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ABSTRACT

ARTSTREET ASSESSMENT: MEASURING CHANGES IN COMMUNITY, CREATIVITY, AND DIVERSITY IN UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON STUDENTS

Name: Lovins, Kristen
University of Dayton
Advisor: Dr. Susan Davies

ArtStreet is a living and learning community at the University of Dayton. This study created a baseline with which to make future comparisons to determine the growth or decline of the facilities and programming provided via ArtStreet, specifically within the domains of community, creativity, and diversity. The study also focused on the creation of an instrument that will enable systematic collection of future data within these domains.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

ArtStreet is a unique living and learning community at the University of Dayton. It offers many benefits to the students, faculty, and community surrounding the campus, far beyond the basic utilities of living space and classrooms. ArtStreet is not just a building where people are allowed to use the physical space, it is also intended to be a way to immerse students, faculty, and the surrounding community within a community that promotes creativity and diversity through its programming.

ArtStreet hosts programs and activities throughout the academic year that focus on expanding the campus community’s appreciation and understanding of creativity and diversity though the arts. There is wide variation in the types of programs and activities offered, from outdoor concerts in the amphitheatre to art workshops and film screenings. The ArtStreet facility and programming are aimed at providing new opportunities for creative exploration, community building and enhancing diversity (ArtStreet, retrieved January 20, 2009).

Purpose

ArtStreet is a multimillion dollar project, created largely from resources donated by the Kettering Fund. The Kettering Fund supports organizations that are located in
Ohio, particularly those that require “seed grants” for creating new programs that advance science or the arts (Kettering Fund, retrieved January 20, 2009). The intent of this study is to conduct a program evaluation of ArtStreet to determine effective elements of the program and components requiring revision.

One of the objectives of this study was to review and analyze surveys that have been administered since ArtStreet’s opening in 2004. The second objective was to utilize the record review to help generate an instrument to measure or monitor growth in students who are selected to live in ArtStreet for three domains: community, creativity, and diversity. If ArtStreet is successful in its mission to provide new opportunities for creative exploration, community building and enhancing diversity, then there should be evidence of an increased sense of community, creativity, and understanding of diversity.

**Significance of Study**

During the first five years of ArtStreet’s history, it had not undergone a rigorous assessment process. However, various data and information had been gathered in anticipation of a comprehensive program evaluation. A comprehensive program evaluation was essential to verify that the funding and resources invested into the conception, creation, and ongoing life of ArtStreet had been effectively used to reach the goals and address the mission of ArtStreet. This process not only provides a picture of what ArtStreet is, but also create a systematic way to track ArtStreet’s progress, assist in continual improvement, and aid in the justification of further funding opportunities.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review consists of information regarding the development of ArtStreet facilities and programming through a review of records as well as interview formats. In addition, the review is comprised of investigation into the three domains that were determined to be pertinent to the study and ArtStreet's mission—community, creativity, and diversity.

University of Dayton Demographics

The University of Dayton is a mid-size Catholic University, with 7,115 undergraduate students enrolled in Fall 2008 (University of Dayton, retrieved January 21, 2009). University enrollment in 2008 was fairly balanced in terms of the male-female ratio, with men representing 50.4% of student, and women 49.6%. The University has five divisions; Arts and Sciences (22.3%), Business Administration (21.4%), Engineering (18.4%), and Education and Allied Professions (15.6%). Arts and Sciences majors include those such as communication, English, history, philosophy, music, visual arts, theatre, religious studies, biology, chemistry, geology, mathematics, and political science. Business Administration includes majors such as accounting, finance, management, and marketing. Engineering includes majors such as mechanical, mechanical technology,
chemical, and civil. Education and Allied Professions majors, include teacher education, and health and human services.

