

**Performing Arts Workshop
Evaluation Report
AIS Program 2001-2002**

July 10, 2002

Richard Siegesmund
University of Georgia
rsieg@uga.edu

**Performing Arts Workshop
Evaluation Report
AIS Program 2001-2002**

This report is an analysis of data collected by the Performing Arts Workshop (PAW) over the course of the 2001-2002 academic year in its Artists-in-Schools program. Data includes results from the pre-test and post-tests of student abilities using the PAW Student Skills Assessment rubric. The performance of 208 students 12 schools over 3 counties is considered. Either the PAW instructor or the Artistic Director completed the student assessments. Combining individual student scores produces profiles of learning by individual school.

In addition to the assessment of student/school performance, the evaluation reviews scores of teacher effectiveness using the PAW Teacher Skills Assessment rubric. Ten teachers completed this form as a self-assessment. PAW's Artistic Director also completed his own assessment using the same rubric of each of these ten teachers.

There are four addenda to the report. The assessment tools are included as Addendum 1. Graphic characterizations of student learning are included in Addendum 2. Graphic characterizations of teacher skills are included in Addendum 3. Profiles of learning by learning and individual rubric items are included in Addendum 4

These tools appear to be highly effective instruments for analyzing teaching practice and characterizing student achievement. There continued use and continuing refinement is recommended.

Summary of Recommendations

1. PAW needs to improve communication with those artists who overestimate the effectiveness of their teaching.
2. PAW needs to help skilled artists appreciate the effectiveness of their instruction.
3. PAW instructors should receive focused training on items 3.3, 3.4, 4.3, 2.3, and 4.2 from the Teaching Skills Assessment rubric in a pre-residency workshop.
4. Connect items from the Teacher Skills Assessment rubric with items from the Student Skills Assessment rubric.
5. Link the Student Skills Assessment rubric to the California VAPA Standards for elementary arts education.
6. Review the Teaching Skills Assessment Rubric for possible improvement.
7. A residency may be highly successful even if student achievement falls below average. These cases should be individually reviewed to identify factors contributing to limited student success.
8. Continue to use and refine both rubrics.
9. Use the rubrics as a means for focusing workshop training.
10. Communicate to classroom teachers, through the rubric, features of the PAW curriculum that offer prompts for reflective writing.

I. Analysis of Teaching

The artists who completed self-evaluation were generally extremely generous in their assessment of their own teaching (see Table 1).

Artist	Self Score
A	89
B	86
C	84
D	83
E	80
F	80
G	80
H	80
I	80
J	77

Table 1
Artists ranked by self-evaluation

The high self-estimation of teaching skills conforms to patterns of self-reporting in other Artists-in Schools programs conducted by different arts organizations throughout the Bay Area. An exception to this pattern is the reporting by PAW most skilled teachers. These artists were extremely self-critical. Tables 1 and 2 provide this comparison. PAW's top two instructors (as ranked by the Artistic Director) underscored their own teaching performance by a combined 26 points on a scale of 100.

Recommendation 1: PAW needs to improve communication with those artists who overestimate the effectiveness of their teaching

Recommendation 2: PAW needs to help skilled artists appreciate the effectiveness of their instruction.

Artist	AD Score	Difference
H	98	+18
D	91	+8
F	80	0
A	75	-14
E	73	-7

C	73	-11
B	72	-14
G	64	-16
I	59	-21
J	51	-26

Table 2
Artists ranked by Artistic Director evaluation
with scoring difference from self-evaluation

Analysis of responses to individual items within the rubric reveals specific weaknesses and strengths in the pedagogical abilities of individual instructors (see Table 3).

Rubric Item	Description	Total Score (100 high)	SD	Artists rated 1 by AD
3.3	Adaptability to change in plan	69	1.70	6
3.4	Improvisational skill	70	1.57	5
4.3	Self-analysis of class presentation	70	1.19	3
2.3	Aesthetic awareness of composition	67	1.23	2
4.2	Evaluation of problem-solving exercises	69	1.00	2

Table 3
Assessment items with lowest score and highest variance

Learning to recognize and adjust to teachable moments in the classroom is the most difficult dimension of teacher education. Indeed, many consider this to be essentially unteachable—a realm of instinctive talent within the art of teaching. While there is some truth to this position, PAW has long maintained that this ability can be cultivated and developed within sensitive teachers. The rubrics for teacher and student skills are positive steps in standardizing teacher development.

