reader review this description.

The extent to which the program was implemented. As discussed previously in this section, the implementation levels reported on the teacher log were low. The student focus group results suggest that the teachers were using managerial-type components, designed to control classroom behavior, more frequently than other components. This finding suggests that the teachers might be comfortable implementing only the managerial-type strategies or that the teachers believed that the artist mentors were emphasizing managerial strategies the most.

Year 1 of the project took place during the 2004 fall semester (February 2004–June 2004), which is an inefficient amount of time to result in high levels of program implementation. Nevertheless, the low levels of implementation reported here might be a cause for concern. We strongly recommend that the program team identify strategies for increasing the teachers' use of ARTS FIRST techniques. The program is not going to affect student outcomes unless the techniques are used more frequently in the classroom. Some of the teachers' comments in response to the open-ended questions on the Quality Professional Development Survey suggest that teachers might use the techniques more if they are held more accountable. One useful suggestion might be to have the teachers prepare and provide lesson plans for use when the drama mentors are present in the class. This will allow the teachers to get immediate feedback about their performance. Through continuous practice, teachers' comfort level might improve and, in turn, their use of the strategies might increase. Tracking mentors' comments about the program might also help us identify change in teachers' skills in implementing the strategies.

Teachers' opinions about program improvements. Several teachers pointed out that they would like more training in how to infuse drama into mathematics. While a major objective of the program is to increase student achievement in mathematics (as well as reading), this aspect of the professional

development should be addressed if any changes in mathematics achievement scores are to be attributed to the AFWRP.

As discussed previously, teachers' perceptions about constraints on the time they need to use ARTS FIRST strategies show another obstacle that the program should address. The intent of the program is to provide supplemental teaching tools, not an additional curriculum component. We suggest that the AFWRP team ensure that teachers fully understand that the program is designed to fit into the existing curricula.

Evaluation Question 11

The eleventh and final evaluation question asks, "What aspects of school context, if any, affect the findings?" The statistically significant difference found between the project and control teachers' mean scores on the School Context Survey might be interpreted to show differences in the project and control schools' educational contexts. The items on the questionnaire ask about the extent to which the school is supportive of arts activities. The project schools showed higher mean scores, suggesting that they have more supportive contexts for implementing arts programs. However, the instrument was administered at the end of the school year; therefore, we believe that the results on the items show a program effect. Implementing the program might have affected teachers' beliefs that their schools were supportive of using arts in the classroom. To examine further the differences between schools, we might need to add a qualitative component to future project teacher interviews.

The implementation of ARTS FIRST might be affected by the types of reading and mathematics programs that the project and control schools are implementing. The principal interview results suggest that the project and control schools show rough equivalence in the types of these programs. One project and one control school use the *Harcourt Trophies* reading program, and one project and one control school use the *Success for All* reading program. Of those schools, all the principals described their programs as effective. The other project school uses the *Open Court* reading program and believes the teachers who implement it fully do so effectively, although it was noted that not all the teachers are using it as prescribed. The other control school does not have a consistent reading program and is in the process of revising their program next year. The principals' comments also show that the groups' mathematics programs are similar.

The project school principals all expressed interest and support for the participation in ARTS FIRST. The principals' opinions about the level of exposure to the arts also shows consistency across schools.

The non-significant findings from the parent questionnaire examining the project and control school students' participation in, and prior exposure to, the arts outside of school suggest that both

group of students have basically the same arts background. This questionnaire will be administered to all incoming Grade 3 parents in the middle of SY 2004–2005. The end of the year administration of the questionnaire for Year 1 did not allow for us to adequately follow-up with the non-responsive parents. By administering the questionnaire earlier in the year we will be able to increase the balance and response rate among project and control groups.

Together, the set of findings about school context suggest no marked differences among the project and control schools.

References

- Brandon, P. R., & Higa, T. F. (2000). *The Hawai'i Department of Education's Character Education Pilot Project: A second-year evaluation report*. (Report No. 99-00/01). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Curriculum Research & Development Group, Evaluation Office.
- Chapman, J. W., & Tunmer, W. E. (1995). Development of young children's reading self-concepts: An examination of emerging subcomponents and their relationship with reading achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 87*, 154–167.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Guskey, T. R. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Lyon, M. A. (1993). Academic self-concept and its relationship to achievement in a sample of junior high school students. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53*, 201–211.
- Majoribanks, K. (1992). The predictive validity of an attitudes towards school scale in relation to children's academic achievement. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 52*, 945–949.
- Marsh, H. W., Chessor, D., Craven, R., & Roche, L. (1995). The effects of gifted and talented programs on academic self-concept: The big fish strikes again. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*, 285–319.
- McCoach, D. B., & Siegle, D. (2003). The school attitude assessment survey–revised: A new instrument to identify academically able students who underachieve. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 63*, 414–429.
- Oreck, B. (2001). *Teaching with the arts survey*. Unpublished survey instrument. Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut at Storrs.
- Oreck, B. (2004). The artistic and professional development of teachers: A study of teachers' attitudes toward and use of the arts in teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*, 55–69.
- Wigfield, A. & Karpathian, M. (1991). Who am I and what can I do? Children's self-concepts and motivation in achievement situations. *Educational Psychologist, 26*, 233–262.

Appendix A

Description of the Implementation of the *ARTS FIRST TOOLKIT* at Three Windward Schools

Description of the Implementation of the *ARTS FIRST TOOLKIT* at Three Windward Schools

This appendix describes the ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project during its first year, including the Professional Development for the teachers from La‘ie, Ben Parker, and Keolu Schools, and the artist-mentor residencies by two drama artist at these schools. Table A1 presents the results of the interviews conducted with the two drama mentors during SY 2003–04. The purpose of this appendix is to provide detailed description of the training, thereby helping the evaluation team understand and document the project and providing HAAE with a written summary of the training it provided. A Curriculum Research & Development Group faculty member attended most of the training sessions and summarized her notes for this report.

A significant part of the ARTS FIRST Windward Project is the training of teacher in the project through professional development sessions. In eight sessions throughout the spring 2004 semester, teachers and others involved with the project took part in all or some of these sessions. While the first year of the project emphasized drama, some of the training was also in the other three art forms.

Full-Day Drama Institutes

On January 30, 2004, the nine 3rd-grade teachers participating in the ARTS FIRST Windward Project met with Deb Brzoska, Dan Kelin, Natalie McKinney, Lei Ashsing, and Noni Floyd at Keolu School from 9:00AM-4:00PM for their first Professional Development (PD) session. It took place at Keolu School. Deb Brzoska, the national consultant for this project, introduced the teachers to one of the foci of ARTS FIRST-- of how the arts can bring new ways to make children become better readers. She expressed that the classroom teacher has the content knowledge, while the in class resident artist will assist the teacher in strengthening this content knowledge through art.

Deb stated that powerful teaching is the basis of all learning. She asked that the participants share a most powerful learning experience from their K–8 school days, which they still remembered today. Under her direction the group also developed a list of what constitutes powerful learning. She shared that this list is the same list that other groups of teachers in the country, with whom she has worked, have developed. She stated that the Gates Pyramid of Personal Relationship/Active In-Depth Teaching/Demonstration of Learning, which makes learning visible, is the synthesis of powerful teaching and learning, which the arts are all about.

Dan Kelin, Director of Drama Education for the Hawaii Theatre for Youth, and the In-Class Resident Artist (artist/mentor) for the four teachers at La‘ie Elementary School, engaged all teachers in a variety of warm-up drama activities. These process-oriented active learning activities were acted out for all at the same time and in small groups of three teachers. Here the creative processes engaged the learner with problem solving, team approach, and co-operative learning, where everyone had a role, was involved, and there were no right or wrong answers.

Deb emphasized that these activities have to fit into the teacher’s everyday language arts program, and that vocabulary can be acted out and shows the meaning of a word or object. It is important not to separate the language arts from the drama activity. She noted that both In-Class Resident Artists Dan and Natalie will “invent” drama to embed into each school’s language arts program to reinforce the language arts, reading and writing, and mathematics.

The teachers developed a list of language arts skills that need to be taught at the third grade. In small group discussions some teachers expressed that time is too short in the classroom to bring

“fun” into reading, and the teachers from La‘ie and Ben Parker schools mentioned that they have mandated daily reading programs.

Classroom management in active learning, like drama, requires rules. The teachers created a list of rules that would be useful for their students when they engage in active learning activities. Natalie McKinney, an artist and a drama educator from Ohi‘a Productions, and the In-Class Resident Artist (artist/mentor) for three teachers at Ben Parker Elementary School and two teachers at Keolu Elementary School, engaged all teachers in a variety of drama activities that can be linked to good classroom management as well as language arts and mathematics. She emphasized that these activities can also be used as good transition time or for following directions. She introduced the concept of a “Frozen Statue”, when one neither talks nor moves, and the “On/Off” mechanism as part of the frozen statue. She discussed the three levels in drama (high, middle, low) and interwove them with characteristics of line and shape. Natalie demonstrated how the idea could be included in third-grade geometry and descriptive language arts. The teachers created a list of third-grade mathematics and language arts concepts, and discussed how these might be acted out.

Another drama concept is the tableau, a frozen picture that tells a story. Under their instruction, Natalie and Dan asked the teachers to create a variety of tableaux using the story of Cinderella. In small groups the teachers told parts of the story in tableau. The newly learned knowledge applied here includes steps such as the on/off concept, presentation of various levels and shapes, expression of emotions, frozen characters, and relationships within a group.

Noni Floyd, the teacher liaison for the ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project and a visual artist/educator, asked the group to profile their classes or individual students as objects. A unique list came to the surface. Deb concluded the discussion by emphasizing the uniqueness of each student in a class.

January 31, 2004, was the second all-day workshop of professional development for the teachers and took place at Mid-Pacific Institute. In the morning the project teachers had the opportunity to observe portfolio presentations from teachers who had participated in the 2003 ARTS FIRST professional development workshop. This intersecting meeting gave the project teachers an insight into what other teachers had experienced in an ARTS FIRST professional development workshop and how they had applied their knowledge in their classrooms. The teachers observed five third-grade portfolio presentations. These included arts-based projects in language arts through drama and dance, science (unusual animals) through drama, astronomy through the visual arts, communication skills and listening skills through drama (animal explorations), and social studies through music (African drums).

The afternoon session entailed a drama lesson conducted by Dan Kelin. He engaged the teachers in one of the ARTS FIRST Toolkit’s 3rd grade drama lessons, *The Crow Boy* (Grade 3, pp.22-25). Teachers experienced parts of the story through personal interpretations individually and in groups. This exercise demonstrated how drama taps into reading.

Deb concluded the professional development day. She emphasizing that the material presented by the In-Class Resident Artists needs to fit into the work each teacher is covering in the classroom. She expressed that teachers need to share their teaching concepts and materials. Once the In-Class Resident knows the material used with the students, he or she can develop the appropriate arts content to meld to two together.

In the third professional development workshop on March 31, 2004, from 9:00AM-4:00PM at

Ben Parker School, the focus was on writing. Natalie gave the teachers several tongue twister warm-up activities. Deb elaborated on the value of warm-up activities, particularly for the art process. The teachers created a list of the writing process in third-grade which includes pre-writing or brainstorming, rough draft, graphic organization, revised editing or peer editing, final draft, and publication. The group discussed how a drama person would look at this process and translate it into drama. The teachers became aware that play writing has the same process. Its purpose is to take children through the process of writing and drama. The teachers shared that the power of peer editing is important in Grade 3.

Deb directed the teachers to the ARTS FIRST Toolkit, pages 8–12 and 14, and reaffirmed that the function of the arts is to create, perform, and respond, and thus assessment is an integral part of art education. Rubrics in assessing writing and drama were juxtaposed by her for comparison and similarities. These include ideas vs. meaning, organization vs. design, voice vs. audience, word choice vs. clarity, fluency vs. rhythm, and conventions vs. spelling. With a protocol of structure, rules, and participation of all, and the format of the group that included a presenter, timekeeper, and facilitator, Deb asked the teachers to evaluate samples of their students' writings. Small group discussions and large group presentations followed. Deb expressed that we can help students perform better on state tests when we make personal connections for them. Drama can present these connections to the students' writing by giving them memories they can write about. Deb referred to research by Bob Marzano, which found that children who experience personally what they read about, improve their learning.

In a writing/visual arts activity Noni read an underwater story she had written for the group. Teachers were handed parts of the story and had to line up according to the sequence of the story. She also suggested that students could draw pictures of their parts of the story.

Dan explored and created an original story with the teachers: Each person had to contribute one word at a time to the story. To make a story successful, three parts are needed, including character (most important), want (goal, what the character wants), and problem (opens up the story). Strong images generally help to strengthen the story. After dividing the story up into scenes, small groups of teachers (a) created three frozen pictures of each scene, (b) created narrations for the frozen pictures, and (c) acted the story out. The teachers titled their story, "The Heavenly Bean". Deb discussed with the teachers how they can look for ways to apply the above drama experience in the classroom to better prepare their students to take the state test. She referred them to the *Teacher's Guides for Interpreting the Hawaii State Assessment, 4th edition*.

Under Natalie's guidance the teachers discussed how they could reinforce the play. The teachers suggested writing, journal writing, and video-taping it. Natalie introduced the teachers to the format for play writing in which a dialog is created for parts of a scene that show character traits, that is, it gives clues to what the character wants. Small groups wrote parts of a dialog of the play, then turned the writing over to another group, which added details and rewrites. Scenes were reread and acted out.

The fourth Professional Development session focused on the intersection of mathematics and drama, and took place all from 9:00AM–4:00PM at La'ie School. Natalie started the morning with group activities that included tongue twisters, breathing exercises, and reciting of a poem. Dan introduced the group to the "behind the stage" elements of the theater. He shared a professional set design of a building and a stage. The teachers were asked to create a floor plan and a stage design

by using the library, their immediate environment, for their assignment. By estimating the perimeter of the building, and noting its architectural features, the teachers established the floor plan for their stage. They designed and drew the setting for the play, "The Heavenly Bean," which they had created the previous day. With furniture and other items available to them in the library, groups created actual sets for the play. Frozen pictures from their play completed the scenes. This session demonstrated the connection between mathematics and drama (the theatre as a space). Dan also presented the teachers with his handout entitled "Storytelling and Story Play."

Deb engaged the group in a discussion and the creating of a list of verbs and nouns of math used in third grade. Guest Neil Pateman, Professor of Mathematics Education at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, emphasized that students have to learn place value first and that problems have to be physically experienced by the students, rather than just demonstrated or explained in an abstract manner. He presented solutions to mathematical terms covered the Grade 3 and expressed that drama can especially assist with mathematical terms, including perimeter, area, volume, symmetry, pattern, problem solving, calculation, fraction, borrowing, regrouping, place value, measuring and estimating. He believes that changes in mathematics learning can only come from liking and learning it, compared to if their parents did or did not like it. He is convinced that mathematics test scores would increase if children can act out their math concepts, can do their own presentations, can learn their own arbitrary knowledge, and that scores also would increase when art projects are integrated at the right time into their mathematics learning.

Deb engaged the teachers in a discussion concerning the challenges and strategies of the ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project up to this point and in the future, especially as new teachers will join the group. Teachers had positive feedback, and suggested that the new teachers meet with the old group during this year's last professional development day.

The eighth and last Professional Development for the first year, which was also the first Professional Development session for the second year of the project, took place on May 25, 2004, from 9:00 AM–3:30 PM at La'ie Elementary School. Next school years' fourth-grade teachers at the three schools participated in this session, along with the current year's teachers.

Deb Brzoska started the day by introducing the group to eight Profiles of Learners and asked participants to select one profile that applies to them when they were in school. In groups of two the teachers and discussed their profiles, and later sharing them with the entire group. Deb introduced the "Powerful Learning Protocol," the Gates Triangle, which found that the single most important thing for a student is the need to be known, the second is that students see the connections and bridges from one core subject to another, and the third is students' need to feel important. She expressed that teaching strategies need to be built around this triangle.

In the Building Communities session, Natalie presented each teacher with eight laminated drama cards for them to use as teaching tools in the future. These cards represent two significant parts of drama. They include the Tools of Expression (voice, imagination, body, and ensemble), and the Forms of Expression (tableau, pantomime, improvisation, and role playing). Natalie expressed that tableau is most often used in the classroom. She also stated that once the students act out the concept, they do better on exams that test these concepts. The group discussed the math terms taught in fourth grade, which include: properties, angles, Pythagorean theorem, spatial, congruent, factor, prime number, fraction, word problems, hypotenuse, greatest common factor, parallelogram, perpendicular, Rhombus, quadrilateral, conversion, and 3-D. Natalie noted that if these terms are also taught in

words, symbols, pictures and thoughts, students would get higher scores on tests, as opposed to just learning the right answers to math problems.

In the Dance with Math in Focus session, Vivian Lee introduced group choreography. While applying the dance elements of Body, Energy, Space, and Time (BEST) the teachers used body parts to create lines, 2-D and 3-D shapes in warm-up exercises. They “traveled” on geometric shape pathways around the perimeter in six variations. In small groups the teachers performed for each other to show that all assigned variations were completed. Their degree of creativity was discussed. In this group work the teachers addressed the math concepts of symmetry, spatial sense, and transformation as recommended in the *Teacher’s Guide for Interpreting the Hawaii State Assessment*, Fourth Edition, p. 135 (Content Knowledge and Skills). Visual literacy is experienced through these exercises; thus, students will develop visual literature kinesthetically through dance.

The remainder of the afternoon was spent on the expectations for the second year of the ARTS FIRST Windward Project, discussing the calendar for the next year, and presenting certificates to the teachers who participated in the first year of the project.