In 1999, then President, Brother Raymond Fitz, S.M., issued the University of Dayton Statement on Dignity. In this letter to the University, Brother Fitz indicated that the University is determined to provide students and faculty in the University with a climate of understanding and acceptance of all people. This letter stated that “Every person, regardless of race, color, creed, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age or disability shall be treated with respect and dignity.” While the University attempts to create a climate of diversity, the truth is that the student population is 90.8% Caucasian. African-Americans represent 3.4% of the undergraduate student population; International students 1.8%, Hispanic 1.6%, Asian/Pacific Islander 1.1%, American Indian .3%, and 1.1% represent other ethnicities (University of Dayton, retrieved January 21, 2009). While it may be ideal to promote ethnic integration, it is difficult with the low ratio of Caucasian students to students of other ethnic backgrounds. Therefore, a different approach to incorporating diversity in the University of Dayton may be necessary. This study, in part, attempts to examine ArtStreet's approach to addressing diversity.

In the late 1990s, Virginia Kettering, a local benefactor of arts and academics, was approached by the University of Dayton’s Vice President of Advancement with the idea of creating a Learning-Living community at the University of Dayton. Ms. Kettering indicated that she was interested and willing to donate five million dollars for a Learning-Living community to be located in the student neighborhood and centered on the arts. Ms. Kettering believed that the arts would help transform the student culture, and provide alternative opportunities for student activities and programs.
Development of ArtStreet

In an interview with Dr. Deborah Bickford, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Learning Initiatives, (personal communication, February 9, 2009), she presented the story of ArtStreet’s early development.

The project was connected to the College of Arts & Sciences. There was a sense of disappointment that the first sizable gift focused on the arts was not devoted to addressing the significant space deficiencies and needs faced by the arts departments. The current residential undergraduate students of varying majors wondered “How come the arts students would get something like ArtStreet and we don’t?” (D. Bickford, personal communication, February 9, 2009) revealing that they erroneously thought it was for arts majors only.

According to Dr. Bickford (personal communication, February 9, 2009), she, the director of the Learning Teaching Center, was recruited by Dr. Fred Pestello, then Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, to lead the development of the ArtStreet project. The Learning Teaching Center is an innovative space designed to provide services to both students and faculty which opened in 2000. There were a wide variety of issues to negotiate in the development of ArtStreet. Some of these issues included finding the best location, and overcoming preconceived negative perceptions of the project.

The planning committee, which was comprised of a wide range of faculty and students (with representatives from most of the academic Arts Departments as well as representatives from Student Development and Facilities Management), considered a couple of possible locations for the arts-based Learning-Living Community; then
President Brother Ray Fitz weighed in on the issue and said that the Learning Living Arts Community, as it was then referred to, needed to be located in the heart of the student neighborhood; he selected its current location. This idea received lots of opposition (D. Bickford, personal communication, February 9, 2009). Vocal upper class students complained that the complex in the student neighborhood would be an intrusion into the residential space students felt belonged to them, and would violate the spirit and nature of the neighborhood. Students also felt that the building would not blend well into the look and feel of the neighborhood. Some faculty raised concerns because they felt that the location would be too far from the center of campus, and therefore not accessible for faculty-driven activities. Another misconception that had to be overcome was that ArtStreet would only be for art students and faculty. Dr. Bickford indicated that (personal communication, February 9, 2009), in attempting to gain support for the project, conversations with students not associated with the project revealed a curious pattern of reaction. Initial negativity toward the project seemed to disappear once students learned about the intended facilities and uses of the space, for example the amphitheatre and café.

Developing the concepts that became ArtStreet was time-consuming, in part because it took time for committee members to begin to understand the full potential of ArtStreet as transformative space (D. Bickford, personal communication, February 9, 2009). While those on the committee began to embrace the idea, other members of the campus community not involved in the development process still generally found the idea of ArtStreet to be at best, neutral, and at worst, a waste of university resources. Several factors were taken into account with regards to the development of the interior and
exterior spaces (Burgess & Niple, 2001). Studies were conducted to determine specific details of the exterior spaces of the student neighborhood and incorporate the residential feel into the new complex. The interior space, in design, was intended to promote innovative approaches to education, energy, and openness. The learning spaces were created to provide an environment that fostered opportunities for “stimulation, experimentation, collaboration, and participation” (Burgess & Niple, 2001).