Item 2.3 (Aesthetic awareness of composition) needs to be more carefully defined. This may relate to items 3.1 (Associates a specific perceptual detail with a feeling) and 3.2 (Brainstorms multiple associations of detail and feeling) from the Student Assessment Rubric. If so, make this explicit. Teachers would then understand that making explicit

connections between perceptual detail and feelings is an important facet of their teaching. In 50% of the Artistic Director's observations, the overall category of Aesthetic Valuing was the weakest element in the instructors' pedagogy (see Addendum 3).

Poor performance on items 4.2 and 4.3 (aspects of analysis in teaching) is often an indicator of poor time management in a classroom. This can result in a teacher getting swept up in the flow of normal activity and losing sight of the critical thinking goals of each lesson. Reminding teachers to reiterate the educational goal in each lesson (and not focus as much on every child's experience of doing art) might be helpful.

Rubric Item	Description	Total Score (100 high)	SD	Artists rated 5 by AD
5.1	Clarity and consistency of behavioral rules	88	.94	7
4.5	Objectivity	87	.59	6
5.2	Communication with classroom teacher	88	1.05	7
1.4	Voice modulation	85	.44	5
5.3	Use of elements of class dynamics	83	.81	5

Table 4
Assessment items with highest score and low variance

The assessment found the general strength of the Artist-in-Schools instructors was their skill in classroom management (see Table 4). Not only did the artists express a high level of confidence in their abilities in their self-evaluation, but also this was born out in the Artistic Director's evaluations that found that 70% of classes were exceptionally well managed.

Recommendation 3: PAW instructors should receive focused training on items 3.3, 3.4, 4.3, 2.3, and 4.2 from the Teaching Skills Assessment rubric in a pre-residency workshop.

Recommendation 4: Connect items from the Teacher Skills Assessment rubric with items from the Student Skills Assessment rubric.

Relationship to the California VAPA Standards

Along with connecting the Teacher Skills Assessment to the Student Skills Assessment, PAW should consider developing a chart showing how its curriculum of artistic inquiry corresponds to the new California Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA) Standards. PAW has already done this for middle school instruction at the Robeson-Rivera Academy. This chart demonstrated arts instruction was well above grade level. A similar chart for elementary level instruction would probably also indicate accelerated student learning in a PAW curriculum.

Recommendation 5: Link the Student Skills Assessment rubric to the California VAPA Standards for elementary arts education.

II. Student Achievement

A comparison of pre and post student score shows that students improved or remained the same in all of dimensions of learning (perception, conception, expression, reflection, re-vision) at virtually all of the schools. The only exception to this was Monte Verde Elementary: students' ability to reflect on their work decreased from the pre- to the post-assessment. The PAW instructor at Monte Verde was evaluated as weak in teaching aesthetic valuing and analytic skills. Consequently, the weakness of students to demonstrate reflective skills is not surprising. If the teacher is not providing instruction in reflective skills then it is unrealistic to expect students to demonstrate increased proficiency in their use. Another problem that also emerges in the Monte Verde evaluation is that individual scores do not seem to be discriminating (e.g. all students received the highest score, 5, for their ability to work constructively together in a group). This suggests a possible need for further training of PAW instructors in making fine-grained distinctions when completing the Student Skills Assessment rubric.

Overall, global increase in achievement is remarkable. Considering that 30% of the sites reported an increase in student opposition to instruction during the residencies, this increase is even more noteworthy. It is worth noting the schools that registered major gains in student learning and all reported an increase of student opposition to instruction (e.g. Jose Ortega). As student learning increases even as opposition increases suggests that the problems of student opposition are not a result of PAW instruction. It is more likely due the released anxieties following "testing season," which was when most of the post assessments were conducted.

	opposition	perception	conception	expression	reflection	revision	TOTAL
Green Hills	0.00	0.85	1.13	1.19	1.11	1.24	5.52
Laurel Del	-0.05	0.86	1.53	0.83	0.62	1.27	5.12
Harte	-0.08	0.78	0.83	0.83	1.00	0.81	4.25
Ortega	0.09	0.72	0.88	0.53	0.88	0.77	3.77
San Pedro	-0.04	0.81	0.94	0.24	0.46	1.24	3.70

