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Highest-Rated Development Applications

- The Beaverton School District Arts for Learning Lessons Project
- Everyday Arts for Special Education
- Arts Achieve: Impacting Student Success in the Arts
Everyday Arts for Special Education

Grant Title: Everyday Arts for Special Education
District: New York City Department of Education, District 75
Partners: Urban Arts Partnership
Evaluator: ArtsResearch, Dr. Rob Horowitz
Problem of Practice

Using Arts-Integration To Improve Learning for Students with disabilities:
By providing multiple entry points for learning through arts-based instruction, there are greater opportunities for student success

Arts Requirements Are Not Being Met:
District 75 and its schools did not have the capacity to provide state required arts instruction

Population of Students Served:
Highly specialized educational programs and educational support systems needed for each student

Need for Teacher Training:
District 75 was experiencing challenges with teacher recruitment and retention
Theory Of Action:

• A series of PD workshops and extensive in-school support provide participating teachers with skills and strategies across multiple arts disciplines (music, dance, visual arts and theater) to help students achieve their Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals.

• Core academic areas can be taught in more engaging ways through arts integration; using arts-based strategies to teach math or reading provides multiple entry points for the learner.

We wanted to see changes in:

• Innovative PD model changes in teacher practice
• Increasing socialization & communications & academic + arts proficiency

We wanted to develop, test, and explore:

• A arts-integrated delivery system in form of a curriculum
• How much dosage impacts teacher practice & student outcomes

Drivers of change:

• In class Coaching + full day PDs
• Working with a very cohesive school district
• Consistency of school participation over the 5 years
• Fidelity to the model
Evidence

Research/evaluation questions:
1. Does the program increase teachers’ ability to effectively apply multidisciplinary arts-based strategies for students with special needs?
2. Does the program improve students’ communication and socialization skills through multidisciplinary arts activities?
3. Does the program improve students’ arts proficiency through multidisciplinary arts activities?
4. Does the program improve students’ academic proficiency through multidisciplinary arts activities?
5. Are there different effects among different sample populations, including students on the autism spectrum, students with intellectual disabilities, students with emotional disturbance, and students with multiple disabilities?

Evaluation Design:
6. Impact Study (quasi-experimental, reading, math and SEL)
7. Implementation Study (descriptive)
8. Mixed Method - (includes the teacher assessments and observations)
Evidence will be shared at USDOE webinar. The full report will be publicly available Spring 2016. Journal articles will be submitted and there will be interim, publicly available papers on research components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Assessment 2013-2014 (n = 19,689)</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Pre (mean)</th>
<th>Post (mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>Nov 2013 – May 2014</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization Skills</td>
<td>Nov 2013 – May 2014</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows Directions</td>
<td>Nov 2013 – May 2014</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time on Task</td>
<td>Nov 2013 – May 2014</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Nov 2013 – May 2014</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency in EASE arts activity</td>
<td>Nov 2013 – May 2014</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Study Confirmatory Contrast</th>
<th>Treatment Group N of Students</th>
<th>Comparison Group N of Students</th>
<th>Treatment Group SD</th>
<th>Comparison Group SD</th>
<th>Comparison Group Mean</th>
<th>Impact Estimate</th>
<th>Standardized Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NYS Alternate Assessment: Reading</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dissemination

Products & Services

In person:
- 30 evidence-based curriculum modules
- Off-site PD series (intensives, bi-monthly)
- In class (embedded) PD series

Online:
- Online community of practice (Schoology)
  - Integrated Lesson Plan database
  - Coaching Sessions
  - Video examples of activities
- Administrative webinar

Blended Model
- 2013-2015 partnership with Los Angeles Unified School District
- Local & National conferences
- Online access to e-courses, lesson and video databases
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Beaverton School District
Arts for Learning (A4L) Project
i3 Development Grant

Beaverton School District, OR
Young Audiences (YAI), National Office
Young Audiences Oregon & SW Washington (YAO)
University of Washington (UW)
WestEd
**Problem of Practice**

**NEED:** Improvement of students’ reading and writing achievement through integration of the arts into the language arts curriculum in grades 3-5, with emphasis on 4th grade writing.

