

TCAP-AEAT AERA 2008

Abstract

AERA 2008 Proposal

An Online Arts Education Assessment Tool (AEAT) for California K-12 Public Schools and Districts
Audience: K-12 Educators and Administrators, Arts Educators

This proposal focuses on the second year development, revision, and expanded testing of an online arts assessment tool for California K-12 schools and districts. The 2007 paper presented first year development, pilot testing, and results. First year results are now stored in a relational database and form the baseline assessment data for California schools and districts to inform local curricular, instructional, and professional development decisions regarding arts education. AEAT test items are within the guidelines of the current California Visual and Performing Arts Framework and Standards.

The AEAT is online and designed to easily facilitate assessment of arts education programs to inform efforts to improve outcomes for all students, especially those students in traditionally underserved schools and school populations.

"Second Year Implementation and Study of an Online Arts Education Assessment Tool (AEAT) for California K-12 Public Schools and Districts"

By Cathleen Galas and Kristine Alexander
The California Arts Project

Background and Purpose

Introduction

Arts education assessment has traditionally been an arduous process, assessing numerous aspects of an arts educational program, requiring multiple sessions of school staff participation and often taking a year and a half or more to complete the assessment. At that point in time, teaching and administrative staff may have changed, as well as student demographics, funding, and student needs. Record keeping of data collected in these assessments was usually poor, with most data having been thrown out or lost. No data gathering and management system exists for California's arts education programs. California

schools and districts need a streamlined, up to date arts education program assessment tool that provides timely information from which to build and evolve quality arts programs for students.

The California Department of Education, The California Arts Project, California Legislative Coalition for Arts Education, the California Arts Council, and other entities had implemented several assessment projects in the 1990's to assist in the implementation of quality arts education programs in California public schools. These assessment initiatives involved multiple school and district staff members to implement assessments that took a year to a year and a half to administer. After a year and half of assessment, the school was finally ready to begin actual implementation of recommendations for school arts education program improvement.

A new model, The California Arts Project Arts Assessment Education Tool, TCAP-AEAT, was developed to expedite the assessment process using programmatic developmental criterion to supply assessment results and recommendations in the areas of curriculum, instruction, and professional development. This model was first developed and implemented by the California Arts Project in 2006-07.

The 2006-07 pilot was administered in the fall of 2006 and winter of 2007, using paper and pencil assessments given only by TCAP site directors, and then entered online by site directors and the Executive Office staff after the database was built.

In its final version, this model will be administered online, where Internet access is available, with computer-generated results available immediately and guidelines for school specific next steps from the TCAP assessor available within weeks. All data, including TCAP recommendations and implemented school changes will be stored in the AEAT database. Data storage over time will serve as a data management system for schools and districts and allow for longitudinal study of arts education programs.

Providing immediate results, and supplying a plan of developmental next steps and timeline on the key areas of arts education will allow schools to implement recommendations and to be ready for a second assessment in the time that it traditionally took to do only the first assessment. The TCAP-AEAT online system will serve as a data management system for schools and districts involved in assessment and development of arts education improvement plans. The data will be recorded, updated as needed, and will begin to provide a much-

needed view of arts education programs statewide.

Arts Education and Assessment

Efforts to assess arts education programs have primarily taken the form of school self-study and planning over a 12 to 18 month period. These arts education assessments required the formation of a community and school team and used a guidebook format with multiple paper checklists to assess seven to nine focus areas, with multiple sub-topics in each of those areas. Three key programs were used in California: Arts Count, 1990; Arts Education Program Toolkit, 2001; and Community Arts Education Partnership (CAEP), 2003. There were inconsistencies in using these guidebooks, school data that was to be collected was hard to obtain, reports were not timely, standards were inconsistent, and no digital records or databases were produced, resulting in loss of any school or district longitudinal data records.

History

Over the past twenty years in California there have been three major statewide efforts to strengthen public K-12 school arts education programs. Each of these programs, along with other smaller, efforts have included as a key part of the process the assessment of the current status of arts education programs either at all levels. An examination of the three major statewide efforts informed the design of The California Arts Project's Arts Education Assessment Tool, TCAP-AEAT.