Bayshore	0.00	0.73	0.71	0.67	0.32	1.08	3.51
Pacific Heights	-0.07	0.93	0.74	0.46	1.00	0.30	3.43
Dixie	0.00	0.62	1.00	0.95	0.10	0.59	3.26
Average	0.05	0.59	0.75	0.58	0.51	0.66	3.09
Garfield	-0.07	0.25	0.47	0.46	0.84	0.26	2.28
Swett	0.76	0.10	0.50	0.00	0.48	0.07	1.14
Clarendon	0.04	0.08	0.02	0.27	0.02	0.29	0.69
Monte Verde	0.00	0.37	0.27	0.49	-0.69	0.00	0.45

Table 5
Schools by largest raw improvement scores

There are varieties of ways to characterize successful student learning. Looking at raw improvement scores, the schools with the largest improvement were Green Hills, Laurel Dell, and Bret Harte (see Table 5). Interestingly, the teachers in this school ranked from one of the most accomplished to one of the least accomplished. This suggests the standards for evaluating PAW instructors are rigorous, and that an instructor who receives a modest skills evaluation can effect significant learning outcomes in the students.

Teacher B also achieved impressive results with students at Bayshore. B's teaching scores would not indicate she/he is one of the stronger PAW instructors; yet, the assessments of students' learning suggest she/he is quite skillful. The disjunction between B's success with effecting student achievement (which is the bottom line) and the mediocre teaching evaluations by teacher B and the Artistic Director point to a possible problem in the Teaching Skills rubric. The rubric may not be providing enough credit for aspects of teaching that are highly effective for student learning.

Recommendation 6: The case of teacher B indicates a possible problem in the validity of the Teaching Skills Assessment Rubric. The rubric should be reviewed for possible improvement.

It should not be assumed that all schools that preformed below average in raw score improvements were unsuccessful residencies. The students at Garfield Elementary began

the residency program performing significantly above average in all dimensions of artistic inquiry. Therefore, although their gains were relatively modest, the students were performing at an exceptionally high level of achievement. The students at Swett Elementary and Clarendon began close to the mean of overall student performance and showed slight improvement. Students at John Swett demonstrated the highest levels of opposition to instruction of all sites in the survey. Monte Verde is the only case where one might suspect that weak teaching skills contributed to the modest levels of growth demonstrated by the students.

Recommendation 7: A residency may be highly successful even if student achievement falls below average. These cases should be individually reviewed to identify factors contributing to limited student success.

Base-line student scores are consistent across all five dimensions of artistic inquiry. Initial pre-assessments of students find them struggling to engage the curriculum (score: 2.46— i.e. midway between Rarely and Sometimes. See Addendum 2, "Summary: All AIS Schools 2002"). Post assessment finds students performing at 3.09 (a .6 overall improvement).

The PAW curriculum cycle of artistic inquiry can be engaged at any development level of the child. It is the responsibility of the instructor to work with the classroom teacher to adapt the curriculum for each classroom. Therefore, it is appropriate to compare success in teaching the cycle of inquiry across ages and abilities. Lower levels of student learning would be attributable to an inappropriate matching of lessons to developmental level, poor teaching skills in delivery the full scope of the curriculum, or even (as found in earlier assessments) the teacher delivering an arts education curriculum that is valid but that is not a PAW cognitive curriculum. There is not enough information in the data provided to determine if any of these conditions are an impact on overall student achievement.

Although all schools experienced student improvement, only one school (Garfield) experienced sustained high levels of student achievement. It may be interesting to examine what the Garfield students "know and can do." When students are doing so well in the PAW curriculum, what kinds of attitudes and abilities do they demonstrate? This site may serve as an exemplar of benefits from sustained instruction in PAW curriculum.

Impact by SES

The most accurate predictor of test scores and student overall success in school is Social Economic Status (SES). This is true for all standardized assessments in the arts. Interestingly, the reports of student success from PAW residencies run counter to this expectation.

	Lower SES
Green Hills	11%
Laurel Dell	70%
Harte	63%
Ortega	31%
San Pedro	100%
Bayshore	56%

Table 6
Top six schools for student achievement and SEC

The top school for raw student achievement (Green Hills) has a relatively low percentage of SES students, thus confirming the assumption of high performance tied to low SES. However, four of the next five high performing schools have majority of students who can be characterized as lower SES (see Table 6). The PAW curriculum appears to be highly effective for working with students from this lower economic quartile. This is a significant finding

Analysis by Rubric Items

Multiple themes emerge from a comparison of scores by individual rubric item (see Tables 7 and 8). Ability to revise one's own work is noted as a significant weakness in pre-testing (17% of all students. See Table 7). This number drops to 11% in post testing, suggesting that students are improving in this skill. Student strengths in post-testing are their ability to find a resolution (31%, item 4.2), their capacity for working constructively in groups (25%, item 6.3), and their ability to identify the problem for solution (19%, item 2.1). Addendum 4 provides a complete comparison of ease and difficulty of individual items from the Students Skills Assessment.