In addition to the planning committee work that was happening, Dr. Bickford (personal communication, February 9, 2009) explained that several campus faculty members created assignments for their respective courses that centered around the creation of ArtStreet. Civil engineering students conducted a study that focused on student and automobile traffic patterns in the neighborhood, and developed a plan outlining how they felt the new buildings would affect traffic patterns. A senior sociology capstone course surveyed students, faculty, and staff to find out about perceptions of ArtStreet. A public relations course came up with a marketing plan to provide the future complex with exposure and to draw in future users of the space. The Café was conceived, designed, and run by business students from Flyer Enterprises. A religious studies course focused on inner journeys and creativity developed activities around the potential of ArtStreet. In all, over 200 students participated in the development of ArtStreet through coursework.

Once the building plans had been drawn up and the actual construction began, and as the committee was working on programming and organizational structure for ArtStreet, the timeline for completion of the project was accelerated by an entire year, preventing the possibility of hiring an ArtStreet Director prior to significant programming
work (D. Bickford, personal communication, February 9, 2009). The construction of another, much larger (384 bed), residence hall on campus began, and was slated to take a much shorter amount of time for completion than the 58 bed ArtStreet. The general thought was that if Marianist Hall, with its enormous size, could be completed so quickly, then the much smaller ArtStreet should also take much less time, and thus the project was rushed through to completion a year ahead of original schedule. In fact, not all of the construction was completed by the time the first residents moved in the Fall semester of 2004, and the campus was not as “ready” for the complex as it could have been on the original timeline.

Perhaps the most important, yet abstract, idea that emerged from the development of ArtStreet is that it brings people together (D. Bickford, personal communication, February 9, 2009). People from different disciplines and different departments worked together to create ArtStreet. Students, faculty, staff, and administrators worked side by side in the creation of this space. This drawing together of people who would not normally interact in such an intentional way has continued past the planning stage. Residents from all disciplines live in ArtStreet. Faculty from different disciplines teach there and otherwise use the space. Students and faculty interact in non-traditional ways that make it possible for the faculty person to move beyond being the “sage on the stage” (D. Bickford, personal communication, February 9, 2009). One aspect of ArtStreet is that, while it is new, there are many references to the past. The new housing retained the street names and numbers of the residential houses that it replaced, thus allowing alums to “find” a reference point to their past in the neighborhood. Salvageable pieces from the
demolished buildings were kept. During the holiday season, a mantle from one of the houses is put up and decorated in memory of the past.

**Program Funding**

The ArtStreet programming was supported through a McGregor Fund grant for the first four years of operation. The McGregor Fund (retrieved January 20, 2009) provided aid to Detroit area programs and organizations to support the “well-being of mankind” in the areas of “human services, education, health care, arts and culture, and public benefit.” Though the money is typically disbursed to Detroit area programs, the fund also provides assistance to private universities and colleges in Michigan and Ohio. The grant money was replaced by University funding at the conclusion of the 2007-2008 academic year. Additional grants have been provided by Residential Services (for the Student Artist in Residence Program) and by the Learning Teaching Center (for the Arts and Sciences Collaboration for Stander Symposium).

**ArtStreet Operations**

While much of this study involves looking at the residents of the ArtStreet, it is important to recognize the fact that ArtStreet is in existence to attempt to benefit all members of the University of Dayton community, as well as to impact the surrounding community of the city of Dayton, not just ArtStreet residents. The facilities and programs are aimed at providing services to faculty so they may offer classes and other projects at ArtStreet. These services are also available for student use, as the spaces may be reserved without faculty involvement. This brings many various organizational activities, meetings and events, as well as meetings for group projects. Dayton community members who are not directly related to the University of Dayton are invited
and encouraged to attend many of the events and activities held at ArtStreet. It is important to keep this bigger picture in mind when looking at the operations of ArtStreet, even while narrowing the focus to the more specific group of ArtStreet residents.