Three-Hour Ancillary Workshops

The first three-hour professional development session entitled, “Overcoming the Fear of Drawing” was presented by artist/teacher Linda Oszajca on March 4, 2004 at the Keolu School Library. In this three-hour after-school class the project teachers learned that (a) it does not mean that they have to teach how to draw, but overcome the fear of drawing, (b) drawing becomes a process and a skill you have to learn, and (c) the main focus in drawing is to represent the object to be drawn. Four of the nine teachers expressed that they had no talent in drawing.

The first learning activity entailed drawing a fish from a photograph by sectioning the fish into simple geometric shapes. Then a contour line was traced directly onto the laminated fish illustrations to create a more realistic outline. A repeated pattern was added for texture. During the assessment Linda expressed that teachers need to learn not to be so hard on themselves when drawing, and that they should give positive feedback to students. Use of this activity can be applied to science, mathematics, Hawaiiana, and can be used to visualize a story that comes without illustrations or pictures. Two paper mirror image cutouts of the same fish can be used to create a 3-dimensional sculpture and be used for a mobile.

In the second activity the teachers learned to draw the face of a fox by first breaking the laminated illustration into simple geometric shapes with a wax pencil. All shape separations are considered as correct. The simple shapes are lightly transferred to paper with a soft pencil and short lines are filled in to represent the fur. The geometric shapes are erased as more of the fur texture is penciled in.

In the third drawing activity the teachers learned how to draw a portrait. In a step-by-step method, Linda guided the teachers through the mathematical analysis and the process of breaking facial features into parts and drawing them with a pencil on paper. Facial proportions are basically the same for all people and can be easily broken up into shapes and proportions. Linda emphasized that it is important to draw what you see and not what you think you see. She suggested that students make a self-portrait at the beginning of the school year and another one at the end. An extensive and detailed 17-page handout entitled, “Overcoming the Fear of Drawing,” accompanied Linda’s professional development workshop.

The second three-hour professional development session took place on March 11, 2004 at La’ie

School from 3:15–6:15 PM. Vivian Lee engaged the teachers in Poems that Dance: Combining Poetry Writing and Dance. Introducing the world of dance to children can be a creative approach with problem solving. After everyone shared a personal dancing experience, Vivian introduced the teachers to the elements of dance. In dance the letters B.E.S.T. stand for *body* (what parts of the body are moving and what are they doing?), *energy* (How is the body moving?), *space* (Where is the body moving?), and *time* (How does the body move in relation to time?). Each of these four parts represents an element of dance. *Body* incorporates parts, shape, movements and balance; *energy* includes weight, flow, and balance; *space* reflects place, size, level, direction, pathway, and focus; and *time* includes tempo, beat, duration, and rhythm.

Several warm-ups and basic dance exercises followed. They included sitting and lying shapes, number of body parts on the floor, and traveling through space. Each warm-up and exercise included different levels and concluded with a freeze. Vivian introduced Laban's 8 Qualities of Movement which include the time factors (fast/slow), the space factors (curved/direct), and the force factors (strong/light); combined, they create eight combinations at their simplest extremes. These movements are then connected with words/vocabulary.

After the teachers explored adjectives (e.g., wild), nouns (e.g., fires), verbs (e.g., spread), and adverbs (e.g., quickly) that have moving or action potential, they acted them out. Then, keeping the elements of dance in mind, the teachers improvised dance motions based on a poem format of a cinquain. They created shapes and motions indicated by the words in the poem. Individually, in twos, and larger groups, the teachers acted out this cinquain:

- Volcano
- Massive, jagged
- Swelling, bubbling, exploding
- Lava flowing to ocean
- Hisss!

Vivian presented each teacher with an extensive handout reflective of the workshop, and additional materials useful for dance in the elementary classroom.

The third professional development session, entitled "Music with a Math Mind" and taught by Jolene Kim, took place from 3:15–6:15 PM on April 15, 2004, at Ben Parker School. The session focused on making connections between music and math concepts. Both disciplines use complex symbols to communicate, and when making connections between communalities of the two, learning results are claimed to be comprehensive and lasting. Teachers explored the arts integration by finding common principles between the two without either compromising the quality of the art of music or the importance of understanding the basic concepts of mathematics. Through the concept of steady beat, teachers explored the math concepts of patterns, sequences, addition/subtraction, fractions, and multiplication/division. They sang simple songs, used symbol cards, and engaged in sound activities such as clapping and using simple musical instruments to experience reversal, symmetry, and geometric shapes, and again patterning, sequencing and fractioning. While most teachers might integrate music with social studies or language arts, this session demonstrated a significant relationship between music and math, and how both can be presented in an interrelated fashion.

In-Class Residency/Mentoring Sessions

During the spring semester two artist/mentors in drama visited the participating teachers in their classes a minimum of five times for the in-class residency/mentoring sessions. While some

visitations took place as early as February, others did not start until the beginning of May. Classroom residencies were preceded by discussion/planning sessions at which time the artist/mentors and the teachers discussed the needs of the students, and the possibility for the artist/mentors to deliver meaningful drama experiences for the students and teachers alike. In debriefing sessions the artists and teachers discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the in-class residency for that day. The author observed a minimum of two sessions in each class at each of the three schools.

La'ie Elementary School: first two classes. La'ie Elementary School has four third grade classes. Dan Kelin, the artist/mentor for the project at the school first worked with two of the classes during February–June, and then with the other two classes during May 2004. The first two classes serviced separately were Yvonne Ah Sue's and then Franki Laqeretabua's. The author observed three sessions (first, fifth, and sixth).

The school presently engages in the *Success for All* reading program, which is designed to teach reading using principles derived from cooperative learning. In order to integrate Dan's drama lessons with the school's reform program, Yvonne and Franki requested that Dan work with them on a drama session presenting explorers.

In the first session, by using drama methods including warm-up, auto-images, ensemble, teacher-in-role, visualizations, tableau, frozen pictures, and discussion inference students experienced a most engaging event of what could happen when two groups of people meet each other for the first time. Students believed they had just acted out a make-believe story until Dan directed them to specific pictures and books that documented real explorer events of the past, those of the conquistadors. In the debriefing that followed the teachers expressed that all students in both classes were enthusiastic and engaged in the session, including a handful of special education and/or ADD students. The teachers thought that the students really felt the experience of the explorers' encounters with an unknown culture and foreign people in a new land. One of the teachers said that she already uses some of the management methods she had learned, such as "on/off" and "freeze."

In the next three sessions Dan worked with the students on "creating communities." These sessions, linked to social studies, reinforced the concept of "Cause and Effect (if... then)." In small groups the students built special communities and acted them out through drama via character, improvisation, tableau, pantomime, and ensemble. In the role of the "Meister-Master of the Land" (Teacher-in-Role), Dan announced contests between the communities and later made some communities not survive while others became bigger. Students analyzed the reasons for the loss of the communities and how they felt about the events. In the last of these sessions students recaptured of what went wrong, analyzed their actions, and contemplated the best ways for a community to function well. Throughout these sessions the students interchanged between acting their roles and discussing the consequences of their actions in their roles. They learned that they needed to work hard for each other for a community to survive and be successful. When summarizing the "Creating Communities" concept the students expressed that they knew that they had acted, but it still felt very "real" to them. They felt badly about some of the events in the story (planned by Dan to happen), and wanted to rectify things that had gone wrong.

For the fifth session the teachers requested that Dan work with their students on "creating an original story," the character/want/problem story process he used in part of the fourth professional development sessions on March 31, 2004. The teachers wanted to observe and learn how Dan would

work with the students. Since the teachers were already familiar with the process of creating an original story, they were able to reinforce their knowledge and strengthen their confidence of using this process.

In their sixth and last artist/mentor session, Dan worked with Yvonne's and Franki's students by having them act out the story of *The Crow Boy*, one of the ARTS FIRST Toolkit's 3rd grade drama lessons (Grade 3, pp. 22-25). The students went through parts of the story through personal interpretations individually and in groups, just like their teachers did in their professional development session. This exercise demonstrated how drama taps into reading.

La'ie Elementary School: second two classes. The second group of classes serviced by Dan Kelin at La'ie Elementary School was that of Nanette Steward and Heidi Hontanosas. The author observed three sessions (second, fifth, and sixth).

In the first three sessions Dan linked his drama class with language arts, added social studies for the next two sessions, and language arts and reading for the sixth and last session. He introduced the vocabulary words ensemble, tableau, pantomime, freeze, and improvisation. The first session included a variety of individual and small group work in which students engaged in activities that addressed this key drama vocabulary. Some activities addressed students' personal preferences, and others drama topics related to their community. Students reflected on what is good about drama and how it might help them in their learning.

For the second session Dan worked with students on the drama/language arts concept of "creating an original story," the character/want/problem story process he used in part of the fourth professional development sessions on March 31, 2004 and in the first two La'ie classes. This gave the teachers the opportunity to observe and learn how Dan worked with their students. Again, since the teachers were already familiar with the process of creating an original story, they were able to reinforce their knowledge and strengthen their confidence of using this drama concept. Dan discussed with the students what makes a good story, and where they would be able to find or watch stories. When the students worked through creating an original story they learned that not all of their stories were "good," i.e. workable stories. After several trials the students needed to create the character/want portion in seven words. Through intermittent free-form group discussion the students came up with an original story idea that could be acted out. Using Dan's drama management tactics of "on/off," "freeze," and "in just a moment... but not right now," students performed their original story in a variety of individual and group tableaux. Dan discussed with the students that he would give the classes a "five" and an "eight" respectively, on a 1-10 scale for their performance in this session. In the debriefing Dan shared that the students generated a lot of good ideas, and enough ideas for their original story. He also expressed that due to the time constraints of one hour the students needed more guidance to "walk through" creating the story and acting it out in tableaux.

In the third session, the key arts vocabulary was narration and tableau. After applying drama warm-ups, Dan and the students reviewed their previous lessons. The students created another original story in which Dan provided the structure and the students the content. The students auto-imaged the story (character, major events, emotional reactions, and major events). Each group was assigned one scene of the story and created two tableaux. After sharing their tableaux with the others, the students narrated and shared the tableaux in story order.

During the next two sessions the teachers wanted their students to be exposed to drama lessons that engaged them in the "explorer" and "discovery" concepts. Instead of using the conquistadors

theme from the first two La'ie classes, Dan engaged them in two expeditions of the discovery of the Hudson River and the Hudson Bay. Through auto-imagining, Teacher-in-Role (TIR) as exploration leader, and narrated picture (students represent parts of the picture), students went on a sailing expedition, and later interacted with Indians.

At the fifth session the students experience a second sailing expedition that ended in the disappearance of the captain of the ship. Dan shared a picture of an old map of the Hudson Bay, narrated the plot, and had the students visualize parts of the journey. Through tableaux students express the moments of discovery. Via pantomime, narration and several TIR's, characters interact arising conflicts. Role-playing engaged students in intense experiences of the story that escalated to a mutiny. After Dan narrated the discovery of the Hudson Bay and the disappearance of Hudson, the students reflected on the risks and rewards of explorations. In the debriefing Nanette expressed that she is planning to use this process and apply it to the Jamestown colony. Dan reviewed crucial steps needed to make the process work: groups of people with real world jobs; interaction of groups; conflict-driven situations and applying drama elements of frozen images, pantomime, and visualization.

In their sixth and last artist/mentor session Dan worked with Nanette's and Heidi's students by having them act out the story of *The Crow Boy*, one of the ARTS FIRST Toolkit's 3rd grade drama lessons (Grade 3, pp. 22-25). The students went through parts of the story through personal interpretations individually and in groups, just like their teachers did in their professional development session. This exercise demonstrated how drama taps into reading.

Ben Parker Elementary School. In the 2003/2004 school year Ben Parker Elementary School participated in the research project with its three fourth-grade classes and teachers. Natalie McKinney, the artist/mentor for the project at the school worked with teachers Lynn Mochizuki, Kim Ah Soon, and Lynn Wong during February and March 2004. As the formative evaluator, the writer observed the first and the fourth of a total of five sessions at the school.

Natalie visited the three classes during their language arts time. She always started with Lynn Mochizuki's class, then moved to Kim's class, and ended with Lynn Wong's class. Students in these classes are grouped according to their academic performance, starting with the highest performers in the first group and the lowest performers in the last group. Academically, some of the students in the third class perform at first- to third-grade levels. All three classes used the *SRA Open Court Reading*, but were at different levels of the reading program.

In the first session Natalie introduced each class to drama, what it represents (acting, pretending, action, passion, imagination), and how it interacts with language. She used visualization (imagine details, support, feelings, setting, invest in reality of the moment) as it links with action. She shared her expectations (focus, safety, and personal space), and introduced the students to freeze and on/off. Through auto imaging students created patterns of movement in drama (lines and levels). Natalie asked the students to name verbs from their current reading (*The Island of the Blue Dolphin*), since verbs represent actions that can be expressed through drama. In the debriefing she recommended that the teachers reinforce the vocabulary of the week by having the students visualize and act it out. The group agreed that Natalie would apply the same format for future classes, and would use the stories the classes are reading at the time of her visit. They also came to the conclusion that the third class would engage in more listening/acting skills than reading/acting skills used in the first two classes.

During the next class visits Natalie kept the content format the same but changed the story

content by basing it on the reading of the week. The students read a new story every week. Natalie introduced new drama concepts along with the new stories. The drama content included tableau (visualizing and describing detail), pantomime (experiential, helps students gain meaning in text, personalization, and building schema), role playing (create empathy with character), scene work (adding dialogue, character interaction, conflict/resolution, and sequencing), and ensemble (building communities). The third class learned more audience skills along with performing skill. With this class Natalie reinforced the need for each student to respect the personal space of the other students. Via drama Natalie reinforced the 7-point reading responses to the stories the students were tested on weekly. The format of the tests was always the same. It included questions the related to the stories' character, setting, plot, central problem, resolution, mood, and indent. For the reading response the teachers also used a rubric the addresses the Hawaii State Content Standards in reading and writing.

In Natalie's fourth visit the students focused on audience skills (attentive, appreciate, and appropriate applause), and acting skills (pronounce, project, poise, and personality). After tongue twister warm-ups, students in Lynn Mochizuki's and later in Kim's class learned and practiced the four "A" words that are needed be part of a good audience. Then they learned the four "P" words of acting and performed for each other in small groups. They took their roles from their current reading *Two Ticket to Freedom*, a story that addresses slavery in America. Students practiced the four "P" words in their brief dialogues and presented them to the others. Natalie used the drama classroom management skills of "on/off, freeze, cue, 3/2/1-action, and cut" to guide the classes through this drama experience, and clarified the role of the director in drama. In Lynn W's class, a homogeneous group of low achievers, Natalie spent approximately half of her time reviewing previously introduced drama processes before addressing new material. The review included creating lines and shapes and presenting them at different levels while following previously learned classroom management of "on/off, focus, freeze." Natalie then presented the four "A" words of audience skills. As she told the story of their current reading, *Nachiko*, the students act it out emotionally in facial/body expressions. In discussing the story with the class, Natalie asked them which part of the story they related to and what there fears were.

In debriefing with all three teachers, Natalie expressed that she felt telling the review of the previous drama session/story would be less time consuming than asking for student responses. She shared that pantomime would have been appropriate in the first two classes at one point. Natalie suggested that the teachers connect the stories the students read with their own real life experiences, and possibly also act them out with role-playing. She also shared that she felt she had to "put on the brakes" in the third class. Dynamically, Lynn Mochizuki observed that her group acted the story out more emotionally. Kim observed that her students increased the amount they wrote in their reading response tests. Lynn Wong reflected that her unchanged classroom furniture arrangement works best for her class, as opposed to the rearrangement of furniture for the first two classes. The teachers expressed that they would like to keep the mentoring process on an individual basis, rather than as a group, while the debriefing could be in a group. Natalie would also like to observe each teacher in a "normal" class session in the future.

During Natalie's fifth visit she reinforced the audience skills (attentive, appreciate, and appropriate applause), and acting skills (pronounce, project, poise, and personality) in all three classes. Again, the content was based on the weekly reading of each class.

Keolu Elementary School. In School Year 2003-2004, Keolu Elementary School participated

in the research project with its two third-grade classes and teachers. Natalie McKinney, the artist/mentor for the project at the school worked with teachers Jana Harrison and Jewels Alameida during February and June 2004. The author observed Jana's first session and the fifth and sixth joint sessions for both classes. Due to the fact that Jewels class was cancelled (due to weather conditions and illness) several times, the author was unable to observe her class in the beginning of the program. After Natalie and the teachers found out that the two classes would make up one class next school year, they felt that it would be an excellent opportunity to have them already in one drama group for the remainder of the year. Since Natalie visited the Keolu students during their non-language arts classes, she only sometimes linked her drama activities to Trophies, the school's reading/language arts program.

In the first session Natalie introduced the class to drama and what it represents (acting, pretending, action, passion, imagination). She emphasized the significance of fluidness and poise in acting. A tambourine, used by her as the cue (indicator) frightened an autistic child, and she quickly switched to clapping her hands as the new cue. Natalie practiced point of focus with the students before they learned to use auto imaging. In this process the students created patterns of movement through various lines, shapes, and levels. They practiced these drama elements until Natalie felt that the students were comfortable with them. She used teaching aids displayed in the classroom (student-drawn pictures of different types of clouds and a poem about clouds) to demonstrate different shapes and levels. In the debriefing process Natalie mentioned that the clouds worked well for the levels activity. Jana mentioned that the students already learned about line and shape in the visual arts and that she would be starting them with shapes in math. They discussed that while Natalie changed her "on/off" technique to "cue" to be in line with the ARTS FIRST Toolkit, Jana mentioned that she uses a bell for that purpose. She also felt that a big problem in her class is writing as opposed to reading, and that she would like to have some help with this problem. They discussed that maybe the students could "think aloud" to speed up the writing process. Natalie pointed out that fluency in drama is connected with fluency in reading.