In 1988, the National Endowment for the Arts' issued *Toward Civilization: A Report on Arts Education*. This national report to Congress on the status of arts education in the United States set in motion a number of efforts around the country aiming to improve arts education. Building upon this national momentum, California began the *Arts Count: Basic Learning for Tomorrow* initiative. The Arts Count initiative was funded by a number of sources including Chevron U.S.A. and the Getty Center for Education in the Arts and was supported in leadership by the California State Department of Education, Assembly Office of Research, California Legislative Coalition for Arts Education, and the California Arts Council. Arts Count brought together three Arts Education Task forces. These task forces assembled various constituencies from education and arts communities within the state, and issued a number of reports and accompanying recommendations.

One of the historic documents from this era was *The Handbook for Planning an Effective Visual and Performing Arts Program for California*

Public Schools Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve commissioned by the County/State Steering Committee of the California Association of County Superintendents of Schools in 1990. The *Handbook* was designed to function as a companion to other statewide arts education documents including the *Visual and Performing Arts Framework*. The *Handbook* was "...developed for teachers, administrators, parents, students, board members, artists and community members." (Arts Count, 1990). The *Handbook's* content was designed to enhance an established well-developed arts curriculum to help begin an arts education program, and to assess the status of current arts education within a school. The *Handbook* was distributed as part of the conference materials at a California State Staff Development and Curriculum Leadership Conference in 1990. Following distribution, committees of arts education representatives from schools and districts were pulled together within some regions for meetings aimed at engaging the stakeholders in utilizing the content found in the handbook. No official statewide data gathering system was put into place.

During the same time period, The California Arts Project, TCAP, emerged as one of the nine projects of the California Subject Matter Project. TCAP utilized the *Handbook* and other documents as a central part of their teacher and administrative development strand throughout the early 1990s. Teachers and administrators attending either open or invitational institutes offered by TCAP's regional professional development centers were trained on the goals of the *Arts Count* initiatives, became familiar with current data on arts education within the state, developed in-service workshops, and were charged with administering the Visual and Performing Arts Program Assessment found in Appendix III of the *Handbook*.

The *Handbook's* Visual and Performing Arts Program Assessment provided a set of tools designed to assess the status of current arts education programs. The seven categories of assessment each had a four-point scale for scoring from effective to ineffective. The seven areas of assessment were curriculum, instruction, staff development, resources, program support and implementation, and program evaluation. Teachers that attended or lead TCAP institutes over the next few years, along with administrators attending, engaged in assessing their current arts programs. Many developed an improvement plan, and facilitated the adoption of arts education policies by their local school boards. While these efforts and results were shared at the regional level within the TCAP community and sometimes county offices, there was not a statewide effort to gather

data, so impact of the assessment or plan implementation was negligible. Formal records on the assessments, if kept, have been lost, put into storage, or forgotten. Other data or results of the implementation around the larger *Arts Count* initiative, including arts education assessment efforts either at county or in other settings during this period either were not recorded or have been lost with changing leadership. Most information from this period relies on oral recounts by leaders from that time period or through the few existing copies of the published documents.

Nine years later, in 1997, Delaine Eastin, then California Superintendent of Public Instruction, issued a call to action: "The lack of attention to arts education has been the silent crisis in California schools for too long..."(*ArtsWork*, 1997). In the spring of 1997, following the release of the 1996 *Visual and Performing Arts Framework for Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve*, Eastin created the Superintendent's Task Force on the Visual and Performing Arts. The task force consisted of 60 members from the arts education stakeholder community that included researchers, scholars, parents, business representatives, teachers and others. The result of the four-month effort was the report *ArtsWork: A Call for Arts Education for All California Students* that outlined five key recommendations to improve arts education within the state. The five recommendations included a call for visual and performing arts content standards for K-12 students (which were adopted in 2001 by the State Board of Education), support for arts programs, literacy in and through the arts, preparation for career, and access for all students.

Following the publication of *ArtsWork* in early 1998, the California Department of Education sent each school a short questionnaire with the purpose of gathering information on frequently asked questions regarding arts education. The goal was to establish a baseline of knowledge on the status of arts education within California public schools. Questions centered on who was teaching the arts, what arts disciplines were being taught, what did schools see as indicators of success, and how were schools funding such instruction. The survey resulted in a small number of responses statewide. While not seen as an assessment process, the *2000 ArtsWork Report*, which was only released in small numbers in a prepublication draft format, provided additional insight as to the status of California's arts education and was the precursor to the Model Arts Education Program and its Network of districts. The data from the 2000 report seems to be only available in existing copies of the prepublication draft.