**Physical Facilities**

All residents who wish to live in ArtStreet are required to submit an application. These applications include questionnaires that are meant to determine which groups of applicants can bring the most positive characteristics to ArtStreet. Potential residents also submit a project that is meant to showcase creativity. Residents are selected, not based on major, but on character, eagerness to gain something from the opportunity, and creative potential. The ArtStreet website provides details about the application process:

- Providing housing for 58 juniors and seniors of all majors, ArtStreet combines innovative living spaces with multi-purpose studio facilities. As part of a university initiative to integrate academic and experiential learning with residential and community living, ArtStreet residents contribute to the student neighborhood by providing arts-based educational programming, sponsoring community gatherings, and devoting time and energies to creative philanthropic projects. Residents are selected by a committee through the special interest housing application process; applications are generally due at the beginning of the spring semester for the following academic year. All ArtStreet residents are required to enroll in UDI 371:ArtStreet Experience each semester. This 1-credit pass/fail course exposes residents to a variety of arts-related projects, field trips, workshops and performances. (ArtStreet, retrieved February 5, 2013)
In addition to housing for 58 students (which is open to students of all majors), ArtStreet provides the unique facilities of an amphitheatre, artistic studio, theatre projection room, gallery, practice areas for musicians, student run café, recording studio, and radio station. These facilities are available for class usage, as well as for organizations and individuals.

**Programming and Events**

ArtStreet has been in operation since the 2004-2005 academic year. Since the opening, it has undergone many changes in programming as well as methods of funding. For example, residents of ArtStreet are required to take the ArtStreet Experience Class, a year-long, one credit class that focuses on providing the residents with opportunities for new experiences, community building, and ways to get involved on campus and with the arts. Alterations have been made in the ArtStreet Experience Class, and new programs have been created.

The programming and events at ArtStreet are as important as the facilities themselves. The programming is not only created and implemented by the staff of ArtStreet, but students and faculty are also encouraged to create new programming of their own. For example, Saturday evenings are reserved for student hosted events that are often collaborations with other on-campus organizations. Some of the regularly scheduled events include the ArtStreet Experience Class, Wednesday Workshops, Thursday Night Live, and Friday Films.

Wednesday Workshops are offered during the academic year. These workshops are led by students, faculty, and other community members who wish to teach some specific skill to other students, faculty, and community members. Past workshops have
included such activities as acrylic painting, sushi and origami making, print making, and paper cutting. Thursday Night Live is a weekly opportunity for student and guest musicians to perform in the ArtStreet Café. The venue is intended to create opportunities for informal performances. Film showings are offered on Fridays during the academic year. These Friday Films are selected with the intent of not only providing entertainment, but also to encourage learning, understanding of diversity, and to provide insight into current world and social justice issues.

ArtStreet is also host to a variety of events including ArtBeat, the publication OffBeat, Student Artist in Residence, and Citizens of the World. ArtBeat is a festival of the arts that includes performances by Dayton area music, dance, and theatre groups. ArtBeat features the UD Alumni Food Court, in which UD Alumni provide food that is typical of their hometown (for example, Alumni from Cincinnati might provide chili), art vendors (students are invited to set up booths and sell their original artwork), as well as booths providing information pertaining to arts and culture in the Dayton area and at the University of Dayton. OffBeat was originally a student initiated publication that highlighted community news and things to do at ArtStreet and around campus. OffBeat grew into a monthly publication which features articles, artwork, recipes, music and performance reviews, and publicity for events that students might otherwise not be aware of. All of the items submitted for publication are produced by students.

The Student Artist in Residence (AIR) Program is a program funded jointly by ArtStreet and Residence Education, in which students are paid to work on their art. The six to eight week program culminates in an “ArtHop.” Their work is permanently installed on campus to help beautify and expose students to art. ArtHop is an event held
to promote the artwork done by AIR, which involves an open-house style walking tour of campus, including the locations of current and past AIR artwork. Citizens of the World is an annual series of events put on as a cooperative venture between ArtStreet and the Center for International Programs. These yearly events include an art exhibit, film series, workshops, etc. that aim to expand understanding of culture and diversity.