For the second visit to Jana's class Natalie planned to work with the students using The Stories Julian Tells from the school's Trophies reading program. Through the drama concept of visualization (imagine details, support, feelings, setting, invest in reality of the moment) Natalie linked the stories' content to action.

According to Natalie's content summary report, she also covered setting, pantomime, and tableau with the students at Keolu School. The author was not able to observe these drama activities.

At the fifth session Natalie worked with both third-grade classes (a total of 24 students) at the same time. The students sharpened their acting and audience skills by playing rhythmic word games in a domino effect: Natalie started one move or rhythmic move, and the students had to repeat it in a close consecutive sequence. By being attentive and listening carefully to Natalie and the other students, the class refined its attention skills. Through frozen pictures and ensemble work (groups of three and more), the students created unique images of common objects like cars, and animals. After sharing their frozen pictures with the others in the class they analyzed them on the basis of composition, level, point of focus, and shapes and lines created.

Natalie conducted the sixth and last session outside of the classroom in a nearby outdoor pavilion. The students responded well to her domino effect warm-up exercises and the review of the previous session. Everyone worked on acting skills by learning to project their names like a "voice

ball.” Natalie instructed them to “keep their comments to themselves, worry only about themselves, and not to let the dialogue in their brains to come out.” The students interpreted sounds and motions of machines through the domino effect. This method kept the students’ attention successfully. In groups of five they created gestures combined with sounds of TV’s car, soda machines, and other machines and performed their creations at different speed and sound levels. Natalie ended the session by asking the students to project a word that started with the same first letter of the alphabet as their first name and then arranging themselves alphabetically by their first names.

Table A1. Drama Mentor Interview Comments, School Year 2003–04

To what extent did you contribute to the developing/writing of the ARTS FIRST Toolkit?

- Significantly. I was on the writing team from the beginning. Natalie and I are primarily responsible for the drama section, with the bulk of the lesson plans (the longer ones), being mine.
 - I was part of the ARTS FIRST TOOLKIT writing and development team. My involvement was from the start of the project through the final revisions. My contribution was in the area of drama/theater, however much work was done in all art forms.
-

What was your role in the Professional Development sessions for the teachers for the ARTS FIRST Windward Project in the spring of 2004?

- Brain-stormed the structure, the lessons, designed the lessons and lead them during the sessions.
 - My role in the Professional Development sessions consisted of planning and leading activities in drama that used arts strategies.
-

What was your role at the Elementary schools as the artist/mentor for the ARTS FIRST Windward Project?

- The mentor for the La‘ie third grade teachers. As such I consulted with the teachers, designed workshops for their classrooms. Implemented the workshops. Wrote out the lesson plans for the teachers to have. Unpacked the lessons for them as necessary. Provided consultation for them as they implemented their own ideas.
 - As the artist/mentor at Ben Parker and Keolu Elementary I prepared and implemented lessons and strategies in drama that the generalist classroom teachers could use to engage students in arts based learning. I also assisted the classroom teachers in creating and implementing their own arts based instruction. I would observe their lessons. Following each session I would debrief with each teacher and strategized for future lessons.
-

How did you use your role as mentor at the school?

- Brain-stormed with the teachers about the kinds of lessons they thought would be useful in their classroom. Designed lessons accordingly. Wrote out the lessons for the teachers to follow what I taught. Discussed my process with them. Offered them ideas on how they might begin to use drama in their classroom. Answered questions they had about drama, the lessons and implementing such.
 - I used my role as mentor at the school as another support mechanism for not only the teachers, but the students as well. I saw myself as an additional teacher in the classroom who could assist the classroom teacher with devising and implementing arts based instruction. The students saw me as a teacher who used drama. They were always very excited to engage in the activities and responded to the lessons and material presented. I would often sit and observe both students and teacher in an effort to get to know them and how they work.
-

(Table A1. Drama Mentor Interview Comments, School Year 2003–04, continued)

How and when did you debrief with the teachers?

- We met after school each time I gave a workshop in their classes. I tried to answer questions they had, and discussed with them how the children reacted to the work. The debriefing was more or less specific to the various lessons I did with their students as opposed to the greater field of drama in the classroom.
 - I would debrief with all teachers from each school together as a group during the first few lessons. I quickly learned that this was not an effective use of time for both teachers and myself. I then would debrief teachers individually as it became clear that each classroom was different and each lesson played out differently given the different classroom dynamic and differing learning styles and levels. The debrief would happen after the lesson, during recess, lunch or after school.
-

What results did you expect working with the teachers and students when you started the ARTS FIRST Windward projects at the school?

- I didn't, really, expect very much. Although I felt as though the children would react with a good deal of excitement while the teachers would be slower to see the benefits.
 - Due to the nature and swiftness that this project got under way, there were not many expectations. I wasn't sure how receptive the teachers would be to the project or how committed or dedicated they would be. I know from experience that all students benefit from drama in the classroom. It helps build confidence and improves classroom dynamic by creating an environment of support and discovery while being fun, fresh and exciting. I had no doubt that implementation of arts based instruction would help raise reading and writing scores, math was another ball of wax. Math would be a bit more difficult.
-

What were your immediate goals working with the students in the classroom?

- To get them all involved. To offer them an opportunity to make contributions. To get them to respond emotionally, intellectually and creatively to the material. To give them a chance to interact with their subject in a deeper fashion.
 - My immediate goals with the students in the classroom were to give them a general understanding of drama. To expose them to drama techniques and vocabulary by actively engaging them in the arts was first and foremost. Through the first few lessons I was able to determine students learning styles and personalities.
-

(Table A1. Drama Mentor Interview Comments, School Year 2003–04, continued)

What were your immediate goals working with the teachers?

- To introduce the possibilities of using drama. To introduce to them that drama is more than just a subject in and of itself. To demonstrate the multiple uses of drama techniques. To encourage them to find something they would be interested in using.
 - My immediate goal in working with the teachers was to develop a rapport with them. To let them know that we don't know what this project will evolve into. I encouraged them to be honest and openly communicate their thoughts, concerns and ideas. I also wanted to share some of my classroom experiences to enable them to trust me as an educator and allow them to get to know me. I also tried to be very open to their responses and suggestions.
-

What were some problems you encountered working on the project and how were you able to address them?

- Teacher resistance (initially). In that case I just did as I always did, trusting that they would see the power of the work.
 - Student discipline. I tried to redesign lessons as I went along to keep them engaged and tried to stay focused on the task so they would see the seriousness with which I approached the work.
 - Scheduling. By being flexible.
 - Multiple voices trying to control the situation. I tried to stay focused on the core of the project (training the teachers) and use that in guiding my choices.
 - In the beginning we had no real clear picture of what the project should or would look like. The first few lessons were real shots in the dark in regards to making the reading and writing connections. I tried to approach each lesson based on what the students were reading. I immediately began to lose the art. This became very apparent as Lei and I would debrief. I re-strategized and discovered that staying true to the art was the best way to reach our goals. I decided on a few drama strategies/methods and stuck with them, allowing the students to go deep into a particular idea or theme using drama.
 - I also was very hard on myself in the beginning, trying so hard to cover all the bases in drama and reading and writing. I had to learn to loosen up on myself and to allow my knowledge and experience to guide the project. This proved invaluable as the project began to have wings of its own.
-

(Table A1. Drama Mentor Interview Comments, School Year 2003–04, continued)

What do you think are the strengths and weaknesses of the ARTS FIRST Windward Project?

Strengths:

- The length and intensity of the program, giving the teachers repeated exposure to the process in order to let them truly and deeply understand it.
- Working with both the teachers and the students simultaneously.
- I think the strengths of this project are in the artists who have committed to the project. Our collective knowledge and experience in the arts makes a great team. Also the willingness of each artist to share ideas and suggest possible strategies has been invaluable. I think that this project has the potential for serving as a model on a national and international level. Deb is our pillar of strength, leading us with positive reinforcement and a belief in the project and us.

Weaknesses:

- At times unfocused, with too many people trying to influence the process, potentially confusing the teachers.
- Too little time to truly develop some of the ideas.
- A clear focus as to what the teachers should expect and is expected of them.
- The weakness of the project was the rapid-fire way we launched it. More planning time on the front end might have helped to alleviate some of the unpreparedness felt in the beginning.

What changes/adjustments do you think could be made to strengthen the project?

- More planning time with the teachers and mentors. Clearer set of simple goals for the professional development workshops.
- More planning time as a group with teachers and mentors. Also more mentor planning time. I would suggest that teacher expectations be clearly defined at the beginning. There was some confusion about what the project looked like and what the expectations of both teacher and mentor would be.

What are your ultimate goals as you continue working with the ARTS FIRST Windward Projects?

- To widen the impact of drama in the classroom. To further my own understanding of working with teachers. To discover new ways of teaching using drama. To find ways to encourage teachers to feel comfortable sharing their work with me.
 - My ultimate goals are to assist teachers in extending arts practices into ongoing instruction to improve student learning not only in math, reading and writing, but in all subject areas. I also would like students to have an increased knowledge base in the arts and to be life long patrons of the arts.
 - I would like to find the math connections in drama and impact the educators of the nation by developing these instructional strategies.
-

Appendix B
Outline of Research and Evaluation Methods

Outline of Research and Evaluation Methods

1. *Student Achievement Data*

- a. *Data sources*
 - 1) Hawaii State Assessment (HSA)
- b. *Subject areas tested*
 - 1) Language arts (reading and writing)
 - 2) Mathematics
- c. *Norming, range of scores, performance levels*
 - 1) HSA consists of criterion-referenced items matching state content and performance standards and items from the Stanford Achievement Test (9th edition) which is developed by Harcourt Measurement.
 - a) The HSA uses a custom designed scale score system which ranges from 100 to a maximum of 500.
 - (1) There are four performance levels: well below, approaches, meets, and exceeds.
- d. *Information about scoring*
 - 1) The scale developed for Hawaii by the Psychological Corporation fixes two scores by definition.
 - a) *Proficiency level score range*
 - (1) Well below, 100 - 199
 - (2) Approaches, 200 - 299
 - (3) Meets, 300 (Score dependent on the content area and grade level)
 - (4) Exceeds, any score above meets
- e. Summaries of School Year 2003–04 achievement results will be reported as an addendum to this report when results become available in November of 2004.

2. *Student Attitude Survey*

- a. *Instrument development*
 - 1) Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC) was searched for elementary level student attitude surveys.
 - a) Initial search identified instruments that were inappropriate for the study, including, a poor match of constructs aligned with the study's purposes, and the results from the validity measures.
 - 2) Search was widened to include K–8 student attitude instruments.
 - a) Instruments were again reviewed for relevance, alignment with project, and validity.
 - b) The School Attitude Assessment Survey–Revised (SAAS-R) (McCoach, 2003) was selected for the constructs of interest (academic self-perceptions and attitudes toward school).
- b. *Instrument modifications*
 - a) The SAAS-R instrument contained 35 items.
 - (1) *Constructs*
 - (a) Eight questions on academic self-perceptions
 - (b) Seven questions on the attitudes towards teachers
 - (c) Five questions on the attitudes toward school

- (d) Six questions on goal valuation
- (e) Ten questions on motivation/self-regulation
- b) *Deleted constructs*
 - (1) The questions addressing constructs about attitudes toward teacher, goal valuation, and motivation/self-regulation were deleted because they were deemed to be inappropriate for the study.
- c) *Language modifications*
 - (1) Because the instrument was designed for middle-school age language, modifications were made to adapt it to elementary-school age language.
 - (a) *Academic self-concept changes*
 - 1) Three questions were reworded, one question was deleted, one question was changed to the negative, and one question was not changed.
 - a) “I am intelligent” was changed to, “I am smart.”
 - b) “I can learn new ideas quickly in school” was changed to, “In school, I learn new things fast.”
 - c) “I am capable of getting straight As” was changed to, “If I try, I can get good grades.”
 - d) “I am good at learning new things in school” was changed to, “I am not good at learning new things” (changed to the negative).
 - (b) *Attitude towards school changes*
 - 1) Two questions were deleted, two questions were not changed, one question was changed to the negative and three questions were added.
 - a) “I like this school” was changed to, “I don’t like this school” (changed to the negative).
 - b) *Questions added*
 - “I like being at school”
 - “I like to learn at school”
 - “School is fun”
 - d) *Additional items added to the School Attitude Survey*
 - (1) Additional items were added to consider attitude and self-concept toward reading and mathematics (Chapman & Tunmer, 1995), which are the specific subject areas of interest for this project.
 - (a) Ten items were added for reading and math self-concept (five items each)
 - (b) Four items were added for reading and math attitude (two items each)
 - e) *Change in School Attitude Survey scale*
 - (1) Rating scale was changed from a 7-point Likert-type agreement scale to a 3-point Likert-type agreement scale (“I agree a lot,” “I agree some,” and “I don’t agree”). This was done to provide more simplicity for the elementary age population.
 - f) Final pre-pilot test instrument included 25 items.
- c. *Pilot test*
 - 1) The School Attitude Survey was administered to 20 second- and third-grade students’ attending the Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG) Education

- Laboratory School (ELS).
- 2) *Analysis*
 - a) A reliability analysis was performed for each construct. Cronbach's alpha of 0.78 for academic self-concept and 0.59 for school attitude were found.
 - b) One additional school attitude item was added to the survey and selected other items were revised for similarities in format between reading and mathematics.
 - c) A follow-up pilot test was not conducted due to time constraints of the ELS.
 - d. *Data collection and project and control school administration*
 - 1) Data were collected using the modified 26-item School Attitude Survey during the last two weeks in May 2004.
 - 2) The survey was administered to 108 second- and 125 third-grade ARTS FIRST project school students and 124 second- and 183 third-grade control school students.
 - 3) Descriptive statistics were calculated, factor analyses were conducted, reliability coefficients were calculated, an analysis of variance was conducted, as presented in the body of this report.
 - 4) The student attitude survey will be administered to project and control school third- and fourth-grade students at the end of School Year 2004-2005.
- 3. *Student Interest in the Arts Questionnaire***
- a. *Item development*
 - 1) Items were developed specifically for this project.
 - a) Items attended to the four major art forms outlined by the project, including drama, music, dance, and the visual arts (painting, drawing, sculpture, and ceramics).
 - (1) Drama, 6 items
 - (2) Dance, 6 items
 - (3) Music, 7 items
 - (4) Visual arts, 6 items
 - b. *Scale*
 - 1) A 3-point scale was used, in which the student circled a face with a corresponding feeling ("enjoy," "neutral," and "dislike").
 - c. *Pilot test*
 - 1) The 25-item questionnaire was administered to 9 third-grade ELS students.
 - d. *Revisions*
 - 1) Based on the results of reliability and item analyses, several changes were made.
 - 2) Question wording was changed to better examine student interest in the arts.
 - 3) The scale was changed from a 3-point to a 4-point Likert scale ("Strongly agree," "Somewhat agree," "Somewhat disagree," and "Strongly disagree"). The scale also included a column for "Don't know."
 - 4) A follow-up pilot test was conducted on eight third-grade ELS students.
 - 5) Further analyses were conducted.
 - 6) The visual arts section was expanded to separate the different visual art forms into more appropriate groupings.
 - a) Six items for painting and drawing
 - b) Six items for sculpture and ceramics

- 7) Final Student Interest in the Arts Questionnaire consisted of 32 items.
- e. *Project School Pilot Test*
- 1) *Data collection, analysis, and final revisions*
 - a) The questionnaire was administered to 94 project school third grade students in April of school year 2003–2004.
 - b) Reliability coefficients were calculated for the arts forms.
 - c) After further analysis with the larger sample size ($N=94$), additional revisions will be completed for the final version of the student interest in the arts questionnaire.
 - d) The final version of the questionnaire will be administered to the project and control schools third- and fourth-grade students at the beginning (pre) and the end (post) of School Year 2004–2005.
4. ***Attitudes Toward Teaching with the Arts Survey***: Modified version of the *Teaching With the Arts Survey (TWAS)* (Oreck, 2001).
- a. *Instrument identification*
 - 1) ERIC was searched for instruments assessing teachers use of, and attitudes toward, the arts.
 - a) The Teaching with the Arts Survey (TWAS) (Oreck, 2001) was selected based on the alignment with the project goals.
 - b. *Instrument modifications*
 - 1) *Item constructs*
 - a) Eighteen items, loading on four factors: importance of arts, self (efficacy and image) support, and constraints, as identified in a validity study for the original TWAS (Oreck, 2004).
 - b) The four-factor, STET-item modified TWAS was used for the project, rather than the original 31-item TWAS (Oreck, 2001).
 - 2) *Wording changes*
 - a) Item wording was changed from “I feel it is important” to “I think it is important” for selected items.
 - 3) *Scale*
 - a) A 6-point likert scale was used for each item (1 = “strongly disagree,” to 6 = “strongly agree.”).
 - c. *Data collection*
 - 1) The TWAS was administered to eight project school teachers (one project teacher was on leave for the remainder of the school year) and eight control school teachers at the end of school year 2003–2004.
 - 2) Descriptive statistics, analysis of variance, and a narrative summary are present in the report.
5. ***School Context Survey***
- a. Items were borrowed from a previous evaluation report examining school context as a variable (Brandon & Higa, 2000).
 - b. A 6-point Likert scale was used for each item (1 = “strongly disagree,” to 6 = “strongly agree.”).
 - c. Instrument was administered to eight project and eight control school teachers at the end of

School Year 2003–2004.

- d. Descriptive statistics, and the results of an analysis of variance are given in the narrative of the report.