Also in 1998, inspired by the draft report and assisted by a booming economy and tax surplus within California the ArtsWork Visual and Performing Arts Grant Program for K -12 public school districts was established. This 6 million dollar grant program provided districts with seed funding to improve their standards-based arts education program in a number of areas. One of the focus areas available to districts was the California Model Arts Program (MAP) Network. This program was implemented through the California Department of Education in collaboration of with the California Alliance for Arts Education, the California Arts Council, and The California Arts Project, TCAP. The MAP Network began in 1999 with fourteen school districts working together with the California Department of Education and The California Arts Project to develop a process "...to help school districts to evaluate, improve, and expand visual and performing arts programs in California schools through a guided self-evaluation process, professional development seminars, conferences and a supportive network of colleagues."(MAP Toolkit, 2001)

The next few years of the MAP Network produced the next generation of tools for schools and districts to assess the status of their arts education program. During this period the MAP Network and its collaborators had developed *The Arts Education Program Toolkit, A Visual and Performing Arts Program Assessment Process*. The *Toolkit* guides a district or school through a complex assessment process examining what is place for arts education and identifying the continuum of next steps in nine key focus areas. These focus areas are standards-based curriculum, instruction and methodology, student assessment, professional development, program administration and personnel, partnerships and collaborations, funding, resources and facilities, and program evaluation. The nine focus areas reflect a number of the seven original categories of program assessment found in the *Arts Count Handbook*. The *MAP Toolkit* provides a self-assessment questionnaire and inventory, matrix continuum outlining achievement levels of best practices, building, and foundation for each of the nine areas, and templates to guide the development of a written report and action plan.

By the end of the MAP Network Grant Program in 2003-2004, the network had expanded to 53 districts and had begun to move to an on-line *Toolkit*. During the granting period many districts struggled with the complexity of the data collection for the *Toolkit's* nine areas. The MAP Network, while no longer operational due to funding cutbacks, opened its doors in 2005 to any district within the state. At this time the California Department of Education (CDE) has access to

some of the data gathered in the pilot over that period of time, but given the individual approach to the administration of the assessment within schools and districts, the data only provides locally useful feedback.

In 2002-2003, as a response to the complexity of the MAP Toolkit process and to engage additional schools and districts in evaluation of their arts education programs, the Community Arts Education Project (CAEP), was developed by the California State PTA and California Alliance for Arts Education, an alliance of arts education organizations within California. CAEP's set of tools was based on the *MAP Toolkit's* nine focus areas and continuum. The CAEP was designed to help parents, local schools and school districts to work together to create district wide systemic change in arts education through a simpler process than the MAP Toolkit. Districts using the CAEP process found gathering and assessing the data in the nine areas took at least a year of monthly or bi-monthly meetings. The CAEP was not an effort to gather statewide data, but an effort to support grassroots arts education improvement. As such, it has no system for gathering or storing statewide data.

TCAP-AEAT History

Tool Development 2006-07

The TCAP-AEAT development process began in early 2006 with a review of both national and California arts education program assessment tools. A deeper analysis of the California tools was conducted, including the strengths and weaknesses of the related assessment processes and results. Within the TCAP network of statewide and regional directors, over *ninety combined years* of hands-on experience was tapped, covering development, implementation and assessment of action plans from the California tools. The group incorporated this working knowledge throughout the development of the tool.

The first revelation of the analysis and review was a need to narrow the TCAP-AEAT assessment areas to those that laid the foundation for implementation of standards-based arts education for all students and that aligned with TCAP's mission and goals. The three core areas of curriculum, instruction and professional development were identified as the areas on which TCAP would focus its assessment. A need to build upon past assessment tools and scoring levels found within the state was also identified. A first draft of possible assessment items in

the three areas was developed. A sub-committee of the TCAP leadership undertook a series of refinements and calibrations. The goal of the assessment in each area was to structure the prompts as an embedded professional development experience, fostering understanding of the key characteristics of a standards-based arts education program in the participants engaging in the assessment, while also leading the school and district in developing their action plan. The refinement of the assessments prompts and related scoring statements took place over a nine-month period, in a process that moved between the sub-committee and the entire TCAP regional leadership. Discussions on the format of the computer-generated report were begun, but the reports were individually processed and delivered by the site directors. The development of the report became one of the major goals for the 2007-08 study. Discussions were held to outline the key components for the report beyond the assessment results. Existing state databases were examined and key databases were selected.