**Mission and Goals**

To effectively assess and evaluate the impact of ArtStreet, it is important to consider the ideology embraced by the University, as well as the mission and goals of the ArtStreet. In “Habits of Inquiry and Reflection: A Report on Education in the Catholic and Marianist Traditions at the University of Dayton” (Benson et al., 2006), several topics are addressed. Among the topics discussed are the University’s seven core learning outcomes. Three of these outcomes are directly related to the idea of ArtStreet. The outcomes indicate that all undergraduates will develop and demonstrate:

1. Advanced habits of academic inquiry and creativity through production of scholarly work
2. Understanding of the cultures, histories, times, and places of multiple others
3. Understanding of and practice in values and skills necessary for learning, living, and working in community (Benson et al., 2006)

Although the ArtStreet Mission Statement was developed independently, it incorporates the core ideas above from the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection. The ArtStreet Mission Statement affirms:

Through its unique environment and diverse range of programs designed to involve all students, ArtStreet fosters student-generated initiatives, faculty and
student engagement, student exploration of arts and culture, cross-disciplinary creative collaboration, and interaction with the Dayton community, to connect living and learning both within and outside of the classroom setting. (ArtStreet, retrieved January 20, 2009)

This mission indicates that ArtStreet has a focus on community, creativity and diversity. The goals of ArtStreet are to:

1. Serve as a dynamic learning-living environment in the student neighborhood
2. Foster and encourage new ways of engaging learners through the arts
3. Stimulate interest in culture and creativity
4. Enhance the culture and diversity of the neighborhood
5. Link campus artists with all students in the neighborhood
6. Connect campus and students with the Dayton art community
7. Provide new opportunities for creative exploration, community building and enhancing diversity
8. Engage faculty in the learning and living experiences of students
9. Create new opportunities for student-faculty collaboration

(ArtStreet, retrieved January 20, 2009)

For the purpose of this study, the main focus is on the goal of providing new opportunities for creative exploration, community building and enhancing diversity. The current project is intended to answer the question: Is ArtStreet meeting the goals of providing opportunities for creative exploration, community building, and enhancing diversity?
Community. As outlined in the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection, community is an important learning outcome for the University of Dayton. This learning outcome indicates that students will “develop and demonstrate understanding of and practice in the values and skills necessary for learning, living, and working in communities of support and challenge” (Benson et al., 2006, p. 8).

The Psychological Sense of Community (PSOC) was first suggested by Sarason (1974) in *The psychological sense of community: Prospects for a community psychology*. While this source may seem dated, it is referenced in nearly all of the current literature regarding Sense of Community. This highly quoted book suggests that PSOC is the “overarching” theory of community psychology (Obst & White, 2004; Chavis & Pretty, 1999). The theory suggested that people were inherently aware of their own Sense of Community (Obst & White, 2004; Chavis & Pretty, 1999).

McMillan and Chavis (1986) expanded upon this idea by introducing four principle elements of Sense of Community. These elements included: membership, influence, integration and fulfillment of needs, and shared emotional connection (Obst & White, 2004). Membership includes boundaries, feelings of belonging, personal investment, and emotional safety (Obst & White, 2004; Wright, 2004). Influence indicates that members feel they have a say over what happens in and with a group, and the group has a say over what happens with its members (Wright, 2004). Integration and fulfillment of needs refer to the necessity of the group to meet both individual and collective needs (Obst & White, 2004) for survival, as well as wants and desires (Wright, 2004). Finally, shared emotional connection refers to bonds created and nurtured by the interaction between members of the community (Obst & White, 2004). It is from these
four elements that their definition of Sense of Community was developed. Their
definition indicates that Sense of Community largely consists of feelings of belonging,
mattering, and that the needs of the individual and the group will be met through their
commitment to the community (McMillan & Chavis, 1986).

In the literature, the most often referred to measurement of community is the
Sense of Community Index (SCI) (Obst & White, 2004), which was first introduced by
McMillan and Chavis in 1986. The purpose of this measure is to assess the four elements
or dimensions of Sense of Community (Peterson, Speer, & McMillan, 2008). The Sense
of Community Index (SCI) is one of the most commonly used measures to indicate the
level of psychological sense of community, and the underlying dimensions of
membership, influence, needs fulfillment, and emotional connection (McMillan and
Chavis (1986). The SCI has been a strong predictor of behaviors (such as participation)
and a valid measure of the four dimensions of PSOC (Obst & White, 2004).