6. Professional Development Quality Survey

a. Instrument development

- 1) Thomas Guskey (2000) outlined several components of quality professional development in his book, *Evaluating Professional Development*.
- 2) Items were developed and revised based on selected components that aligned with the project's professional development sessions.
- 3) The final version of the professional development quality survey included 28 items.
- 4) A 6-point likert scale was used for each item (1 = "strongly disagree," to 6 = "strongly agree.>").
- 5) Eight open-ended questions were added to the survey, which asked the teachers to describe the strengths and weaknesses of the various professional development sessions.
 - a) Full day workshops (focusing on drama).
 - b) Three-hour after school workshops (focusing on dance, music, and visual arts).
 - c) In-class mentoring sessions (focusing on modeling drama).

b. Data collection

- 1) The survey was administered to the eight project school teachers during the final professional development workshop at the end of School Year 2003-2004.
- 2) Descriptive statistics are presented in the narrative summary of this report.

7. Project Teacher Log

a. Log development

- 1) An instrument was developed to examine the extent of implementation of the ARTS FIRST strategies over the course of a 15-week period.
- 2) Initial log included all the art vocabulary from each of the art forms described in the ARTS FIRST Essential Arts Toolkit.
- 3) After discussion and revision, the log was simplified to the four art forms. The log examined the implementation of drama, music, dance, and the visual arts in reading, mathematics, social studies, and science.
 - a) For each of the subject areas there were five components of implementation reported.
 - (1) Amount of use
 - (2) Presence of student assessment
 - (3) Teacher comfort level
 - (4) Perceived student comfort level
 - (5) Exemplars used

b. Data collection and analysis

- 1) Weekly logs were administered to the teachers at the beginning of the project and were collected for a period of 15 weeks (February – May, 2004).
- 2) Descriptive statistics are presented in the narrative of this report.

8. Parent Survey

a. Purpose

- 1) A parent survey was developed for the purpose of identifying the amount and types of

arts activities that project and control students are involved in and have been exposed to outside of school.

b. *Instrument development*

- 1) A list of the various types of art activities offered for each of the four major art forms was developed after examining community art calendars, art academy class listings, and other arts-based information boards.
- 2) After review by the project staff, the items were compiled and revised to include five drama, five music, six dance, and six visual arts activities, for a total of 22 items.

c. *Survey design*

- 1) The survey contained two sections.
 - a) Twenty-two items asked the parents about their child's exposure to the arts outside of school.
 - b) Twenty-two items asked the parents about *their own* exposure to the arts.
- 2) Two questions were added to the survey, in which the parent marked (a) which of the four major art forms they thought their community offered, and (b) which of the four art forms they would like their child to know more about.

d. *Data collection*

- 1) Surveys were distributed to project and control school parents via teachers.
- 2) Three-hundred and eight surveys were distributed to project and control school parents (124 project and 184 control).
- 3) Seventy surveys were returned (19 project and 51 control).
- 4) Descriptive statistics are present in the body of this report.

9. *Project and control school principal interviews*

a. An interview guide was developed based on a previous version used for a CRDG evaluation.

b. *Question development*

- 1) Principal interview guide was tailored to examine two research topics relevant to the implementation of the ARTS FIRST project.
 - a) The aspects of school context, if any, which may affect program implementation.
 - (1) Principal's opinions.
 - (2) Current reading and mathematics programs.
 - (3) Student cohort affects.
 - b) To what extent is the project likely sustainable over time.
 - (1) Principal opinions.

c. *Data collection*

- 1) The three project and three control school principals were interviewed during April, 2004.

d. *Graduate student helpers*

- 1) The first two principal interviews (one project and one control) were conducted by graduate students fulfilling the requirements of a qualitative course in which they were enrolled during the Spring 2004 semester.
 - a) The project manager was present to ensure that the research questions were adequately addressed.
 - b) The project manager conducted the remainder of the interviews.

- c) The graduate students helped the project manager with pilot testing and revising some of the beginning drafts of the principal interview guide.
- e. *Data analysis*
 - 1) Narrative summaries of the results of the qualitative analysis for the principal interviews are presented in the narrative of this report.

10. Project school teacher interviews

- a. The project teacher interview guide was modeled after the principal interview guide.
- b. *Question development*
 - 1) The project teacher interview questions were aimed at answering several research topics relevant to the implementation of the ARTS FIRST project.
 - a) Teacher interest in and prior exposure to the arts.
 - b) Opinions about the ARTS FIRST program.
 - c) The aspects of school context, if any, which may affect program implementation.
 - (1) Student cohort affects
 - (2) Factors affecting teacher use of the ARTS FIRST strategies
 - (3) Teacher opinions about their schools current reading programs
 - d) Observed affects and unintended consequences of program.
 - (1) Limitations on other types of school programs.
- c. *Data collection and analysis*
 - 1) The project teacher interviews were conducted by the program manager during the latter part of May, 2004.
 - 2) Narrative summaries of the results of the qualitative analysis for the project teacher interviews are presented in this report.

11. Project school focus groups

- a. A student focus group guide was developed based on a previous version used for a CRDG evaluation.
- b. *Question development*
 - 1) The student focus group questions were aimed at answering research topics relevant to the implementation of the ARTS FIRST project.
 - a) Activities and aspects of the project students received most and least favorably.
 - b) The perceived effects of the program.
 - c) Students' understanding of the programs purpose.
 - d) Students' perceptions of program implementation.
- c. *Data collection and analysis*
 - 1) Six focus groups were conducted at two project schools.
 - 2) Each focus group had six students (three boys and three girls) from each class.
 - 3) One project school did not participate in the focus groups due a situation that is explained in the body of this report.
 - 4) Summary tables of student responses are presented in the body of this report.

Appendix C
Qualitative Findings on
Interviews and Focus Groups

**Table C1. Content Analysis of 2003–04 Teacher Interviews
(A summary of the comments shown in Table C2)**

Initial opinions about the ARTS FIRST program		
Topic categories	Number of comments	Percent of total
Time concern	4	31%
Comfort concern	4	31%
Student benefit	2	15%
Effectiveness concern	2	15%
For the arts sake	1	8%
Total	13	100%

Prior exposure to the arts		
Level of exposure	Number of comments	Percent of total
High	5	45%
Low	6	55%
Total	11	100%

Opinions about current reading programs		
Categories	Number of comments	Percent of total
<i>Programs' strengths</i>		
Comprehensive	4	17%
Ability centered	3	13%
Standards based	1	4%
Consistency	1	4%
<i>Programs' weaknesses</i>		
Restrictive	8	33%
Ability specific	3	13%
Ease of use	2	8%
Lacking basis in standards	2	8%
Total	24	100%

Students' exposure to the arts		
Level of exposure	Number of comments	Percent of total
High	7	44%
Low	9	56%
Total	16	100%

(Table C1. Content Analysis of 2003–04 Teacher Interviews, continued)

Factors that influence the use of the ARTS FIRST strategies		
Category	Number of comments	Percent of total
Time	9	39%
Confidence	7	30%
Student feedback	2	9%
Student behavior	2	9%
Accountability	2	9%
Facilities	1	4%
Total	23	100%

Observed affects of the program		
Category	Number of comments	Percent of total
<i>Student benefits</i>		
Internalization	10	34%
Enjoyment	7	24%
Confidence	4	14%
Closed performance gaps	3	10%
Behavior	3	10%
Group interaction	2	8%
Total	29	100%
<i>Teacher benefits</i>		
Pedagogical insight	13	76%
Confidence	4	24%
Total	17	100%

Other factors that might influence program effectiveness		
Category	Number of comments	Percent of total
Parent involvement	2	33%
Student demographics	2	33%
Student behavior	1	17%
Professional development	1	17%
Total	6	100%

Potential of the program		
Category	Number of Comments	Percent of total
Academic	6	55%
Effectiveness	2	18%
Self-concept	2	18%
Attitude	1	9%
Total	11	100%

Table C2. Teacher Interview Comments, Classified by Theme or Level of Exposure, School Year 2003–04
(Comments were transcribed verbatim)

Initial opinions about ARTS FIRST	
Category	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • effectiveness • student benefit • confidence, effectiveness • for arts sake 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I didn't think that drama would really help comprehension • I thought well it wouldn't hurt to look at other things that could help the children. • I was skeptical mostly because I am shy and I didn't think that I could make it effective. • I liked the idea of trying to integrate the arts into the rest of the curriculum considering the arts are getting squeezed out of the curriculum, with the increase on the focus to standards.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • time • confidence • time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I was a little concerned about if I was going to have a enough time to use it. • I was worried I didn't want to be a guinea pig. • My main concern was time - trying to implement it. We had just started a new reading program and I was wondering how we were going to fit one more thing in.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • confidence • student benefit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I was really afraid to be acting in front of people. • My initial thoughts were that if this is going to increase test scores than I'm all for it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • confidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I was very intimidated, because I don't consider myself to be an artist, especially drawing, so I was afraid.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I didn't want to use my personal time to be trained and wasn't really sure how we would be involved.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My main concern was the time factor - if it would fit, how we would use it.
Prior exposure to the arts	
Exposure level	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would go to a play, go to the opera, to the symphony because my husband enjoys it, I don't
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not much a couple of classes in college.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I was the designated 4th-grade visual art teacher. But it wasn't something that was real formal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think that because I like arts and I grew up liking the arts that my interest in the project has been influenced in a positive way.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I was in drama through high school and college.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I feel that my love for drama and art has positively influenced my participation in the program.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not anything formal, no formal classes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pretty limited. I have a little music experience, I played an instrument growing up, but as far as dramatic arts and visual arts - very limited.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not deep exposure.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I teach Polynesian dancing and regular cultural things like attending plays.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I teach ukulele. I took a couple of drama classes in college.

(Table C2. Teacher Interview Comments, Classified by Theme or Level of Exposure, School Year 2003–04, continued)

Opinions about the school's reading program	
Categories	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ability centered/ comprehensive • comprehensive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I like the reading program, because the children are able to move at their own pace and they are getting exposed to different types of literature. • We are teaching them the different elements in the story and it gives them the opportunity to write about what they read and explain themselves.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • restrictive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If I had to point to a weakness in the program, I would say it's the writing component.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • restrictive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Its hard to get the kids to move up, because its based on the scores from the tests rather than teachers comments about the children's performance.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • restrictive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reading program doesn't cover things like grammar, which I have to do in the afternoon. This also takes time away from other activities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • standards based 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think the reading program is very effective because it covers basically all the standards set by Hawaii.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ability specific 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The low in kids tend to slip through this program, which is supplemented through the corrective reading program.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ease of use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't think the reading and programs are very teacher friendly. You really have to study the program before you present it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • standards based 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to work on matching the stories with the standards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ability specific 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because it's so fast based its hard for the lower level kids to keep up.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ability centered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think the reading program is very effective. It seems to me that it has helped all the students make gains and it is filling in the holes for the students who weren't making the gains before.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ability centered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The part that I think is going to be successful is the part where the kids are grouped according to their ability.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • restrictive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't feel there is enough time for creativity in the program
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • restrictive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't feel I can now do a play with it, just because we have a limited amount of time to get a set amount of things accomplished. Its very strict.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • restrictive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I wish there was more writing involved.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consistency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do think its good because its consistent throughout the school and all grade levels.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • restrictive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do think that the teachers have to supplement with their own things because there's more to reading than just what a book tells you.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ability specific 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program is kind of geared towards the middle
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • standards based 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If I could, I would like to have a program more aligned with the Hawaii standards.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • restrictive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My sense of it is that is very restricted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ease of use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maybe I'm not as proficient as I need to be and maybe that will come with time, but right now its quite overwhelming to become acclimated.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • comprehensive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's a very effective program. It covers everything.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • comprehensive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our reading program now is very effective, its nice to have a guide.

(Table C2. Teacher Interview Comments, Classified by Theme or Level of Exposure, School Year 2003–04, continued)

Students' exposure to the arts	
Exposure level	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high • low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have a music program once a week • We would also go to plays when we could, but due to our strict reading program, we no longer attend.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have found that being a third grade teacher you have had to put so much emphasis on preparation for the HSA that I didn't have time for the arts.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high • low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I tried to do it on a weekly basis. The majority of the time is math and reading. • We are only allotted a period a day to teach the rest of the stuff; art, PE social studies, science, character ed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • low • low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Art is the last priority. • What ever time is left over after we have finished are reading and math.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I try to have music once a week in my room beside the hour they get in the actual music class.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high • low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I spend Fridays from 12 -2 doing the arts activities • There is no formal art time, but we try and integrate it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They do have a weekly music class they attend.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My class does music once a week and visual arts once a week.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a hierarchy it would probably be reading, math, science, social studies, PE, then the arts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We exposed them maybe once a week, if their lucky.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have music class once a week.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The only art that we do in our class is music. Most of the reason is the time issue. Art is the lowest priority at this time.
Factors that influence use of the ARTS FIRST strategies	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time is the biggest issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have tried to set up my room so I have half the room open so that I can try and use the strategies more like Dan does.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has been kind of a crunch with getting all the mentoring during the last month or so of school. We really haven't had the opportunity to implement.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • confidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natalie has come into our classes above and beyond what she was expected to and I think that has really help me with my confidence.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • student feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think it enhances their learning, which definitely factors in to how much I use it. I can see the difference.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You have to plan it out.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • confidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I was very uncomfortable at the beginning. I don't think I would have ever done it if we didn't have the support from the PD classes and having the mentors come into the classroom and model the strategies.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • confidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we stopped the training, I would probably still use some of it, but I know I could be better and that will only come with seeing Natalie more and spending more time with the PD.

(Table C2. Teacher Interview Comments, Classified by Theme or Level of Exposure, School Year 2003–04, continued)

(Factors that influence use of the ARTS FIRST strategies, continued)	
Categories	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • student feedback • confidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's simple strategies that help them focus better. • I think in part its due to the amount of time Natalie has been spending in the class.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accountability • time • confidence/time • time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I need to be held more accountable. • Time is the biggest factor. • I am pretty comfortable with using it. Maybe just not preparing enough. • I think its because the time has been really short - being all crammed into the last month of school, it hasn't really given us an opportunity to explore.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • time • student behavior 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there are other things going on then that is a low priority. • A lot of times they want to get a little too silly or too out of control and you have to bring them back in.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because of the mandates and the standards its hard for us to implement these kids of innovative approaches.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • confidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think its going to take a lot more time and practice for us to find a comfort level to make it second nature.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accountability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When I go to pull out you teacher log, I think about how I might incorporate the arts into some activity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • time • confidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have made time to use it for reading • Seeing Natalie, who has spent above and beyond the time she needed to. We have been using the strategies pretty much everyday.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • student behavior 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't think you would be able to use it until you have your classroom managed well.
Observed effects of the program	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enjoyment • pedagogical / internalization • internalization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have been really surprised about how much they [students] have enjoyed it. • I have had it reinforced that when children get involved with something that you want to teach them they seem to remember more. • After going through the classes and seeing Dan with the kids I noticed the kids remembered better.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • confidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I was not comfortable at all, but now that I have gotten to know the people its kind of fun and reminds me of when I was a little girl
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • confidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think that I have increased my comfort level by being able to share and hearing the others stories during the workshops.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • group interaction • internalization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I thought that not all of them would want to participate, but they all did. • I think that they feel some emotion when they act out different stories, they're able to visualize and experience - what it was like for the characters of the stories.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • closed performance gaps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have noticed that the low end kids have really benefited because its something easy for them to do.

(Table C2. Teacher Interview Comments, Classified by Theme or Level of Exposure, School Year 2003–04, continued)

(Observed effects of the program, continued)	
Categories	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • behavior /confidence • group interaction • enjoyment • internalization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behavior has also improved, they have more self-esteem—they feel better about themselves. • It allows more kids to get involved. • The kids respond well to it. • I notice that the kids remember a lot more when you have them interacting and doing a lot of drama.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • confidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The kids seem to be taking more risks. They came out of their shell. I think in part its due to the amount of time Natalie has been spending in the class.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pedagogical insight • pedagogical insight 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have only used arts for the sake of doing arts where this program is actually giving me the skills to integrate the arts into the academic activities. • In the beginning I felt that it was going to be a lot of extra work, but now I have seen how it can be integrated into what I am already doing.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • closed performance gaps • internalization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lower kids have shown to pay attention more when Dan is doing the drama activities. It has enhanced their listening and learning. • I’ve really liked how Mr. Dan has been able to take some of the stories and get the kids to visualize what was going on.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pedagogical insight • internalization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I never thought about incorporating just little, more manageable pieces rather than feeling the necessity to have to produce a whole play. • I think it is going to be useful in getting the kids to remember things about a story more.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • confidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I was really afraid to be acting in front of people, but in retrospect that was a real misconception.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enjoyment • enjoyment • confidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They get excited when Natalie comes in. • They seem to be more excited about learning . • I feel more comfortable now.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pedagogical insight 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have realized what a difference it makes with getting the kids involved in movement in activity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enjoyment /pedagogical insight 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After doing it I can tell they are excited about learning. For me that was a real eye opener.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enjoyment /internalization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I wasn’t expecting the children to enjoy it as much as they have and just how much they have retained and learned from it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pedagogical insight 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I saw my kids have this wealth of potential and that potential came to the surface.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • confidence • pedagogical insight 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They really came out of their shell and participated • I feel that this has opened up a new bag of tricks.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enjoyment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing but positive - they crave it. They wait for Natalie and Lei to show up.