**Importance of 5 yr. i3 support:** To develop, implement and test **NEW UNIT** to focus on improvement of students’ writing skills; **EMBEDDED ASSESSMENTS** to assess each student’s progress; **ADAPTIVE STRATEGIES** to support professional learning, ELL, & low level readers; **DISTRICT-WIDE ADOPTION**;

**ON-LINE ACCESS TO THE A4L CURRICULUM AND RESOURCES**

**ADAPTATIONS OF A4L** to alternative sites and conditions.

**I3 PROJECT BUILT ON A4L FRAMEWORK & RESEARCH FINDINGS:** Student’s show a consistent pattern of statistically significant literacy gains and greater engagement across research sites, including Title 1, ELL, and low level readers.
Theory of Action: Beaverton A4L Lessons Project

Inputs
- Developed and tested A4L Lessons Units 1-6 with new unit on writing
- Refined & validated Comprehensive Cross-Unit Assessment (CCU)
- Design of artist residencies as integrated co-teaching model
- Theory: How People Learn
- Model: IDEA
- Partner expertise: Young Audiences, Inc., YAO, UW, Beaverton SD, & WestEd
- BSD: time in school day; staff training; district data, with modifications to meet school schedules & sustained professional learning for teachers
- Identification and professional learning for pool of artists with skills in arts and education

Outputs
- Activities
- Participation
- PD Classroom Teachers
  - 1 full day/Unit
  - School-based: 2 "booster" sessions per Unit (developer/literary specialist)
  - Sustained professional learning and planning
- PD Lead Teachers
  - Pre-training on 1 unit (16 teachers chosen—one/grade level/school)
  - Fall & Spring PD in smaller affinity groups
  - Teacher support provided by:
    - TOSA & YA staff
    - 16 Lead Teachers
    - On an as-needed basis
- PD Teaching Artists
  - 1 full day initially within 2 weeks of planned residency – revised for embedded co-teaching
  - 5-6 sessions embedded within and following unit

Participation
- High fidelity and quality implementation of A4L Lessons Units by classroom teachers: Using IDEA method
- Implementation in alignment with essential components of A4L & quality arts integration co-teaching residency model delivered by teaching artists with classroom teachers

Activities
- Student Outcomes
  - High level of student engagement in literacy lessons in and through the arts
  - Increased literacy and life skills as assessed by the CCU & student observations, teacher surveys, & TRAIL Markers & A4L Assessment Tool Kit at micro & macro level
  - Implementation in alignment with essential components of A4L & quality arts integration co-teaching residency model delivered by teaching artists with classroom teachers

Outcomes
- Short
- Medium
- Long
- Increased student achievement—OAKS Reading Test & CCUs
- Increased student achievement—OAKS Writing Test, discontinued after second year.
  1. Close achievement gaps in reading; ELL, students disabilities, low SES, with statistically significant level of improvement from baseline
  2. Increased percent of students meeting CCR Benchmark standards at grades 4 & 5
  3. Increase the percent of 4th-grade students meeting the state writing achievement standards from baseline (grade 4 intensive study with statistical significance.)

School Environment
- Professional Learning Community of teachers in grades 3-5
- Changed perception of value of arts integration in education
**Evidence**

**Hypothesis:** Students experiencing the Arts for Learning Units to teach literacy using arts integration will have significantly higher mean scores in reading and writing than students receiving a traditional literacy curriculum.

**Research Questions:**
1. What is the impact of A4L on students’ reading and writing achievement as measured by the Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS) and the CCU?
2. Do the impacts of A4L on students’ reading and writing achievement vary by students’ status as ELL, below grade level reading, or eligibility for free or reduced-priced meals?
3. What is the A4L program model as it is being implemented under i3?

**Methodology:** Formative and summative components & multi-method approach

**Formative evaluation**
- To inform & refine further development of the A4L Units & professional learning

**Summative evaluation**
- A three-year, cluster-randomized trial in 32 elementary schools in the Beaverton School District (OR)
  - 16 schools randomly assigned to the treatment and 16 to control conditions
  - Grades 3-5
Evidence

Research Results for Students in the Beaverton i3 Study:

▪ Students receiving A4L had higher mean scores on the Comprehensive Cross Unit Assessments (CCU’s) than the control group students not receiving A4L, with the mean difference for 4th grade student’s achieving statistical significance.