A study conducted by Loomis, Dockett, and Brodsky (2004) attempted to
measure change in Sense of Community (SOC) induced by the presence or absence of an
“external threat” encountered by students at a predominantly African American
university. The study was conducted in two parts. During the first, an “external threat”
was present to the participants. This threat consisted largely of student led protests
against relocation of the university. The second was conducted the following year after a
peaceful resolution had been reached. Participants were given the SCI during the period
of external threat and after the resolution. The researchers concluded that significantly
higher levels of sense of community were found to exist during conditions that included
an external threat than during those that did not. The results indicated that SOC changes
over time and over differing conditions (Loomis, Dockett, & Brodsky, 2004) and thus provides a valid index of the community construct.

In 2008, Chavis, Lee, and Acosta presented a newer version, which addressed specific problems of the original. The format was changed from true-false questions to Likert scale type questions. The revised SCI was renamed the Sense of Community Index II (SCI-2). The Sense of Community Index II will be the basis for comparison for the community segment of the ArtStreet assessment tool.

**Creativity.** As outlined in the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection, scholarship is an important learning outcome for the University of Dayton. The section regarding scholarship states that undergraduate students “will develop and demonstrate advanced habits of academic inquiry and creativity through the production of a body of artistic, scholarly or community-based work intended for public presentation and defense” (Benson et al., 2006, p. 8). While residents and users of ArtStreet are not required to create a body of work for public presentation and defense, they are encouraged to develop habits of academic inquiry and creativity, which may culminate, for some, in the form of a product, or may come to fruition in the form of expanding interest in/curiosity towards creative pursuits.

In the introduction to “The International Handbook of Creativity,” Sternberg (2006) indicates that though there are many different views and aspects of what creativity is, there seem to be a few common threads that flow through these different ideas. These commonalities include the idea that creativity is goal driven. It aims at creating ideas or products that are novel and exciting. Creativity may be a broad concept that can be applied in general ways, but to apply creativity to specific concepts, specific knowledge
of those concepts must be obtained (Sternberg, 2006). Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, Sternberg indicates that creativity can be measured.

Welkener (2000, 2004) introduces the idea that many colleges and universities recognize creativity as a desirable attribute in students and that fostering it is an important aspect of university focus. ArtStreet, as a subset of the University of Dayton, exemplifies Welkener’s assertion in its mission to foster student creativity. Welkener (2004) elaborates her findings by noting that students believe that the focus of the institutions they attend, whether high school or in higher education, typically shifts student paradigms or thought processes from “creative activity” to “intellectual.” Students in her study indicated that rather than promoting or encouraging creativity, the institution in her study systematically minimized the opportunity to apply creative ideas and processes. Student perceptions were related to the concern that creativity was discouraged in projects and assignments, and therefore was avoided in order to reduce the risk of negative reactions to their work, including, but not limited to, lower grades (Welkener, 2004). It is this stereotypic view of institutional programming that the University of Dayton is fighting to overcome through ArtStreet.

In his introduction, Sternberg (2006) lists several reasons that creativity may be difficult to study. A large body of research on creativity has not been accumulated. This is perhaps due to the notion that creativity is hard to define and measure. This is an indication that the field is full of opportunities for future research.

There have been few attempts to measure creativity. The most widely used and documented measure of creativity are the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT). These tests were developed from a list of characteristics that were thought to differentiate
highly creative people from those who are less creative (Torrance, 1976). The list of 84 characteristics was knitted from a conglomeration of personality studies comparing individuals identified as highly creative to those who were not. Some of these characteristics included a person who accepts disorder, is adventurous, is full of curiosity, and so forth. According to the Scholastic Testing Service, Inc., the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking are utilized to identify those who are creatively gifted from Kindergarten to adult (retrieved April 21, 2013).