(Table C2. Teacher Interview Comments, Classified by Theme or Level of Exposure, School Year 2003–04, continued)

(Observed effects of the program, continued)	
Categories	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • closed performance gaps • behavior • behavior • internalization • pedagogical insight • internalization • pedagogical insight • internalization • pedagogical insight • pedagogical insight • confidence • pedagogical insight 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are sent into orbit because they know this is something they are good at, being themselves and expressing themselves and not having the constraints of the standards that is pushed upon them. • My class works better as a team and they seem to crave it so much that they go out of their way to make sure that they do it right so they keep getting to do this. • I noticed that it helps control some of the anger issues that some of my kids have. • I notice that the students get a better overall understanding of the activities we are doing in reading. • I have learned that it's a way that everybody can get involved. • They are getting more out of reading than when I am trying to force it out of them using the traditional drills. • It has helped me in a sense that I think I will be able to remember next time how it was taught this year. • I see the evidence in their writing. • I would say that the biggest change for me is realizing that I don't always have to control the situation. • Sometimes effective teaching, like I have seen Natalie doing, comes from letting the kids get a little noisy. • The kids seem to be a lot more confident and sure of themselves • I recognized that the kids have different talents and we need to create an environment to allow for that exploration.
Other factors that may influence program effectiveness	
Categories	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parent involvement • student demographics • student demographics • Parent involvement • student behavior • professional development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the first year that the parents have been involved in their kids academics and you can really see the difference. • I think that the program needs to keep the background of the population in mind and the different cultural differences. • I don't think there is a lot of exposure to the arts in the home. • The problem I have is the accountability component of others. Maybe the parents are limited and they don't know how to help their kids • I thought that it would effect the lower kids more and help them increase their skills, but it seems that their behavior has really gotten in the way of making that jump. • Natalie spent more than was required and if she didn't do that I don't think we would have seen the progress that we did.

(Table C2. Teacher Interview Comments, Classified by Theme or Level of Exposure, School Year 2003–04, continued)

Potential of the program	
Categories	Comments
• academic	• I think that it will help them a lot. I notice that the kids remember a lot more when you have them interacting and doing a lot of drama.
• effectiveness	• What I'm worried about is being able to transfer what they learn to the HSA.
• academic	• I think overall it will help bring the scores up - as long as the teachers are using it consistently.
• academic	• The arts are really going to help them because we are going to have to work harder to get them ready to take the HSA and meet the proficiency levels.
• academic	• I think that the students that aren't meeting proficiency, that this program will help them meet proficiency if it is implemented how it is designed to be.
• attitude	• I don't know about their skills really increasing, but I think they would have more feeling doing some drama for the stories maybe their interest will be increased to want to read.
• self-concept	• I think that the continued participation in the program will help show that their worth something.
• self-concept	• I think we will have happier kids who aren't so depressed because they can do something that the higher achieving kids can do.
• academic	• I think that it has a chance to move the middle kids to the upper.
• effectiveness	• The struggle is going to be to were they can tie the connection of what they are acting out to what they are expected to do on the HSA.
• academic	• I see that the program is going to benefit them remembering the stories, but they need to be able to internalize those feelings.

Table C3. Teachers' Comments Made in Response to the Open Ended Questions about the Quality of the ARTS FIRST Professional Development, School Year 2003–04

(Comments were transcribed verbatim; however, spelling errors and some grammatical errors were corrected)

What were the most helpful aspects of the full-day drama PD sessions?

- We were able to interact with more people. Saturday, January 31, 2004 at Mid-Pac we were able to watch other teachers, who had gone through the training, present their projects. It got me motivated. I wanted to try some of what they did. The all-day sessions made me learn more than the half-day sessions. We got to know the others in the project better. We received a stipend.
- I like when we collaborate with other schools about reading, writing, and math. I like the activities that were taught because it gave us a chance to experience.
- Techniques that I can actually use in my classroom. Very practical strategies that are easy to use.
- The hands-on, movement activities, such as learning tableau. We did it enough so that we could fully implement it into the classroom with confidence.
- Using drama terms.
- The fact that everything was hands-on. You physically became part of the sessions, which made it easier to incorporate what was learned in the classroom.
- It gave us the time to learn the strategies from beginning to end. For instance, make up a story, tableau, narrate, dialogue. It was time consuming but worth coming for a full day.
- Realizing that anytime we teach a concept and if we use some form of drama, the kids will probably retain better, gain knowledge, and have experiences.

What were the most helpful aspects of the three-hour ancillary workshops?

- We concentrated on one topic. We didn't have to make lesson plans. We received a stipend.
- I like the shorter blocks of time and the activities.
- Interaction with peers – I gained new ideas.
- I enjoyed the handouts from art (portrait drawing) and music (apple notes).
- Apple music.
- I think that taking part in the workshops allowed us to think of those areas (dance, music, visual arts) in a different perspective. It makes integrating those areas into other curriculum areas easier.
- It wasn't too much when are plates our so full.

What were the most helpful aspects of the in-class mentoring sessions?

- I was able to see someone actually use all the ideas that I had been taught with my children before I had to try them myself. It was great to see a professional handle the class and see the children's reactions. I then felt more comfortable trying it out.
 - This was the most helpful part of this project. Having Natalie co-teaching with us gave me the confidence I needed to teach the strategies. We learned a lot from her and the students loved her.
 - Improving my teaching in reaching all types of learners. A great model to work from.
 - The focusing activities.
 - Watching Mr. Dan interact with my students – good model.
 - To see how drama can be integrated and can enhance the core subject of language arts.
 - Provided a guide on using my curriculum. The video gave me a chance to review Dan in action, so when I can't translate my notes back I can watch the video.
-

(Table C3. Teachers' Comments Made in Response to the Open Ended Questions about the Quality of the ARTS FIRST Professional Development, School Year 2003–04, continued)

(What were the most helpful aspects of the in-class mentoring sessions?, continued)

- Seeing Dan present drama lessons were very beneficial for me to try to carry out the steps and processes. I love how the lesson was relevant to what they were learning in social studies.
-

What were the least helpful aspects of the full-day drama PD sessions?

- We had to give up our Saturday.
 - They were very long – the Saturday sessions especially.
 - There was no follow-through or responsibility to lesson plan proof that we were actually doing the activities, need more teacher accountability.
-

What were the least helpful aspects of the three-hour ancillary workshops?

- We had to rush to get to the different sites after school.
 - The music and dance, I didn't feel comfortable doing it and after school was tough to stay focused. I felt that the music workshop really didn't integrate well with math. It wasn't intentional.
 - Being held after school was difficult to coordinate - you should try to hold them during school hours and get subs for us.
 - There was no follow-through or responsibility to lesson plan proof that we were actually doing the activities - need more teacher accountability (respondent wrote "same as above" under this question).
-

What were the least helpful aspects of the in-class mentoring sessions?

- The reflection session afterward.
 - 1-hour almost seemed too short.
-

What would you like to learn more about?

- Visual arts. I enjoyed the drawing lessons.
 - I really wish that we could connect these strategies with math, maybe teach us songs to help with math.
 - How to integrate drama and math.
 - More drama in math, Dr. Neil Pateman.
 - I would like to learn more about visual arts music and dance.
 - Adding higher level thinking to the drama.
 - Math drama activities.
-

What other comments do you have?

- I liked how HEEA worked with us to set the schedule. Also having workshops at different schools was very helpful. I felt that the team (UH & HEEA) was very supportive.
 - I have gained a lot professionally.
 - Thank you for giving such great considerations for the teacher needs, requirements, and time.
 - Thank you for letting our school be a part of this. It was beneficial for the children and their learning.
 - I found the PD sessions were helpful and will enhance my teaching.
 - Art was too short, would like to have more experience with this.
-

Table C4. Principal Interview Comments, School Year 2003–04
(Comments were transcribed verbatim)

Initial thoughts during project introduction	
Project schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The school saw a need to bring more arts into the curriculum. After some initial problems the participating teachers were happy about the idea. They saw the importance of integrating the arts into other subjects. I thought the program sounded great. I have confidence in Lea Albert’s judgement. I was happy when we were chosen to be one of the project schools. Initially I was hoping we would be a control school. We have been in corrective action for four years and have been devoting a tremendous amount of work to making AYP. However, after the introduction to the training, I saw that this was something that could be used along side their current teaching, and even help them with their efforts.
Control schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> My initial thoughts were that the teachers are not going to have the time to go through the ongoing training on top of my expectations of standards-based learning. So in addition to tightening up their curriculum, I was going to ask them to be involved in this project, I said no. We were relieved to be a control school. Being a new principal, I was overwhelmed with getting established. I didn’t want anything to do with the project. I didn’t know what the school was already involved in and didn’t want to come in and add something new without first assessing the situation. I was pleased to be chosen as a control school. I was hoping we would be one of the schools chosen for the project because it sounded like a really good program. I feel there is a lot that goes into student achievement beyond the core areas of math and reading. I was disappointed when we were picked as a control school.

Opinions about the effectiveness of the reading and math programs

	Reading	Math
Project schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For those who faithfully implement the program it has been effective, however we are still not meeting our goals. Its tough when not all the teachers are willing to use the program how it is meant to be used. It has a lot to do with the teacher-student relationship. It is still new and too early to see how effective it can really be. Preliminary data looks good, 85% look like they are at or above and the remaining 15% look like they are making progress. If anything needs to be changed its refinement - knowing what parts need to be stressed and what parts can become lower priorities. Some of our initial results show about a 20% increase, we started at about 40% reading at or above the grade level, now we are at about the 60% level. This is a pretty good increase in a four month period. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The standards are not being met. We are looking for a more remedial supplemental program for those students who are struggling. We are currently using off-grade level materials, which doesn’t have the same concepts that you would find by using grade-appropriate materials. The students don’t seem to be benefitting. Its been a really good program. It’s a problem-based program with some writing involved. Its rigorous with a lot of work involved. We are currently assessing several programs to implement: Everyday Math, Harcourt-Grace, McGraw-Hill and Scott Foresman. Next year we will be implementing a math block to ensure we are assessing math like we assess reading.

(Table C4. Principal Interview Comments, School Year 2003–04, continued)

(Opinions about the effectiveness of the reading and math programs, continued)		
	Reading	Math
Control schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In conjunction with teaching its been effective. Our 3rd-graders had a 4%–7% and 5th had 4%–5% increase. I also think this increase is due to the additional training teachers have received from the district. • It has been really beneficial to our population. We are up to standards which I attribute to this program. We are going to continue using the program. • Our reading program is not very good right now. We don't currently have a program that is school aligned. So each grade the kids are getting something different - not a lot of consistency. We are looking at new programs for next year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, I would say not that effective, because we basically had no net increase. We did, however, meet AYP. We are not considering changing the program, teachers just need more training in understanding what the kids need to do better. • I think the program is fine we have passed the standards using it. No changes will be made at this time. • Our math program has not been effective, we have recently had a curriculum committee select a new program for next school year.

Opinions about students' exposure to the arts

	Principals' perceptions about the students' exposure to the arts	Factors influencing amount of art in the classroom
Project schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have Castle performance where a teacher comes in on a variable bases. The thing is they just come in and teach them one song or something and then leave, its not very consistent. • Other than the Hawaiiana, its pretty much up to what the teacher can get through. Our kids seem to be really good at drama and dance. • The arts in the school are mostly arts and crafts; we do have, however, have a community that is very arts focused - Chinese dancers, Polynesian groups. Kids are exposed to a lot. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teachers seem to try and incorporate the arts at least once a week, but its difficult because most don't have the skills. About 50% of the teachers try and use the arts on a consistent basis. • The time spent on the arts depends on how much the of the core curriculum (reading and math) the teachers can get through. If the teachers cannot cover everything in the morning the lesson spills over into the afternoon. This will definitely affect the amount of time a teacher can spend in the arts or other subject for that matter. • We have some teachers that have a strong artistic background that allows for more arts. In short, it all comes down to how much time they have.

(Table C4. Principal Interview Comments, School Year 2003–04, continued)

(Opinions about students' exposure to the arts, continued)	
Principals' perceptions about the students' exposure to the arts	Factors influencing amount of art in the classroom
Control schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teachers try to have music one time per week and visual arts one time per week. • Primarily the visual arts - just what the teachers do in the classroom. Maybe 1-2 times per week including Hawai'iana. • They do a lot of art projects; mostly because its fun and takes up time, but they are not necessarily rigorous or consistent
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time is the issue. A lot of the teachers like the arts, but have a hard time focusing on them because they are not assessed. • When push comes to shove, what we are measured and assessed on is what the teachers focus on in the curriculum. The teacher use the arts in subjects that require the added instruction. • They do address art because they give an art grade, but most of the focus is on the subjects which are assessed for AYP.

^a All schools participate in Hawaiiana for 30–45 minutes per week.

Other Factors Influencing Student Achievement

School programs	
Project schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Character Education Program (Punahou program). Some teachers use it, some don't. • We have supplementary educational programs through NCLB (no child left behind) about 25-30 of our kids go to Kumon. They go for tutoring two times per week for reading and/or math. Its not necessarily a school program but it may have some effect on math and reading achievement for those selected to go. • We have family reading nights. A lot of communication through our news letters. A lot of the parents are involved (about 400-600 participate in the parent nights). Involves students from BYU, other high school students. They have the students go into the classrooms, while we meet with the parents and go though the work with them.
Control schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do have after-school tutoring with about 3-4 kids. Its up to the teachers who volunteer to tutor, which they do get paid for. Its typically reading. A lot of the teachers might just teach the kids after-school because they don't get the support at home. We have a very orderly school, of course we still have the problems with kids, but it is an environment that is very conducive to learning. • The summer intercession program would most likely have the biggest impact on student achievement. About a third of the students participate in the summer intercession program. • We have a math inclusion program. We have designated one teacher position and she pulls out those who are well below proficient and this is the first year that we have had this in place. The additional thing we did for grades 3 and 5, those being the testing grades, is six weeks before we ran through a test busting program sold by Harcourt Grace, the test publishers, and its designed to review and practice for the test. We brought on additional PTTs (one per classroom) for that six week period to help with the preparation. This is the first time we've tried this type of test preparation program.

Table C5. Student Focus Group Responses, School Year 2003–04

Students' perceptions of the purpose of using drama	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To make up our own stories. • So we can relate to our own stories. • To learn about communities. • So we can use our imagination. • So we can have fun. • So we can learn more about drama. • So we can make up stories. • So we can improve our drama. • So we think drama is interesting. • Teaching us different things we can do with our bodies. • To learn more about drama. • How to project our voice. • One day we might be an actor. • To help us learn about people and how to use drama words. • We can focus on exciting parts of the stories, that we thought it might not be exciting. • It expands our vocabulary. • So we know what were supposed to do. • So we can improve our teamwork. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So we could experience what the characters were going through. • So if we want to become actors we know the steps. • So we can understand regular experiences in real life. • What kinds of emotions happen. • So when we get older we'll know how to do it and wont have to start over. • So we can focus on what we're doing. • So when we are doing our homework we don't get distracted. • If we grow up and what to be an actor we won't get distracted if people are laughing or something. • When we're not listening. • So we know how to be a team. • If we can't do it right she would give us ideas. • Because the shapes we do help us in reading - like when there are no pictures in the story.
Students' observations of teachers' use of the arts first strategies	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing different. • Sometimes she uses on/of. • She's been ready stories and then having us to tableau. • She uses on/off. • We move desks and do some pantomime. • She does on/off. • She does tableau with our books. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • She makes us act out different characters. • We've been writing in our journals about what we did in drama. • We have been acting out books we read and she lets us act out are favorite parts. • We did a play about the Mayflower. • We have been doing a lot more group stuff.

(Table C5. Student Focus Group Responses, School Year 2003–04, continued)

Students' perceptions of when the ARTS FIRST strategies are used	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• When were being bad.• When were talking too much.• Mostly when Mr. Dan comes.• Mostly when Mr. Dan comes in or when the BYU students come.• Not very often.• Not really used.• When Ms. McKinny comes in.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Like once a week or once every couple of weeks.• She's been teaching drama, mostly on Thursdays.• A lot more during science projects, like molding each other into different shapes.• She's been doing more since Mr. Dan left, she does it because we miss Mr. Dan coming to our class.
Students' perceptions of the affects of the drama activities on their peers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• They seem to listen more, because if they don't Mr. Dan wont let them participate.• Everybody seems to like it.• Some people waste time.• They ask when Mr. Dan is coming back.• Some people are shy.• They act out, because they might be embarrassed and don't want to participate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• They were a little uncomfortable at first or thought it was going to be boring.• We remember it more after we acted it out.• Everyone seems to like it, except for a couple who don't want to participate.• Some of the kids did not like at first, but they did at the end.• Everyone seems to like it.

Appendix D
Data Collection Instruments

Student Interest-in-the-Arts Questionnaire

Instructions: We would like to know what you think about dancing, drama, music, drawing and painting, and ceramics and sculpture. Your opinions will help us teach these subjects better.

For each statement below, please circle the answer that best gives your opinion. If you *strongly disagree* with the statement on the left, circle 1; if you *somewhat disagree*, circle 2; if you *somewhat agree* with the statement, circle 3; if you *strongly agree*, circle 4. If you *don't know* or are unable to decide, circle the × in the “Don't know” column.

Please do not write your name on this paper. All your answers will be private, and no one will know how you answered these questions. Your answers on this survey will not change your grade in any way, so please be honest and answer how you really think and feel. I will read each statement, please read along and give your opinion.