The web-based structure of the TCAP-AEAT was designed and built by WebMedia Solutions. WebMedia had built and maintained other web-based tools for TCAP and other educational agencies. They were selected due to their understanding of the educational goals, ability to access existing state databases, their knowledge of TCAP methods of working, and attention to and support of the end users of the tool.

In fall 2006, the first iteration of the TCAP-AEAT was developed, refined, and a first pilot study assessing eighty-four schools across the state began.

2006 -2007 Pilot

The TCAP-AEAT was first administered to California schools and districts in 2006-2007, with development and revisions occurring between January to December 2006. School assessment and data collection occurred largely between January and February 2007. The first pilot iteration was done with paper and pencil assessments administered by TCAP site directors and then later entered into the TCAP-AEAT database by the TCAP Executive Office staff. Only the twenty-seven criteria statements were used for measurable evidence during 2006-07

Eighty-four elementary through high school schools were assessed in the 2006-7 pilot. Double assessments were conducted on thirteen out of the eighty-four schools, a 15% sample to test inter-rater reliability.

The AEAT database system has now been built and is in use to store and compare information. As the administration of the AEAT is embedded in a professional development process, the TCAP site directors were able to share the results verbally with the 2006 -2007 schools to facilitate their planning prior to the data entry process. After the pilot study, the individual school's reports were written and added to the online administration center. These reports are shared with the schools to continue to help guide their planning process.

Pilot Study Methods 2006-07

Pilot testing began in fall 2006 across the state within the 15 regions of the state educational agency. TCAP site directors in all CSMP regions in California assessed eighty-four schools, elementary through high school. The schools assessed include urban, rural, and suburban, with many "targeted" improvement schools. Site directors met with principal stakeholders at school sites. Site directors in close geographic proximity were able to conduct double assessments by assessing each other's schools. Thirteen of the eighty-four assessed schools, or 15% of the sample, were double assessed for inter-rater reliability tests. The first part of the data analysis examined double assessment data gathered by site directors. TCAP site directors who were in close geographic proximity to each other were able to go in to each other's schools and conduct the assessment a second time. The site directors were the only individuals who were in on the development discussions and knowledgeable enough to conduct the assessment with school personnel.

Pilot Study 2006-07 Results

In the 2006-07 pilot study tests of inter-rater agreement were performed on 15% of the sample, or 13 out of 84 schools. Correlations on all items comprising each of the three quality indicators (9 items for Curriculum, 10 items for Instruction, 8 items for Professional Development), as well as the means for each quality indicator, showed that the inter-rater agreement was excellent (all but four coefficients $> .90$, all $ps < .01$). We used a Repeated-Measures Analysis of Variance to examine differences among the means of the three quality indicators for each school. Results indicated that Professional Development was significantly higher ($M = 2.81$, $SD = 1.99$) than both Curriculum ($M = 1.88$, $SD = 0.93$) and Instruction ($M = 1.81$, $SD = .82$); $F(2, 166) = 31.18$, $p < .001$.

2007 – 2008 Study

Purpose of the 2007 - 2008 Study

The 2006 -2007 pilot year study and results both developed the first draft of the AEAT and informed the revisions of the AEAT. The purpose of the 2007 - 2008 study is to continue to investigate the implementation of and the administration capacity building for the AEAT throughout all of The California Arts Projects regional sites.

2007 – 2008 AEAT Website Development and Revisions

The 2006 -2007 pilot did not indicate necessary revisions in the criteria in curriculum, instruction, and professional development prompts or statements. The prompts and criteria remained for 2007 -2008 consistent with the 2006 -2007 pilot.

The AEAT website was fully developed in July and August of 2007. The school report has been also been developed, and an online version of the report is available. The results of the pilot study indicated that some changes in the AEAT website needed to be made. WebMedia made the changes indicated and for the 2007-08 study site directors utilized the revised AEAT online version. Many of the site directors are still finding they need to administer the assessment via paper and pencil due to limited internet access at some schools sites, but the tool is available on online. The first final online school report was ready in October 2007.