▪ The positive impact of the A4L Lessons on students’ OAKS Reading scores differed significantly for English Language Learners (ELL) and non-ELL students.

▪ Students’ engagement increased during A4L lessons and teaching artist residencies.

▪ Teachers reported positive student behaviors related to 21st Century skills, including collaboration, creativity and communication.
Dissemination

Strategies, Curriculum & Assessment Instruments Developed or Refined:

**Six A4L Units** – 2 per grade level aligned with National Common Core Standards

**Reliable and Valid Assessment Instruments**, including innovative embedded assessments to assess student learning at the micro and macro level.

**On-line access to the A4L Curriculum and Resources**, including audio, images and video, ELL strategies and adaptations, and alignment with Common Core Standards.

**Differentiated Professional Learning Model** to support and sustain effective teaching practices using essential components of A4L.

**Effective Co-teaching Model** for classroom teachers and teaching artists’ implementation of the A4L arts integrated units

Scale Up and Sustainability:

District-wide support in budget for all 3rd, 4th, 5th grade classrooms

Replication, expansion of grade levels, and adaptations of A4L in 12 Young Audiences’ Affiliate sites.
Problem of Practice

Goal 1
To improve student achievement in the arts through the development and implementation of formative and summative arts assessments aligned to local and national standards.

Goal 2
To translate the standards and information from assessments into classroom practices that support improved arts achievement for all students.

Goal 3
To promote innovations in student and teacher access to content and feedback through the use of technology.
**Arts Achieve Supports**

- Professional Development Workshops
  - Facilitator Trainings
  - Annual Kick-Offs
  - Assessment and Instructional retreats
  - Inter-visitations
- On-Site Work
  - On-site consultancies
- Resources
  - Blueprint-aligned units of study
  - Links to websites and other sources to support instructional and assessment practices
  - Data from the Benchmark Arts Assessments
  - Technology for instruction and assessment
  - Ning, technology platform to enable communication and sharing of resources

**Classroom Planning and Instruction**

- Balanced Assessment:
  - Teachers use data from formative and summative assessments to assess student progress and adjust their instructional practice and content
- Action Research
  - Create an action plan each year based on gaps observed in student work
  - Create a unit to assist in implementing the action plan
- Curriculum Content and Sequence:
  - Supports student attainment of Common Core Capacities and Blueprint benchmarks
- Technology:
  - Used to enhance and deepen instruction and assessment

**School Planning and Programming**

- School Arts Teams
  - School administrator, arts teacher, and facilitator meet to assess gaps in arts programming
- Arts Programming:
  - All students in arts classes receive yearlong instruction
- Arts Instructional Hours:
  - Hours in arts discipline increase

**Student Outcomes**

- Arts Achievement
  - Arts Content Knowledge
  - Arts Performance Skills
- Arts Engagement
  - Interest
  - Awareness of connections
  - Sense of success
- Common Core Capacities
  - Responds to varying demands of audience, task, purpose, and discipline
  - Comprehend as well as critique
  - Value evidence

**Logic Model**

- Writing Skills
- ELA Achievement
Implementation Findings

**Goal 1: Student Achievement in the Arts**

- Year 1: 63.85\(^\ast\) compared to 59.26
- Year 2: 67.64\(^\ast\) compared to 64.63
- Year 3: 67.55\(^\ast\) compared to 66.13

\(N=1,621\) for Arts Achieve, \(N=1,656\) for Control.

\(^\ast\) \(p < .05\).

**Goal 2: Arts Teacher Instructional Practice**

- Year 1: 4.14\(^\ast\) compared to 3.79
- Year 2: 4.43\(^\ast\) compared to 4.05
- Year 3: 4.37\(^\ast\) compared to 4.16

\(^\ast\) \(p < .05\).

**Goal 3: Technology Use in Target Classes**

- Year 1 (N=43): 60%
- Year 2 (N=47): 74%
- Year 3 (N=44): 76%

- Year 1 (N=43): 24%
- Year 2 (N=47): 46%
- Year 3 (N=44): 57%
Implementation Findings

On-Site Consultancies

Classroom Planning and Instruction

School Planning/Arts Programming
Dissemination

- Performance assessments
- Data reports
- Formative assessments
- Unit plans
- Action plans
- Technology integration ideas
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