Statement	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
1. I like to watch plays.	1	2	3	4	×
2. I like to <i>act in</i> plays.	1	2	3	4	×
3. I like to help <i>write</i> plays.	1	2	3	4	×
4. I like talking about plays.	1	2	3	4	×
5. I like learning how to act in, or write, plays.	1	2	3	4	×
6. I take (or want to take) acting lessons outside of school.	1	2	3	4	×
7. Acting in or writing plays makes me happy.	1	2	3	4	×
8. I like to watch dancing.	1	2	3	4	×
9. I like to dance.	1	2	3	4	×
10. I like to make up dances.	1	2	3	4	×
11. I like talking about dancing.	1	2	3	4	×
12. I like learning about dancing and how to dance.	1	2	3	4	×
13. I take (or want to take) dance lessons outside of school.	1	2	3	4	×
14. Dancing makes me happy.	1	2	3	4	×

Statement	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
15. I like to listen to music.	1	2	3	4	×
16. I like to play music or sing.	1	2	3	4	×
17. I like talking about music or singing.	1	2	3	4	×
18. I like learning about music or learning to play music or singing.	1	2	3	4	×
19. I take (or want to take) music lessons outside of school.	1	2	3	4	×
20. Listening to music, playing music, or singing makes me happy.	1	2	3	4	×
21. I like to look at drawings or paintings.	1	2	3	4	×
22. I like to draw or paint.	1	2	3	4	×
23. I like talking about drawing or painting.	1	2	3	4	×
24. I like learning about drawing or painting.	1	2	3	4	×
25. I take (or want to take) drawing or painting lessons outside of school.	1	2	3	4	×
26. Drawing or painting makes me happy.	1	2	3	4	×
27. I like to look at ceramics or sculptures.	1	2	3	4	×
28. I like to make ceramics or sculptures.	1	2	3	4	×
29. I like talking about ceramics or sculptures.	1	2	3	4	×
30. I like learning about ceramics or sculptures.	1	2	3	4	×
31. I take (or want to take) ceramics or sculpture classes outside of school.	1	2	3	4	×
32. Ceramics or sculptures make me happy.	1	2	3	4	×

School Attitude Survey ^a

Instructions: For each question below, please circle *one* number that best tells how much you agree. All your answers will be private, and no one will know how you answered these questions. Your answers on this survey will not change your grade in any way, so please answer how you really think. If you have any questions please raise your hand.

Question	How much do you agree? <i>Circle one number for each question.</i>		
	I don't agree	I agree some	I agree a lot
1. I am smart.	1	2	3
2. I am glad I go to this school.	1	2	3
3. Reading is boring.	1	2	3
4. This is a good school.	1	2	3
5. In school, I learn new things fast.	1	2	3
6. Math is hard for me.	1	2	3
7. Reading is fun.	1	2	3
8. School is easy for me.	1	2	3
9. I don't like this school.	1	2	3
10. Reading is easy for me.	1	2	3
11. Math is boring.	1	2	3
12. If I try, I can get good grades.	1	2	3
13. I like being at school.	1	2	3
14. Reading is hard for me.	1	2	3
15. I am not good at math.	1	2	3
16. I am not good at learning new things.	1	2	3

Question	How much do you agree? <i>Circle one number for each question.</i>		
	I don't agree	I agree some	I agree a lot
17. I like to learn at school.	1	2	3
18. I understand everything I read.	1	2	3
19. I do not understand math.	1	2	3
20. I am not a good reader.	1	2	3
21. Math is easy for me.	1	2	3
22. School is fun.	1	2	3
23. Math is fun.	1	2	3
24. I do not understand what I read in school.	1	2	3
25. I don't like to come to school.	1	2	3
26. I can figure out most math problems.	1	2	3

^a Modified version of the School Attitude Assessment Survey–Revised, with additional and revised items. McCoach, D.B., & Siegle, D (2003).

Attitudes Toward Teaching With the Arts ^b

Instructions: The questions below ask for your opinions about teaching with the arts. For each item, please *circle one number* that best reflects your opinion about teaching with the arts.

Item	Circle one number, where 1 = <i>strongly disagree</i> and 6 = <i>strongly agree</i>
1. I think using <i>drama</i> when teaching helps children learn reading and mathematics.	1 2 3 4 5 6
2. I think using <i>music</i> when teaching helps children learn reading and mathematics.	1 2 3 4 5 6
3. I think using <i>dance</i> when teaching helps children learn reading and mathematics.	1 2 3 4 5 6
4. I think using <i>visual arts</i> when teaching helps children learn reading and mathematics.	1 2 3 4 5 6
5. I think it is important for students to view a videotape of a dance.	1 2 3 4 5 6
6. I am confident in my ability to use dance when teaching.	1 2 3 4 5 6
7. I consider myself a visual or performing artist.	1 2 3 4 5 6
8. I am concerned that music, dance, and drama activities are <i>too noisy or disruptive</i> for the classroom.	1 2 3 4 5 6
9. I feel confident in my ability to facilitate music activities.	1 2 3 4 5 6
10. I have enough space to use movement effectively in the classroom.	1 2 3 4 5 6
11. I am confident in my ability to facilitate visual arts activities.	1 2 3 4 5 6

Item	Circle one number, where 1 = <i>strongly disagree</i> and 6 = <i>strongly agree</i>
12. My students <i>have trouble concentrating</i> on other work after I use the arts to teach.	1 2 3 4 5 6
13. I am confident in my ability to facilitate drama activities.	1 2 3 4 5 6
14. In general, my school is supportive of innovative teaching approaches.	1 2 3 4 5 6
15. I think there are many students in my class who would especially benefit from more arts activities in the curriculum.	1 2 3 4 5 6
16. I am free to use new teaching approaches in my classroom as I see fit.	1 2 3 4 5 6
17. I consider myself a highly creative person.	1 2 3 4 5 6
18. <i>I am constrained</i> by the demands of the curriculum I have to teach.	1 2 3 4 5 6

^b This section is a modified version of the *Teaching With the Arts Survey (TWAS)* (Oreck, 2004).

School Context Survey

Instructions: The section includes items asking for your impression about the context within which you use the arts to teach at your school. Each item begins with the phrase, “To what extent. . . .” For each item, please *circle the number* that best reflects your opinion about your school environment.

Item <i>To what extent . . .</i>	Circle one number, where 1 = <i>not at all</i> and 6 = <i>considerably</i>
1. . . . does your school administration emphasize the <i>importance of using</i> the arts to improve students’ achievement in reading and mathematics?	1 2 3 4 5 6
2. . . . does your school administration support the <i>implementation</i> of arts activities designed to improve students’ achievement in reading and mathematics?	1 2 3 4 5 6
3. . . . does your school’s administration, faculty, and staff <i>communicate</i> about the implementation of arts activities to improve students’ achievement in reading and mathematics?	1 2 3 4 5 6
4. . . . are the <i>facilities</i> you operate in conducive to using the arts to improve students’ achievement in reading and mathematics?	1 2 3 4 5 6
5. is your <i>classroom size</i> adequate for using the arts to improve students’ achievement in reading and mathematics?	1 2 3 4 5 6

ARTS FIRST Professional Development Quality Survey

Instructions: The questions in this section ask for your opinions about all forms of ARTS FIRST professional development, including the two-day drama seminars, the three-hour ancillary arts instruction (music, visual arts, and dancing), and the in-class mentoring sessions. For each item, *circle the number* that best reflects your opinion about the professional development. Note that some of the items are stated in the negative.

Item <i>To what extent . . .</i>	Circle one number, where 1 = <i>not at all</i> and 6 = <i>considerably</i>					
1. . . . were the issues explored in the ARTS FIRST seminars relevant to your professional responsibilities?	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. . . . were the instructors of the seminars knowledgeable and helpful?	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. . . . did you have adequate opportunities to explore the theory and the supporting research about the benefits of integrating the arts into the curriculum?	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. . . . did the instructional techniques facilitate your learning?	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. . . . was the content discussed in the ARTS FIRST workshops <i>confusing</i> to you?	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. . . . was the leader or group facilitator well prepared?	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. . . . does integrating the arts into the curriculum address an important need?	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. . . . was the session leader credible?	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. . . . did the professional development sessions <i>fail</i> to create a climate of professional community?	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. . . . did you have access to all the necessary materials and resources?	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. . . . were the strategies presented by the seminars and the in-class mentoring sessions <i>difficult</i> to understand?	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. . . . did the materials enhance your learning?	1	2	3	4	5	6

Item <i>To what extent . . .</i>	Circle one number, where 1 = <i>not at all</i> and 6 = <i>considerably</i>					
13. . . . was the content of the professional development <i>irrelevant</i> to your classroom?	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. . . . were the activities in which you engaged carefully planned and well organized?	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. . . . was your time well spent?	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. . . . were the goals and objectives <i>vague</i> when you began the ARTS FIRST project?	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. . . . did the professional development sessions include collaborative discussion about professional practices?	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. . . . was your understanding of the arts enhanced as a result of the workshops?	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. . . . were new practices <i>rushed</i> and <i>not</i> thoroughly explained?	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. . . . did the professional development sessions support opportunities to network and learn from colleagues?	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. . . . was <i>insufficient</i> time provided for the completion of the tasks?	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. . . . will the strategies you learned be useful to you?	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. . . . was time organized efficiently and effectively?	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. . . . were the activities relevant to the purpose of the project?	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. . . . will you be able to apply the strategies you learned in the seminars and mentoring sessions?	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. . . . did your experience include a variety of learning activities?	1	2	3	4	5	6

Teacher Comments

Instructions: Please answer some questions about the ARTS FIRST professional development. Use the back of the pages if you need more room.

1. What were the *most* helpful aspects of the full-day drama professional development sessions?

2. What were the *most* helpful aspects of the three-hour ancillary (dance, music, visual arts) workshops

3. What were the *most* helpful aspects of the in-class mentoring sessions

4. What were the *least* helpful aspects of the full-day drama professional development sessions?

5. What were the *least* helpful aspects of the three-hour ancillary (dance, music, visual arts) workshops?

6. What were the *least* helpful aspects of the in-class mentoring sessions?

7. What activities would you like to learn more about?

8. What other comments do you have?

Thank you for your time!

**ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project, School Year 2003–04
Children’s Participation in the Arts: Parent Questionnaire**

*When you have finished the questionnaire please mail
it in the postage-paid envelope **no later than May 28, 2004.***

How much has your 3rd-grade child participated in each of the following arts activities *outside of school* since he or she started school in Kindergarten? Circle one number for each item or (✓) if not at all.

Item	Circle one number <i>or</i> check (✓) if not at all			
	A lot	some	A little	Not at all
1. Acting in a play	3	2	1	
2. Writing a play	3	2	1	
3. Watching a play	3	2	1	
4. Helping with the production of a play	3	2	1	
5. Other drama activities: _____	3	2	1	
6. Music lessons	3	2	1	
7. Community choir	3	2	1	
8. Church choir	3	2	1	
9. Attending a concert	3	2	1	
10. Other music activities: _____	3	2	1	
11. Ballet	3	2	1	
12. Modern dance	3	2	1	
13. Polynesian dance (hula, Tahitian, etc.)	3	2	1	
14. Cultural dance (Chinese, Filipino, etc.)	3	2	1	
15. Attending a dance recital	3	2	1	
16. Other dance activities: _____	3	2	1	
17. Painting/drawing	3	2	1	

Item	Circle one number <i>or</i> check (✓) if not at all			
	A lot	some	A little	Not at all
18. Sculpture or ceramics	3	2	1	
19. Weaving or other crafts	3	2	1	
20. Visited a museum	3	2	1	
21. Attended an art show	3	2	1	
22. Other visual arts activities: _____	3	2	1	

How much have *you* participated in each of the following arts activities *since your 3rd-grade child* has started school in Kindergarten or 1st-grade? Circle one number for each item or (✓) if not at all.

Item	Circle one number <i>or</i> check (✓) if not at all			
	A lot	some	A little	Not at all
23. Acting in a play	3	2	1	
24. Writing a play	3	2	1	
25. Watching a play	3	2	1	
26. Helping with the production of a play	3	2	1	
27. Other drama activities: _____	3	2	1	
28. Music lessons	3	2	1	
29. Community choir	3	2	1	
30. Church choir	3	2	1	
31. Attending a concert	3	2	1	
32. Other music activities: _____	3	2	1	
33. Ballet	3	2	1	
34. Modern dance	3	2	1	

Item	Circle one number <i>or</i> check (✓) if not at all			
	A lot	some	A little	Not at all
35. Polynesian dance (hula, Tahitian, etc.)	3	2	1	
36. Cultural dance (Chinese, Filipino, etc.)	3	2	1	
37. Attending a dance recital	3	2	1	
38. Other dance activities: _____	3	2	1	
39. Painting/drawing	3	2	1	
40. Sculpture or ceramic	3	2	1	
41. Weaving or other crafts	3	2	1	
42. Visited a museum	3	2	1	
43. Attended an art show	3	2	1	
44. Other visual arts activities: _____	3	2	1	

For the following statements please check (✓) all that apply.

45. My community offers the following types of art activities:

45a. Drama 45b. Music 45c. Dance 45d. Visual Arts

46. I think my child should know more about:

46a. Drama 46b. Music 46c. Dance 46d. Visual Arts

*Thank you for your time! Please mail questionnaire
no later than **May 28, 2004.***

ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project Weekly Teacher Log for School Year 2003–04

Please provide answers for each row (one for each of the four art forms). If you did not use any of the strategies learned in ARTS FIRST or have not yet been trained in the strategy, leave the row blank.

Your name _____ School _____ Grade level _____

Week beginning on Monday, ____/____/04

Art form	What is the number of instances in which you used an ARTS FIRST strategy this week? <i>(Please write the number for each subject; if none, enter a zero.)</i>				Did you formally assess the students? <i>(Insert a check mark for the subjects in which you assessed the students.)</i>				What was your comfort level for each subject using the ARTS FIRST strategy? <i>(1=low, 2=medium, 3=high)</i>				What was your students' interest level for each subject in which the ARTS FIRST strategy was used? (1=low, 2=medium, 3=high)				What supplemental materials/exemplars did you use? <i>(B=book, A=audio, V=video; insert all that apply.)</i>			
	Integrated with:				Lang Arts	Math	Soc Stu	Sci	Lang Arts	Math	Soc Stu	Sci	Lang Arts	Math	Soc Stu	Sci	Lang Arts	Math	Soc Stu	Sci
	Lang Arts	Math	Soc Stu	Sci																
Drama																				
Dance																				
Music																				
Visual arts																				

**2003–04 ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project
Student Focus Group Guide**

Introduction and Background

1. This guide gives the procedures for Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG) to conduct focus groups of students at the three project schools in the ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project.
 - a. Focus groups are moderator-led, informal discussions between several people who potentially can offer various perspectives on a topic.
 - 1) Focus group discussions address pre-determined questions, but participants are encouraged to raise their own issues and *focus on* issues that are important to them.
 - 2) The discussions need not necessarily lead to consensus about issues, but instead will result in a collection of opinions.
 - 3) The information collected through a focus group discussion will not necessarily be generalizable to the entire school but will provide some descriptive information that CRDG can use when preparing its evaluation report.
 - b. The focus groups will be led by the ARTS FIRST Research Project Manager.
 - 1) Each focus group session will last for approximately 1 hour.
 - c. The purpose of the focus groups will be to collect information about students' opinions about the implementation of the ARTS FIRST program activities and about their general impressions of the program.
 - d. The evaluation questions that will be addressed by the focus group participants are:
 - 1) What are students' impressions of the implementation of selected activities of the ARTS FIRST program?
 - 2) What are students' impressions of the extent to which students have learned from the activities?
 - 3) What are the students' general impressions of the program?
2. The procedures given in this document should be followed for each focus group session.
 - a. *Without exception*, the moderator should debrief himself by reading the section on the moderator's role and responsibilities as soon as possible after the completion of a focus group.
 - b. He should also prepare himself for each focus group by reading the moderator's section shortly before beginning the session.

Selection of Participants for the Focus Groups

1. A total of six focus groups will be held for all third grade classes at the following project schools (one focus class per school)
 - a. Keolu Elementary School
 - 1) two 3rd-grade classes
 - b. La'ie Elementary School
 - 1) four 3rd-grade classes

2. Students who participate in the focus group will be randomly selected from a group of students who meet these criteria:
 - a. The students have been at the project school for all of the 2003-2004 school year and are in the targeted grade level at the school.
 - b. The students have their parents' permission to participate.
 - c. The students are willing to participate in group discussions.
 - d. The students are likely to be articulate about the school's artistic activities and the ARTS FIRST project.
 - 1) This will be determined by input from the students' teachers
3. The teachers will identify the students who have been at the project school for all of the 2003-2004 school year and are in the targeted grade level at the school.
4. CRDG will randomly select three boys and three girls from each 3rd-grade class at each school and three of each sex for each 3rd-grade class from each school as alternates and send the lists of selected students to the schools.
5. Teachers or other designated school staff will describe the focus group to the students who were selected as participants and alternates and ask them if they are willing to participate and assess if they can be articulate.
6. Each school should mail, fax, or e-mail CRDG a list of the final list of participants and alternates, categorized by gender.

Selecting Rooms for Conducting the Focus Groups

1. Ask school administrators to help find appropriate meeting space for the focus groups.
2. The room should be large enough to comfortably fit the number of participants, moderator, moderator's assistant, and a table with chair for each participant.
3. The room should be as neutral and free from distraction as possible.

The Moderator's Role and Responsibilities

1. This section presents background information for the moderator.
 - a. The moderator should study this section carefully and refer to the guide often to ensure that all important topics are covered.
2. The moderator's script, with instructions for each focus-group step, is given at the end of these procedures.
3. *Facilitating the discussion*
 - a. The role of the moderator is to optimize the type of group dynamics that will encourage in-depth discussion about the research questions.
 - 1) The discussion should flow naturally and be flexible.
 - 2) Participants should feel free to offer new insights about the topic.
 - 3) The moderator should make it clear that there are no pre-defined answers that may constrain participants' willingness to offer opinions.
 - 4) The discussion should elicit information about how participants formed their perspective about a topic.
 - 5) Participants should be allowed to revise their perspective on a topic by listening to the discussion in the focus group.