2007 TCAP Capacity Building

The California Arts Project, TCAP, AEAT implementation plan include a statewide capacity building for administration of the AEAT. TCAP has six regional sites and a statewide leadership and development center. To increase regional based TCAP AEAT administration capacity, TCAP followed the past successful model and practice of statewide regional teams development. TCAP site directors and statewide leadership had met in July 2007 to identify the capacity building content and to set individual regional site goals. The AEAT capacity program content was then designed and implemented by the TCAP Leadership and Development Center and site directors. Each regional site and the statewide office recruited teams of two to three AEAT facilitators from their regional leadership cadre. A profile of the ideal facilitator was developed and each TCAP site director recruited team members in late summer. The expectations for the new facilitators during 2007 -2008 period included shadowing the supporting the TCAP site director in the process of administrating the AEAT within schools in their regions.

The TCAP AEAT leadership development program occurred over three days in the fall of 2007, bringing together two to three facilitators in each TCAP site. The AEAT participants were provided an overview of the AEAT, history of arts education program assessment in California, in-depth review of the content and purpose, and time to role-play both facilitator and school member. The teams also reviewed the online data entry into the AEAT tool, but for the 2007 -2008 TCAP site directors and TCAP statewide office personnel will be the only groups with data entry access. The AEAT teams provided input on the final design of the AEAT school report format, identified possible assessment challenges when implementing the AEAT and brainstormed solutions. The work generated at the program will become part of the content of the regional TCAP AEAT administration handbook.

The TCAP site directors shared with their teams the AEAT goals they had set for their site in July 2007. The goal range was between twenty to forty schools in each of the fifteen regions to be assessed. TCAP regional site directors also developed regional action plans around implementing the AEAT within their region more broadly.

2007 – 2008 Methods

School assessments and data collection for this study occurred between September 2007 and February 2008. The AEAT included the *school profiler*, given to the school before the assessment process, the twenty-seven criterion statements in the three areas of curriculum, instruction, and professional development, and a school history of arts education was gathered when possible. 2006-07 assessment data was available to the eighty-four schools that were originally assessed in the 2006-07 pilot study. Longitudinal data will be available from now on for TCAP's AEAT schools. The assessments in 2007-08 have been administered by site directors with the AEAT facilitators shadowing and supporting the process.

Results

TCAP-AEAT Development

The general aim of this work has been to create an easily administered arts education assessment that produces and records timely, pertinent data to inform school arts education reform. TCAP assessor feedback is direct and provides guidance immediately on how to improve the program to improve student learning. The iterative cycle assesses the program, implements the plan, and reviews the data.

Funding Realities and the Political Landscape Impacts Study

In July 2007, TCAP leadership set goals of approximately 120 to 140 schools to assess during the 2007 - 2008 study period. Site directors felt this was a reasonable goal since the Governor of California had secured block grant funding for every school in California to improve their standards based arts education program for all students. Since assessment of the current arts education program is the first step in improvement, sites were confident of their estimated AEAT schools. By mid-summer it was becoming apparent that the California state budget was in trouble due to a variety of reasons, including decline home sales, and that schools and districts were becoming anxious about possible cuts in educational funding.

By December 2007, impending immediate cuts across of all California budget categories, including education were a reality. The forecast for the next year's budget also was bleak. These concerns began to cause reactions within the educational community. Rumors of cuts and recalls of the new arts education block funding began statewide. These factors began to have an impact in some areas of the state on agreements with schools and districts for implementing the AEAT that had been made with TCAP sites. The well-intended goals were not met by some of the TCAP sites, impacting the number of school data gathered for the study. The study does continue to provide insight into both the AEAT tool and the process of assessment of arts education program. The data gathered during the study period also adds to the overall state data gathered by TCAP.

2007 -2008 Study Results

Since inter-rater tests of reliability were performed on 15% of the sample (13 out of 84 schools) in the pilot study of 2006-07, and the AEAT quality indicators of curriculum, instruction, and professional development did not significantly change, we did not repeat reliability tests. The results of the pilot tests showed excellent inter-rater agreement. Correlations on all items comprising each of the quality indicators (9 curriculum items, 10 instruction items, and 8 professional development items), as well as the means for each quality indicator, showed that the inter-rater agreement was excellent (all but 4 coefficients $\geq .90$, all $ps < .01$).