The rubric appears to be highly successful at identifying areas of strength and weakness in student learning. This information should be used to strengthen teacher training and articulation of learning objectives within individual lessons.

Most certainly, the rubric could profit from continue attention and articulation. However, do not add more assessment items. The concern is on focusing the current set of assessment items and making sure that teachers understand each of these dimensions. Teacher workshops could focus on individual items. In these workshops, individual instructors could share how they interpret and teach to specific items of the rubric.

Finally, the rubric is also a tool to communicate to the classroom teacher where there are opportunities for extension. For example, 31% of the students did well at finding a resolution to their performances. If students write about their resolutions it will not only strengthen learning in the PAW curriculum, it is also a powerful prompt for extended writing by the students. This would be a far more dynamic form of journaling than simply asking students to recall vocabulary used during the PAW class, which unfortunately currently passes as journaling in many schools.

	Difficulty Pretest			Facility Pretest		
Clarendon Elementary	4.1	2.3	6.1	4.2	2.1	6.3
John Swett Elementary	4.3	3.2	6.2	5.1	4.2	6.3
Bret Harte Elementary	3.1	3.2	2.3	5.3	2.1	4.2
Garfield Elementary	4.3	5.3	3.3	2.3	4.2	6.3
Jose Ortega Elementary	4.3	6.1	5.3	3.1	2.1	6.3
Bayshore Elementary	4.3	6.2	5.3	4.1	4.2	2.1
Monte Verde Elementary	2.3	3.2	3.3	4.1	2.1	6.3
Green Hills Elementary	6.1	6.2	5.1	4.2	2.1	6.3
Pacific Heights Middle	4.3	6.3	6.2	4.2	3.1	2.1
Dixie Elementary	3.2	4.3	6.1	6.3	4.2	2.1
Laurel Dell Elementary	4.3	6.2	6.1	4.1	4.2	2.1
San Pedro Elementary	2.3	4.3	6.1	4.2	2.1	6.3

Table 7

Top three rubric items for difficulty and facility: Pre-Test

	Difficulty Posttest			Facility Posttest		
Clarendon Elementary	3.2	2.3	5.2	6.2	4.2	6.3
John Swett Elementary	4.3	5.1	5.3	2.3	4.2	3.3
Bret Harte Elementary	3.1	3.2	4.1	2.1	5.3	4.2
Garfield Elementary	4.3	5.3	3.3	2.1	4.2	6.3
Jose Ortega Elementary	4.3	6.2	5.2	4.2	6.3	3.1
Bayshore Elementary	4.3	6.2	5.3	4.2	6.3	2.1
Monte Verde Elementary	2.3	3.2	3.3	4.2	2.1	6.3
Green Hills Elementary	2.2	2.3	6.1	3.1	4.2	6.3
Pacific Heights Middle	6.3	4.3	6.2	3.3	4.2	2.1
Dixie Elementary	4.3	6.1	6.2	2.1	6.3	4.2
Laurel Dell Elementary	6.1	6.2	5.2	3.3	2.1	6.3
San Pedro Elementary	4.3	6.1	6.2	4.1	4.2	6.3

Table 8

Top three rubric items for difficulty and facility: Post-Test

Recommendation 8: Continue to use and refine both rubrics

Recommendation 9: Use the rubrics as a means for focusing workshop training

Recommendation 10: Use the rubrics to communicate to classroom teachers

features of the PAW curriculum that offer prompts for reflective writing.

Extending the rubrics

As a compliment to the current rubrics, PAW may want to consider developing a chart detailing a development sequence to its lesson plans. The new VAPA standards could

provide guidance in generally accepted age appropriate activities. PAW teachers could then check where her/his instruction is falling within this matrix. Data from the rubric could generate graphic characterizations of the development level of instruction. This would be important to compare to the overall success of teaching a curriculum of artistic inquiry, which the present rubrics provide.

A rubric detailing development sequence would also allow PAW to use the VAPA Standards to articulate its curriculum of artistic and inquiry, and not create the dysfunctional situation where the Standards drive the creation of curriculum.

Conclusion

This is the first year using the rubrics for student and teacher skills in the AIS program. Both of these tools show great promise as effective assessment tools. The continued use and refinement of both of these instruments is strongly encouraged.