- 6) The flow and flexibility of the discussion may be influenced by the social dynamics between participants, physical context for the focus group, and the moderator.
- b. The moderator will be responsible for directing the conversation and taking minimal notes about points to follow up on later in the discussion.
- c. The moderator should memorize the questions and their sequence.
 - 1) The moderator's guide can be used as a reminder.
- d. The moderator should self-monitor her listening behavior by the following questions:
 - 1) Do I need more information to completely understand this respondent's statements?
 - 2) Am I able to tie this respondent's comments to the evaluation questions?
 - 3) How much time is left in the session?
 - 4) How does this comment tie in with the other comments?
 - 5) How do I elicit information about other facets of the participant's experience, for example, the emotional impact of the experience?
- e. The moderator should also practice other traits of a good listener such as:
 - 1) Exhibiting real interest in what people say
 - 2) Encouraging participants' enthusiasm to talk.
 - 3) Keeping silent while participants are offering their points of view.
 - 4) Limiting the amount of tangential comments that are offered to the group.
 - 5) Monitoring the contributions by different respondents to ensure that each participant has offered a perspective on the topic.
 - 6) Ensuring that body language is not inadvertently suggesting a judgmental attitude.
- f. The moderator can expect that two or three participants will be willing to share their points-of-view, and two or three will be less apt to self-disclose and perhaps nervous and uncomfortable.
- g. If participants bring up specific information when a general question is posed, the moderator must decide if the conversation should continue or if he or she should ask the participant to hold the comments until later.
- h. The moderator and assistant can add to the questions if they think of important ones that have been omitted or would like followup information.
- i. In many cases, the moderator can let the conversation flow freely without redirecting its flow.
- j. Encourage both positive and negative comments.
- 4. *Techniques for encouraging participants to contribute to the discussion*
 - a. Move closer to an individual.
 - b. The five-second pause
 - 1) Used right after a question is posed or a participant offers a comment
 - 2) After pausing, establish eye contact with the participant
 - c. The probe
 - 1) Probing questions and comments are used early in a session to illustrate the level of detail or specificity that is desired in responses, when participants have offered vague or very general responses.
 - a) "Would you give me an example of what you mean?"
 - b) "Can you say more?"

- c) “What do you mean by that?”
 - d) “I don’t understand.”
 - e) “Is there anything else you want to say about that?”
- d. Keep the discussion flexible and judgment-free.
 - e. Use subtle and unobtrusive techniques.
 - 1) Spontaneously compose and articulate questions in clear, simple, and straightforward terms to show connectedness and differences between responses.
 - 2) Monitor the mood of the group in the flow of the discussion and interject a question or comment to keep the conversation appropriately focused.
 - a) Watch the discussion and decide on the right time to wrap up a line of conversation and move on.
 - f. Use humor to keep the discussion from being too tense or judgmental.
 - 1) Use humor carefully to avoid offending any participants.
 - 2) Use spontaneous, creative, imaginative humor is better in a focus group than canned humor.
5. *Techniques for dealing with self-appointed experts*
- a. Underscore the fact that all participants have important perceptions that need to be expressed.
6. *Techniques for dealing with dominant participants*
- a. Avoid eye contact with the person.
 - b. Redirect the discussion to other participants; for example, say:
 - 1) “Thank you, John. Are there others who wish to comment on the question?”
 - 2) “Does anyone feel differently?”
 - 3) “That’s one point of view. Does anyone have another point of view?”
7. *Techniques for dealing with shy participants*
- a. Make eye contact with the person.
 - b. Verbally call on them.
8. *Techniques for dealing with rambling participants*
- a. Discontinue eye contact with the rambler after about 20 seconds.
 - b. Look at moderator’s guide.
 - c. Look around the circle of participants.
 - d. Turn away from the rambler.
 - e. If the rambler stops or pauses, move to the next participant or next question.
9. *Types of questions*
- a. The moderator will ask a set of questions about each of several selected school CEPP activities.
 - b. Questions addressing fairly broad topics have been written to flesh out various points of view about the topic from the participants.
 - c. A question asking for negative opinions for each activity will help the participants see that they can discuss both positive and negative topics.
10. *Sequence of questions*
- a. If participants bring up specific information when a general question is posed, decide if the conversation should continue or the comments should be held until later.

- b. During the discussion, the moderator or assistant may think of a question that was not planned as part of the discussion.
 - 1) Ask these questions at the end of the focus group.
 - c. Late in the session,
 - 1) Ask participants to provide more details about their contributions to the discussion.
 - 2) Briefly summarize the participants' contributions and ask the participant to verify its accuracy.
 - 3) Limit the types of responses to focus on the answers that address the research questions.
 - d. In many cases, the moderator can let the conversation flow freely without redirecting its flow.
11. *Closing discussion about one topic and move on to the next topic or redirecting the discussion:*
- a. You may ask questions that include "such as," "how satisfied," "to what extent," and "how much" to wrap up the discussion on a topic.

The Assistant's Role

- 1. The assistant should take comprehensive and detailed notes about the participants' conversation and body language, the physical environment, procedures, participants' responses, group dynamics, and any other component of the focus group.
 - a. The assistant should have at least three bold tip felt markers on hand and a roll of masking tape.
- 2. The assistant should ask questions late in the discussion or ask participants to elaborate on their comments.

Setting up the Facilities

- 1. Arrive approximately 15 minutes before the participants are schedule to arrive to prepare the room.
- 2. Arrange the participants' chairs and tables in a circle so that they are equally spaced apart and at a comfortable distance that allows for eye contact.
 - a. Arrange a chair and table for the moderator, place the moderator's name tent on the moderator's table.
 - b. Arrange a chair and table for the assistant near the tape recorder.
- 3. Set up the tape recorder and microphones.
 - a. Test the equipment to make sure voices can be recorded clearly from any part of the seating area.

Closing the Focus Group Session

- 1. If it seems that there are unexpressed comments about the topic, the moderator will briefly review the main points that were discussed in the session and ask participants to confirm that the list is complete and accurate.
 - a. When presenting the brief summary, the moderator should watch the participants' body language for signs of agreement or disagreement.
 - 1) If there seems to be some disagreement, the moderator should encourage

- participants to articulate their disagreement.
 - b. Alternatively, the moderator may close the session by restating the purpose of the study, asking for additional comments, and asking the participants if they thought their discussion adequately addressed the purpose of the study.
2. The moderator will announce that the session is over and thank the participants for their efforts.

Moderator's Script and Instructions

1. *Greet the participants*

- a. The assistant will greet the participants as soon as they arrive.
- b. As participants arrive, hand them a name tag.
 - 1) Ask them to write on the name tag: their first name or name that they would like to be called.

2. *Assigning seats to participants*

- a. The moderator should then place the "name tents" on the tables with the following criteria in mind:
 - 1) Dominant or expert personalities should be seated to the side of the moderator.
 - 2) Shy personalities should be seated across from the moderator.
 - 3) Participants who have soft voices should be seated near the microphone.

3. *Opening the focus group*

- a. In the first few critical moments of the focus group, the moderator should:
 - 1) create an environment that is thoughtful, nonjudgmental, comfortable, and permissive;
 - 2) discuss the purpose of the group and how participants were selected; and
 - 3) establish the ground rules for the group and inform the participants of the procedures.

4. Introductions and purpose of the interview.

Good morning/afternoon.

Thank you for meeting with us today. My name is Mr. Lawton, and this is [assistant's name]. We work at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. Some of you may remember me sitting in the back of your classroom when some teachers came to your class to teach you about drama and acting. The reason we are here today is to get your ideas about the drama and acting in your class. I am excited to hear from all of you.

Any answers you give to the questions I will ask are important. There are no right or wrong answers; we are only looking for honest answers. So,

- **please say what you think – we want to know everything that everybody thinks about the questions we ask.**
- **Sometimes you might think one thing then after someone has said something, then you might change your mind - this is also OK. We would like to know what changed your mind and why.**

To make sure we all have fun and everybody gets a chance to talk we are going to go over some rules:

- 1. You should not speak when other people are talking.**
- 2. Everyone should have a chance to say something.**
- 3. I may call on people to make sure they've had an opportunity to speak.**
- 4. Everybody's thoughts and feelings are important, so we will respect what someone else says, even if we do not agree with it. Does everyone know what I mean when I say we will respect what someone else says? [encourage students to talk about not making fun of each other].**

Does anybody have any questions about the rules? If you have any questions about the rules as we're going along, please let me know and we can discuss them again. I understand that you may get excited from time to time and may want to share while someone else is talking. When this happens, I will ask you to hold your thought and I will call on you when the other student is finished. Does that sound fair?

We want to make sure that everybody here feels comfortable to talk about how they honestly feel. To make sure that you feel comfortable we are not going to repeat what was said after we leave this group. Does everyone understand this? Does everybody understand why we will not repeat what was said?

We are going to be writing down and recording what is said today to make sure we don't forget anything. Only a couple people at our office will see or hear what is said. To make sure we write down and hear everything, we might ask you to repeat what you said. This is also why it is important why we don't talk when someone else is talking.

5. *Questions about the purpose of arts first windward research project*

- 1. Thinking back to when the drama teachers came into your class, what do you remember about what they were teaching.**
- 2. Why do you think the drama teachers were having you act out the stories you have been reading in class?**
- 3. Was there anything that you liked or didn't like about what they were doing? If so, what did you like or not like and why?**

6. *Questions about the teachers' use of the ARTS FIRST strategies.*

- 1. What are some new things you have noticed your teacher doing during reading or math time? Have you been doing any acting, dancing, music, drawing or painting? Is this different than what you did at the start of school this year?**
- 2. What were you doing when your teacher did the [insert art activities students are talking about (acting, dancing, music, drawing, or painting)]?**
- 3. Is there anything that you didn't like or feel comfortable about when you were doing them? Why?**
- 4. How much do you like doing [insert activity] in reading? In math?**
- 5. Did your teacher seem to be having fun doing these things? How do you know? What was different?**
- 6. What were some of your favorite things you did (be specific about the art activities that they have been talking about)? Why?**
- 7. What were the least favorite things you did? Why?**

7. *Closing the focus group session*

Is there anything else that anyone would like to say?

This is the end of our session today. Thank you so much for your being here and sharing your thoughts and feelings with us. It was really nice getting to know you.

I'll take you back to your classes now.

2003–04 ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project Project Teacher Interview Guide

Introduction

This is a guide for interviewing teachers involved in the ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project during the 2003–2004 school year. The purpose of this document is to provide a guide to gather background information, use of the ARTS FIRST strategies, teachers' opinions about the affects, intended and unintended, of the ARTS FIRST program, opinions about the content of the professional development and their classroom learning environment.

I. Background

Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG.) of the College of Education at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa is doing the research for the Hawai'i Alliance of Arts Education, a non-profit agency that received a grant from the U. S. Department of Education to conduct an arts education project. The purpose of the three-year project is to provide education in the arts and to examine how well education in the arts improves student achievement, attitudes toward school, interest in the arts, and classroom behavior. We believe the project will help us understand the influence of arts curriculum on students' overall academic development as well as provide teachers with additional tools to engage students in classroom activities. What we learn in the project will help the Hawai'i Department of Education develop arts curricula for students across the state. The project ($N=3$) and comparison ($N=3$) schools were chosen randomly from a set of Oahu Title I schools identified by the Department of Education.

II. Research Questions

Some general topics that will be addressed in the interviews are:

- A. The teachers' prior exposure to the arts
- B. The teachers' opinions about current reading and math programs.
- C. What kinds of arts activities are going on in the school
- D. Teachers' use of the ARTS FIRST strategies.
- E. Unintended effects of the program.

III. Interviewees

- A. The teachers' involved in the ARTS FIRST project for the 2003–2004 school year will be the focus of this interview guide.

IV. Interview Time

- A. The interview for each teacher should take between 45–60 minutes.

An Overview of the Interview Process

This section describes the logistical preparations necessary for conducting the interviews.

I. Before the Interview

- A. Review the instructions for administering the interview.
- B. Confirm the interview schedule.
- C. Confirm the location of sites.
 - 1. Ensure adequate travel time.
 - 2. Make sure you know how to get there and where to park.
 - 3. Check in at the office at least five minutes before the interview and ask about visitor sign-in procedures.
- D. Be sure you have all necessary interview materials.
 - 1. A copy of the interview guide.
 - 2. Note pad with sufficient number of pages.
 - 3. Two pens or pencils.

II. Note-taking Procedures

- A. Write your notes on a note pad.
- B. When you begin to move to a subsequent interview question, write the section letter and interview question number on the note pad as a reference for your notes.
- C. Take as many notes as you need to record information.
- D. If you cannot write down all the information during the interview, write notes immediately after the interview to avoid gaps in the information due to time interference with your memory of the conversation.

Conducting the Interview

This section describes how to conduct the interview. Instructions to the interviewer are outlined, and the interview script is given in boxes.

I. General Instructions

- A. The procedures in this section were developed to ensure that each interview covers all aspects of the intended research questions.
- B. Say the content in the boxes to the interviewee.
 - 1. Paraphrasing is permissible as long as the meaning of the statements is preserved.
- C. If you find ways to improve on the interview questions, record these in writing and include them in your final interview report.

II. Before the Interview

- A. Record the school name, interviewee's name, date, time, and location of the interview on the first page of the note pad.
- B. Take notes about the setting.
 - 1. Where in the school did the interview take place?
 - 2. Was there anything about the interview setting that affected the interview (e.g., people walking around, noise outside the windows, interruptions from office staff)?

III. Interviewer's Conduct During the Interview

- A. The interview should be conducted in a friendly conversational manner.
- B. Acceptable probing questions.
 - 1. Whenever you believe that the interviewee has provided a response that needs further clarification to address the question to the fullest, encourage the interviewee to provide further information through probing questions. However, if you believe the interviewee does not want to provide information beyond what was already provided, move onto the next question.
- C. Sometimes verbal prompting is not necessary.
 - 1. You may merely provide more time for the interviewee to ask information to the response.
- D. At other times general prompts may be used; for example:
 - 1. "Please elaborate on your answer."
 - 2. "Can you give me an example of what that means?"
- E. When interviewees provide responses that are evasive or tangential from the intent of the question, maneuver the conversation back to the original question.
 - 1. Be especially diplomatic if you think the interviewee feels uncomfortable about the question; that is, do not point out that the original response was evasive or tangential but try to gently guide the conversation back to the original questions. For example, "let me summarize your response to the question to make sure that the question has been addressed."
 - 2. For more forthright interviewees, it may be appropriate to point out that the question was not addressed.
 - a. In this case you may want to repeat the question.
 - 3. Ensure that the interviewee gives an example to support their opinions.
 - a. Ask the interviewee to provide examples to support his or her statements or opinions and attitudes; for example, "what has led you to reach that conclusion?"
- F. Appropriate responses to various issues or resistance.
 - 1. If the interviewee seems very self-conscious, reluctant, or resistant to the interview questions, it may not be possible to elicit the desired depth of information.
 - 2. However, be friendly and as sensitive as possible to their cultural background, time restrictions, etc.
- G. Reflection of what was said by the interviewer.
 - 1. While some of the responses and explanations of the interviewer may at times be lengthy and off track, it is good practice to reflect what was said. This will ensure:
 - a. that you heard the interviewer correctly;
 - b. the interviewer has an opportunity to add or amend what was said; and
 - c. the question was addressed.

IV. Beginning the Interview and Establishing Rapport with the Interviewees

- A. Describing the purpose of the interview.

Thank you for taking the time to meet with us.

The purpose of this interview is to get some background information about five topics and might cover others that may come up in our discussion. First, your exposure to the arts before this project; second, your opinions about the program; third, your opinions about the current programs you use to teach reading and math; fourth, your observations about the unintended effects of the program; and finally an overview of some of the ARTS FIRST strategies you have used.

I am going to tape this interview to ensure I don't misrepresent any comments that are made during the interview. All information you provide will remain confidential. Do you have any questions before we begin?

V. Background and General Information Questions

- 1. What were your initial thoughts about the ARTS FIRST program when it was introduced to you?**
- 2. How well were the goals and objectives of the ARTS FIRST program presented to you?**
- 3. What has been your exposure to the arts before this project?**
- 4. What is your interest in the arts. How has this developed?**
- 5. How do you feel your exposure to the arts has influenced your participation in this project?**

VI. Review of Activities and Programs that Might Affect Academic Achievement

- 1. Please describe the schools reading and math programs.**
- 2. How effective do you think they are compared to others you've been involved in?**
- 3. Do the reading and math programs help students of all ability levels? [if not] what kinds of students need more help, a different approach?**
- 4. What are the pros and cons of these programs? Why?**
- 5. If you had the option would you change any of these programs? What would you change? Why?**

VII. Review of the arts activities and programs in which the school participates

- 1. About how often are the students exposed to the arts?**
- 2. What kinds of factors affect the amount of time you devote to the arts (that is, is there a set amount of time that you are required to use the arts, or is it determined by each of the teachers'?)**

VIII. Teachers' opinions of student cohort affects

We'd like to get a sense of this years 3rd-graders and the kinds of things that might affect their academic achievement. Is this cohort of 3rd-graders notably different than typical 3rd-graders (more health problems than usual, rowdier, influx of immigrants, etc.)?

IX. Teachers' use of the ARTS FIRST strategies.

- 1. What are some of the reasons for variations of arts use in the classroom (changes in teacher log)?**
- 2. What factors determine your use of the strategies?**
- 3. What have you noticed about the students reaction to your use of the arts?**
- 4. What are some of the challenges you have come up against when trying to implement the strategies. How did you overcome or not overcome these challenges? (Classroom behavior, parent concerns, etc.)?**
- 5. What are some of the pedagogical changes you have made as a result of the PD? [Doesn't necessarily have to be arts related]?**
- 6. What was your comfort level and attitude prior to the first PD? How do you feel now? What specific things about the PD do you think caused this change?**

IV. Program as a means for improving math and reading achievement

- 1. Overall, how effective, to date, do you think the program has been in helping students learn?**
- 2. How much potential do you think the program has in the long run to help students improve their reading and math skills?**
- 3. What are the strengths of the program as a technique to help students improve their reading and math skills?**
- 4. What are the weaknesses of these techniques? How might they be improved?**

X. Unintended affects of the ARTS FIRST Program

- 1. What have you noticed about yourself, that you were not expecting, as a result of participating in the ARTS FIRST program?**
- 2. What significant things have you noticed about your students, that you were not expecting, as a result of using the ARTS FIRST Program?**

XI. Ending the Interview

Is there anything else you can think of to add which might affect the implementation of the ARTS FIRST program?