In the 2007-08 study, ninety-five new school sites were assessed. We used a Repeated-Measures Analysis of Variance to examine differences among the means of the three quality indicators for each school. Results indicated that the means of all three quality indicators were low, Curriculum ($M = 1.58$, $SD = 0.799$) and Instruction ($M = 1.64$,

$SD = .82$) Professional Development ($M = 1.47$, $SD = 1.04$); $F_{(2, 166)} = 31.18$, $p < .001$.

Discussion

The TCAP AEAT helps identify school program strengths and weaknesses to inform curricular, instructional and professional development decisions. The tool assesses factors central to an effective arts program, a consistent series of criteria in curriculum, instruction, and professional development. The TCAP AEAT process is a participatory one that supports school community reflection, that respects and includes the school community, and that enables the most data collection with the least effort. TCAP AEAT tracks program improvements over time, and allows comparisons between schools, districts, and similar programs.

The TCAP AEAT assesses whether schools are achieving quality arts programs, as the indicators in the criterion statements are observable and measurable evidence. As school arts teams evaluate their school program against the quality indicators in the twenty-seven criterion statements, they better understand the level of their progress and commitment toward a quality arts program. The rubric levels then give the teams an understanding of the next steps in an action plan to improve the program. The process of assessment becomes a spiral process of data collecting, evaluating and scoring evidence, analyzing results, making an action plan and timeline for improvements and implementation, and continuing the process through consistent reevaluation over time. The assessment serves as a guide for improvement and accountability while informing the stakeholders about the status of their arts education program. It is hoped that the TCAP AEAT model assessment, as implemented within the partnership of TCAP and school and district will contribute to deeper understanding of the role of arts in education and the teaching and learning process.

The website development in 2007-08 for the TCAP AEAT included only the critical twenty-seven criterion statements and database capability.

Since we established excellent reliability in the pilot study of 2006-07, in TCAP-AEAT administration using site directors, we were confident that to extend the assessor work to other TCAP personnel. After further analysis and revision of the AEAT during spring of 2007, we began developing an AEAT facilitator training and related professional development. The inter-rater agreement test was used as the rubric to determine the reliability of the training of the AEAT facilitators. Since

we were able to establish excellent reliability, we used the site director training as a model in increasing capacity for training facilitators.

The TCAP AEAT provides us with a reliable arts education assessment tool for curriculum, instruction, and professional development. Additionally, it allowed us to assess each separately, thus identifying areas (all three, but especially curriculum and instruction) where more attention needs to be focused.

We used the Repeated-Measures Analysis of Variance to examine differences between the means of the quality indicators of curriculum, instruction, and professional development. Results of the 2007-08 data analysis revealed that all three indicators are low, and there is no significant difference between any of means of the three quality indicators. Since all three means are low, this indicates that none of the three quality indicators of curriculum, instruction, and professional development are being addressed adequately in the schools assessed. On a scale of 0-4 for each criterion statement, the means of all three indicators is less than 2. The ninety-five schools assessed have embarked on a path of arts education improvement of which the AEAT was a critical first step.

California as a whole has neglected its arts education program for over thirty years, though in some districts have been able to provide some level of arts education for their students, so the findings are not surprising. The AEAT has helped schools and districts see the necessary relationship between improvement efforts made in the areas of curriculum, instruction, and professional development. Adopted curriculum or new instructional methods without the necessary professional development will not be effective and conversely professional development not linked to curriculum or instruction is also ineffective. In the case of arts education, the AEAT data points to the increase in efforts into the curriculum and instruction since the quality indicators are quite low – on a scale from 0-4, they are about a one and a half. This in turn, directs the focus of future professional development toward the curriculum and instruction as priorities.

Since the professional development indicators in the 2006-07 study were higher than instruction and curriculum, school administration may be beginning professional development without being completely prepared or focused by curriculum and instruction indicators. Professional development can be embedded within the process of developing curriculum and examining instruction but, in and of itself, it does not promote curriculum and instruction. Effective professional

development leading to improved teaching and learning is tied to the established curriculum and the instructional needs of students. Schools surveyed may be putting more emphasis on professional development, but may need to focus development on the building blocks of curriculum and instruction before promoting the professional development. This data provides an opening point of dialogue with the schools as they begin their improvement plan.

We saw a different trend in the 2007-08 study, which indicates that all three indicators are low. This indicates that all the schools are consistent; all ninety-five of the schools assessed are in the same position. The standard deviation was quite low in all schools, showing a low to moderate level around one. All of the indicators are the same, with no significant different, and all at the same low level.

Since the professional development was significantly higher in last years' pilot, we suggested that the approach that was being taken by schools was to provide teacher's professional development, but still neglecting curriculum and instruction. The schools in this year's study seem to indicate that the schools are neglecting all three aspects of curriculum, instruction, and professional development equally.

Showing these assessment results to schools and districts may help to incite reform and attention to the school arts education programs. Using the California Arts Project Arts Education Assessment Tool, the TCAP-AEAT, may help schools recognize deficiencies in their programs and begin to plan steps to address the areas of need. The AEAT is both a formative and summative assessment which provides and highlights specific areas for improvement. Funding may be more easily acquired when specific goals for school reform will be addressed.

Next Steps

In 2008 – 2009 TCAP will continue to utilize the AEAT as part of its technical assistance to schools and districts throughout the state. Additional schools will be assessed and those schools that had been assessed and in process of implementing improvement plans will be reassessed in the future. Developed arts education plans will be uploaded on the database. TCAP will continue to develop additional AEAT facilitators and TCAP site will provide on-going professional development for the facilitators. TCAP will begin to share statewide AEAT findings with those interested in improving arts education in California.

Bibliography

Arts Education Program Toolkit, A Visual and Performing Arts Program Assessment Process, (2001). California Department of Education, The California Alliance for Arts Education, The California Arts Council, The California Arts Project, and Model Arts Program Network School Districts, published by the California Department of Education (CDE Press), Sacramento, California.

Arts Count, Handbook for Planning an Effective Visual and Performing Arts Program, 1990.

ArtsWork: A Call for Arts Education for All California Students, CDE 1997.

ArtsWork: Building Vision and Stability Conference Welcome, MAP Network, 2000.

Assessment: An Overview, The National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved June 6, 2006 from nces.ed.gov/pubs98/98527.pdf.

California Subject Matter Projects, Retrieved February 2008 from <http://csmp.ucop.edu/>.

Catterall, J., (1998). *Involvement in the Arts and Success in Secondary School*, The UCLA Imagination Project, Graduate School of Education & Information Studies, UCLA, Americans for the Arts Monograph.

Catterall, J., Chapleau, R., Iwanaga, R., (1999). Involvement in the Arts and Human Development, General Involvement and Intensive Involvement in Music and Theater Arts. In *Champions of Change, The Impact of the Arts on Learning*, The Arts Education Partnership, The President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities, The GE Fund, and The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Retrieved March 28, 2006 from <http://artsedge.kennedy-center.org/champions/>.

Clawson, H., Coolbaugh, K., (1996). YouthARTS Development Project, U.S. Department of Justice, National Endowment for the Arts, and Americans for the Arts. Retrieved March 9, 2006 from www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/186668.pdf.

Community Arts Education Project, (2003). Sponsored by California State PTA and California Alliance for Arts Education.

Deasy, Richard, editor, (2002). Critical Links: Learning in the Arts and Student Academic and Social Development, Arts Education Partnership, p.84. "The Arts and Education Reform: Lessons from a Four-Year Evaluation of the A+ Schools Program", 1995-1999 (Executive Summary of the Four-year Pilot of A+ Schools in North Carolina).

Fiske, Edward B., editor, (1999). Champions of Change, The Impact of the Arts on Learning, The Arts Education Partnership, The President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities, The GE Fund, and The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. Retrieved March 28, 2006 from <http://artsedge.kennedycenter.org/champions/>.

Herman, J., and Baker, E., (2003). "The Los Angeles Annenberg Metropolitan Project: Evaluation Findings CSE Tech Report 591", Los Angeles Compact for Evaluation (LACE), CRESST/University of California, Los Angeles.

H.R. 1804, Goals 200: Educate America, 103rd Congress,
<http://www.ed.gov/legislation/GOALS2000/TheAct/index.html>

O'Day, J., (2002). "Complexity, Accountability, and School Improvement", Harvard Educational Review, Volume 72, Number 3.
White, S., Vanneman, A., (1998). 1997 NAEP Arts Education