Do you have any questions for us before we conclude the interview?

Thank you again for taking the time to meet with us and if you have any questions or comments that come to mind after we leave please feel free to contact me.

XII. After the Interview

- A. Protocol**
 1. When the interview is complete, thank the teacher for their assistance and time.
 2. Sign out at the office.
- B. Type out your interview notes according to the interview question numbers.**
 1. Schedule an appointment with the research project manager and Dr. Brandon to review your participation and interview findings.
 2. Submit final summarization and interview notes to the research project manager.

2003–04 ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project Project School Principal Interview Guide

Introduction

This is a guide for interviewing principals for the 2003–2004 ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project school year. The purpose of this document is to provide a guide to compare project and comparison schools on the context in which the arts are used in their schools. This guide will also provide the interviewer with information about the background for the interviews, an overview of the interviews, and the procedures for the interviews.

I. Background

Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG.) of the College of Education at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa is doing the research for the Hawai‘i Alliance of Arts Education, a non-profit agency that received a grant from the U. S. Department of Education to conduct an arts education project. The purpose of the three-year project is to provide education in the arts and to examine how well education in the arts improves student achievement, attitudes toward school, interest in the arts, and classroom behavior. We believe the project will help us understand the influence of arts curriculum on students’ overall academic development as well as provide teachers with additional tools to engage students in classroom activities. What we learn in the project will help the Hawai‘i Department of Education develop arts curricula for students across the state. The project ($N=3$) and comparison ($N=3$) schools were chosen randomly from a set of Oahu Title I schools identified by the Department of Education.

II. Research Questions

Some general questions that will be addressed in the interviews are:

- A. What are the school’s programs and activities that may affect reading, math, science, and social studies?
- B. What kinds of arts activities are going on in the school?
- C. What are the cohort effects (grade level achievement, teacher attitudes, etc.)?
- D. What are the overall impressions of the program?

III. Interviewees

The principals at the project schools will be the focus of this interview guide.

IV. Interview Time

The interview for each principal should take between 30–45 minutes.

An Overview of the Interview Process

This section describes the logistical preparations necessary for conducting the interviews.

I. Before the Interview

- A. Review the instructions for administering the interview.
- B. Confirm the interview schedule with the project manager.
- C. Confirm the location of sites with the project manager.
 - 1. Ensure adequate travel time.
 - 2. Make sure you know how to get there and where to park.
 - 3. Check in at the office at least five minutes before the interview and ask about visitor sign-in procedures.
- D. Be sure you have all necessary interview materials.
 - 1. A copy of the interview guide.
 - 2. Note pad with sufficient number of pages.
 - 3. Two pens or pencils.

II. Note-taking Procedures

- A. Write your notes on a note pad.
- B. When you begin to move to a subsequent interview question, write the section letter and interview question number on the note pad as a reference for your notes.
- C. Take as many notes as you need to record information.
- D. If you cannot write down all the information during the interview, write notes immediately after the interview to avoid gaps in the information due to time interference with your memory of the conversation.

Conducting the Interview

This section describes how to conduct the interview. Instructions to the interviewer are outlined, and the interview script is given in boxes.

I. General Instructions

- A. The procedures in this section were developed to ensure that each interview covers all aspects of the intended research questions.
- B. Say the content in the boxes to the interviewee.
 - 1. Paraphrasing is permissible as long as the meaning of the statements is preserved.
- C. If you find ways to improve on the interview questions, record these in writing and include them in your final interview report.

II. Before the Interview

- A. Record the school name, interviewee's name, date, time, and location of the interview on the first page of the note pad.
- B. Take notes about the setting.
 - 1. Where in the school did the interview take place?
 - 2. Was there anything about the interview setting that affected the interview (e.g., people walking around, noise outside the windows, interruptions from office staff)?

III. Interviewer's Conduct During the Interview

- A. The interview should be conducted in a friendly conversational manner.
- B. Acceptable probing questions.
 - 1. Whenever you believe that the interviewee has provided a response that needs further clarification to address the question to the fullest, encourage the interviewee to provide further information through probing questions. However, if you believe the interviewee does not want to provide information beyond what was already provided, move onto the next question.
- C. Sometimes verbal prompting is not necessary.
 - 1. You may merely provide more time for the interviewee to ask information to the response.
- D. At other times general prompts may be used; for example:
 - 1. "Please elaborate on your answer."
 - 2. "Can you give me an example of what that means?"
- E. When interviewees provide responses that are evasive or tangential from the intent of the question, maneuver the conversation back to the original question.
 - 1. Be especially diplomatic if you think the interviewee feels uncomfortable about the question; that is, do not point out that the original response was evasive or tangential but try to gently guide the conversation back to the original questions. For example, "let me summarize your response to the question to make sure that the question has been addressed."
 - 2. For more forthright interviewees, it may be appropriate to point out that the question was not addressed.
 - a. In this case you may want to repeat the question.
 - 3. Ensure that the interviewee gives an example to support their opinions.
 - a. Ask the interviewee to provide examples to support his or her statements or opinions and

attitudes; for example, “what has led you to reach that conclusion?”

F. Appropriate responses to various issues or resistance.

1. If the interviewee seems very self-conscious, reluctant, or resistant to the interview questions, it may not be possible to elicit the desired depth of information.
2. However, be friendly and as sensitive as possible to their cultural background, time restrictions, etc.

G. Reflection of what was said by the interviewer.

1. While some of the responses and explanations of the interviewer may at times be lengthy and off track, it is good practice to reflect what was said. This will ensure:
 - a. that you heard the interviewer correctly;
 - b. the interviewer has an opportunity to add or amend what was said; and
 - c. the question was addressed.

IV. Beginning the Interview and Establishing Rapport with the Interviewees

A. The project manager will introduce the interviewer and describe the purpose of the interview.

Thank you for taking the time to meet with us.

This is [name], who is a graduate student taking a qualitative methods class at the University. As part of the course requirements they are expected to carry out some form of qualitative method. [Name] has volunteered to be a part of the study and help us in the principal interview portion. To make sure [Name] gets the most out of the process, he/she is going to be conducting the interview. As he/she has had only a basic overview of the project, I might interrupt from time to time to get clarification on certain responses as they pertain to the research. The interview will only take about 30 minutes.

As you know, the goal of the ARTS FIRST program is to improve student achievement by integrating the arts into other subjects. Are job is to examine different aspects of the programs your school uses that might influence this program. This interview will consist of questions that review academic activities and programs which may affect student achievement, current arts activities and programs, your opinions about student and teacher cohort effects, and any comments you have about the implementation of the ARTS FIRST program. The results of this and the other interviews as well as the results from the various student and teacher questionnaires will help us interpret the results of the information we collect and try and isolate any outside effects from the effects of the ARTS FIRST program. Do you have any questions before we begin?

V. Background and General Information Questions

A. The graduate student will now conduct the rest of the interview.

1. How long have you been the principal at this school?

2. What were your initial thoughts about the ARTS FIRST program when it was introduced to you?

VI. Review of Activities and Programs that Might Affect Academic Achievement

- 1. What programs does your school use to address reading, math, science, or social studies for the 3rd-grade?**
- 2. How long has each of the programs been implemented?**
- 3. How effective do you think the programs are?**
- 4. Does your school have any supplemental, ancillary, or standalone programs in reading, math, science, or social studies (for example, older student mentoring programs, after-school tutoring, etc.)?**

[if yes, proceed to questions 7–10; if none proceed to section G]

- 7. How many students participate in these programs?**
- 8. How long have these programs been implemented?**
- 9. How effective do you think these programs are?**
- 10. Are there any other programs that you think might influence student achievement?**

VII. Review of the Arts Activities and Programs in Which the School Participates.

- 1. What are some of the current programs in which the students are exposed to the arts (that is, drama, music, dance, painting, drawing, ceramics, and so forth)?**
- 2. About how often are the students exposed to the arts?**
- 3. What kinds of factors affect the amount of time teachers devote to the arts (that is, is there a set amount of time that teachers are required to use the arts or is it determined by each of the teachers)?**

VIII. Interview of the Principals Opinions of Cohort Affects

- 1. We'd like to get a sense of this years 3rd-graders and the kinds of things that might affect their academic achievement. Is this cohort of 3rd-graders notably different than typical 3rd-graders (more health problems than usual, rowdier, influx of immigrants, etc.)?**
- 2. Is this cohort of teachers notably different (new teachers, teachers teaching outside their grade level, etc.)? Is there anything about them that might affect the implementation of the ARTS FIRST program?**

IX. Principals' Comments about the Implementation of the ARTS FIRST Program

- 1. Do you have any comments about the implementation of the ARTS FIRST program?**
- 2. In your opinion, how is it going so far?**
- 3. Have the teachers voiced any comments or concerns about their participation?**

X. Ending the Interview

- 1. Is there any thing you can think of to add which might affect the implementation of the ARTS FIRST program?**
- 2. Do you have any questions for us before we conclude the interview?**

Thank you again for taking the time to meet with us and if you have any questions or comments that come to mind after we leave please feel free to contact me.

XI. After the Interview

- A. Protocol**
 1. When the interview is complete, thank the principal for their assistance and time.
 2. Sign out at the office.
- B. Type out your interview notes according to the interview question numbers.**
 1. Schedule an appointment with the research project manager and Dr. Brandon to review your participation and interview findings.
 2. Submit final summarization and interview notes to the research project manager.

2003–04 ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project Control School Principal Interview Guide

Introduction

This is a guide for interviewing principals for the 2003–2004 ARTS FIRST Windward Research Project school year. The purpose of this document is to provide a guide to compare project and comparison schools on the context in which the arts are used in their schools. This guide will also provide the interviewer with information about the background for the interviews, an overview of the interviews, and the procedures for the interviews.

I. Background

Curriculum Research & Development Group (CRDG.) of the College of Education at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa is doing the research for the Hawai‘i Alliance of Arts Education, a non-profit agency that received a grant from the U. S. Department of Education to conduct an arts education project. The purpose of the three-year project is to provide education in the arts and to examine how well education in the arts improves student achievement, attitudes toward school, interest in the arts, and classroom behavior. We believe the project will help us understand the influence of arts curriculum on students’ overall academic development as well as provide teachers with additional tools to engage students in classroom activities. What we learn in the project will help the Hawai‘i Department of Education develop arts curricula for students across the state. The project ($N=3$) and comparison ($N=3$) schools were chosen randomly from a set of Oahu Title I schools identified by the Department of Education.

II. Research Questions

Some general questions that will be addressed in the interviews are:

- A. What are the school’s programs and activities that may affect reading, math, science, and social studies?
- B. What kinds of arts activities are going on in the school?
- C. What are the cohort effects (grade level achievement, teacher attitudes, etc.)?
- D. What are the overall impressions of the program?

III. Interviewees

The principals at the project schools will be the focus of this interview guide.

IV. Interview Time

The interview for each principal should take between 30–45 minutes.

An Overview of the Interview Process

This section describes the logistical preparations necessary for conducting the interviews.

I. Before the Interview

- A. Review the instructions for administering the interview.
- B. Confirm the interview schedule with the project manager.
- C. Confirm the location of sites with the project manager.
 - 1. Ensure adequate travel time.
 - 2. Make sure you know how to get there and where to park.
 - 3. Check in at the office at least five minutes before the interview and ask about visitor sign-in procedures.
- D. Be sure you have all necessary interview materials.
 - 1. A copy of the interview guide.
 - 2. Note pad with sufficient number of pages.
 - 3. Two pens or pencils.

II. Note-taking Procedures

- A. Write your notes on a note pad.
- B. When you begin to move to a subsequent interview question, write the section letter and interview question number on the note pad as a reference for your notes.
- C. Take as many notes as you need to record information.
- D. If you cannot write down all the information during the interview, write notes immediately after the interview to avoid gaps in the information due to time interference with your memory of the conversation.

Conducting the Interview

This section describes how to conduct the interview. Instructions to the interviewer are outlined, and the interview script is given in boxes.

I. General Instructions

- A. The procedures in this section were developed to ensure that each interview covers all aspects of the intended research questions.
- B. Say the content in the boxes to the interviewee.
 - 1. Paraphrasing is permissible as long as the meaning of the statements is preserved.
- C. If you find ways to improve on the interview questions, record these in writing and include them in your final interview report.

II. Before the Interview

- A. Record the school name, interviewee's name, date, time, and location of the interview on the first page of the note pad.
- B. Take notes about the setting.
 - 1. Where in the school did the interview take place?
 - 2. Was there anything about the interview setting that affected the interview (e.g., people walking around, noise outside the windows, interruptions from office staff)?

III. Interviewer's Conduct During the Interview

- A. The interview should be conducted in a friendly conversational manner.
- B. Acceptable probing questions.
 - 1. Whenever you believe that the interviewee has provided a response that needs further clarification to address the question to the fullest, encourage the interviewee to provide further information through probing questions. However, if you believe the interviewee does not want to provide information beyond what was already provided, move onto the next question.
- C. Sometimes verbal prompting is not necessary.
 - 1. You may merely provide more time for the interviewee to ask information to the response.
- D. At other times general prompts may be used; for example:
 - 1. "Please elaborate on your answer."
 - 2. "Can you give me an example of what that means?"
- E. When interviewees provide responses that are evasive or tangential from the intent of the question, maneuver the conversation back to the original question.
 - 1. Be especially diplomatic if you think the interviewee feels uncomfortable about the question; that is, do not point out that the original response was evasive or tangential but try to gently guide the conversation back to the original questions. For example, "let me summarize your response to the question to make sure that the question has been addressed."
 - 2. For more forthright interviewees, it may be appropriate to point out that the question was not addressed.
 - a. In this case you may want to repeat the question.
 - 3. Ensure that the interviewee gives an example to support their opinions.
 - a. Ask the interviewee to provide examples to support his or her statements or opinions and

attitudes; for example, “what has led you to reach that conclusion?”

- F. Appropriate responses to various issues or resistance.
 - 1. If the interviewee seems very self-conscious, reluctant, or resistant to the interview questions, it may not be possible to elicit the desired depth of information.
 - 2. However, be friendly and as sensitive as possible to their cultural background, time restrictions, etc.
- G. Reflection of what was said by the interviewer.
 - 1. While some of the responses and explanations of the interviewer may at times be lengthy and off track, it is good practice to reflect what was said. This will ensure:
 - a. that you heard the interviewer correctly;
 - b. the interviewer has an opportunity to add or amend what was said; and
 - c. the question was addressed.

IV. Beginning the Interview and Establishing Rapport with the Interviewees

- A. The project manager will introduce the interviewer and describe the purpose of the interview.

Thank you for taking the time to meet with us.

This is [name], who is a graduate student taking a qualitative methods class at the University. As part of the course requirements they are expected to carry out some form of qualitative method. [Name] has volunteered to be a part of the study and help us in the principal interview portion. To make sure [Name] gets the most out of the process, he/she is going to be conducting the interview. As he/she has had only a basic overview of the project, I might interrupt from time to time to get clarification on certain responses as they pertain to the research. The interview will only take about 30 minutes.

As you know, the goal of the ARTS FIRST program is to improve student achievement by integrating the arts into other subjects. Are job is to examine different aspects of the program and determine if there are any outside factors that may influence the program. As a control school, the information you provide will help us interpret and compare the results from the project schools . This interview will consist of questions that review academic activities and programs which may affect student achievement, current arts activities and programs, and your opinions about student and teacher cohort effects. Do you have any questions before we begin?

V. Background and General Information Questions

- A. The graduate student will now conduct the rest of the interview.

1. How long have you been the principal at this school?

2. What were your initial thoughts about the ARTS FIRST program when it was introduced to you?

VI. Review of Activities and Programs that Might Affect Academic Achievement

- 1. What programs does your school use to address reading, math, science, or social studies for the 3rd-grade?**
- 2. How long has each of the programs been implemented?**
- 3. How effective do you think the programs are?**
- 4. Does your school have any supplemental, ancillary, or standalone programs in reading, math, science, or social studies (for example, older student mentoring programs, after-school tutoring, etc.)?**

[if yes, proceed to questions 5–8; if none proceed to section G]

- 7. How many students participate in these programs?**
- 8. How long have these programs been implemented?**
- 9. How effective do you think these programs are?**
- 10. Are there any other programs you think might influence student achievement?**

VII. Review of the Arts Activities and Programs in Which the School Participates

- 1. What are some of the current programs in which the students are exposed to the arts (that is, drama, music, dance, painting, drawing, ceramics, and so forth)?**
- 2. About how often are the students exposed to the arts?**
- 3. What kinds of factors affect the amount of time teachers devote to the arts (that is, is there a set amount of time that teachers are required to use the arts or is it determined by each of the teachers)?**

VIII. Interview of the Principals Opinions of Cohort Affects

- 1. We'd like to get a sense of this years 3rd-graders and the kinds of things that might affect their academic achievement. Is this cohort of 3rd-graders notably different than typical 3rd-graders (more health problems than usual, rowdier, influx of immigrants, etc.)?**
- 2. Is this cohort of teachers notably different (new teachers, teachers teaching outside their grade level, etc.)?**

IX. Ending the Interview

1. Is there any thing else you can think of to add which might affect student achievement?

2. Do you have any questions for us before we conclude the interview?

Thank you again for taking the time to meet with us and if you have any questions or comments that come to mind after we leave please feel free to contact me.

X. After the Interview

A. Protocol

1. When the interview is complete, thank the principal for their assistance and time.
2. Sign out at the office.

B. Type out your interview notes according to the interview question numbers.

1. Schedule an appointment with the research project manager and Dr. Brandon to review your participation and interview findings.
2. Submit final summarization and interview notes to the research project manager.