The tests consist of two sections, Verbal and Figural, with two forms of each section (Cramond, Matthews-Morgan, Bandalos, & Zuo, 2005). The sections require responses in various forms. For the Verbal section, responses are provided both in writing and orally, and drawn for the Figural. The Verbal section assesses “fluency, flexibility, and originality” (Scholastic Testing Service, Inc., retrieved January 29, 2009). The Figural section provides scores for eighteen different mental characteristics including emotional expressiveness, storytelling articulateness, movement or action, expressiveness of titles, humor, internal visualization, colorfulness of imagery, richness of imagery, and fantasy.

The scoring of these tests is standardized by use of the Manual for Scoring and Interpreting Results, which provide the national norms (as normalized in 2007). Although the tests produce a standardized score, Torrance did not intend the use of the information as a “static measure of a person’s ability;” instead it should be used for research, instructional use and assessing for personal strengths within a student (Kim, 2006).
This idea would seem to lend itself well to the ArtStreet mission of fostering creative exploration, as the measure could be used to determine whether or not there is a change in personal creative strengths during the student’s residential experience at ArtStreet. However, the tests are highly involved, require a great deal of time, and must be administered by someone who has experience administering tests. With these limitations in mind, the TTCT may not be feasible for use in the ArtStreet Assessment process. Also, the TTCT is limited in its scope to the thinking element of creativity, which does not necessarily encompass the element of product creation.

In 2002, Goff and Torrance published a new form of the instrument, with the length of administration in mind. This new form is called the Abbreviated Torrance Test for Adults (ATTA), and was aimed at providing a much quicker administration, specifically for adults. Instead of requiring 75 minutes for administration, the new test only requires approximately 9 minutes for administration. The new test is comprised of three questions, one addressing the verbal aspects and two addressing the figural aspects. The Abbreviated Torrance Test for Adults (ATTA) is a projective assessment of creative thinking abilities which include the four underlying abilities of fluency, originality, elaboration and flexibility. The ATTA is a short form of the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT, 1966). This test, due to the nature of the context and the feasible administration time/procedure, will be the basis for comparison in this study.

Diversity. Diversity, like community and creativity, is difficult to pinpoint as a single, measurable entity. Diversity can be considered as a matter of physical integration of ethnicities, races, gender, sexual orientation, and cultures, or it can be considered to be
more intellectually based, like the awareness, acceptance, and understanding of those differences.

As indicated earlier in the literature review, the University of Dayton is largely comprised of Caucasian students; however there is a definite interest in promoting the understanding of diversity. In the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection, a learning outcome was designed to reflect this idea. “All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate intellectually informed, appreciative, and critical understanding of cultures, histories, times, and places of multiple others…Students’ understanding will reflect scholarly inquiry, experiential immersion, and disciplined reflection” (Benson et al., 2006, p. 8).

For this reason, the focus of research on diversity at ArtStreet is centered on awareness, acceptance, and understanding of the differences between people. ArtStreet promotes acceptance and understanding of diversity through programming and events, but the question of interest is “Does ArtStreet have an effect on the acceptance and understanding of diversity on residents of this relatively homogenous campus?”

According to Chavous (2005), previous research suggests that Caucasian students and students of different ethnicities experience different racial climates. While it may be ideal to promote ethnic integration, it is difficult with the extreme ratio of Caucasian students to students of other ethnic backgrounds. For this reason it is important to explore the effects of the implicit and explicit attempts by ArtStreet to expand the acceptance and understanding of diversity, even when there is not ethnic diversity on campus. Rankin and Reason (2008) state that while the distribution and discovery of new knowledge is the primary concern of institutes of higher education, the campus climate affects the creation of knowledge, and the members of the community. Cyclically, these
members also influence the campus climate. This idea indicates that not only will programs promote the understanding and acceptance of diverse people, but they will also influence the overall climate of campus, and in turn, encourage the development of knowledge.

Universal-Diverse Orientation (UDO), as introduced by Miville, et al. (1999), is a construct that reflects “an attitude of awareness and acceptance of both the similarities and differences among people” (p. 292). This definition recognizes that there are two major intertwining concepts: (1) universality is the awareness of similarities among people, and (2) diversity is the acceptance and openness towards the differences among people (Miville, Romans, Johnson, & Lone, 2004).

Miville et al. (1999) developed the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale to create a measurement that would reflect the concepts of UDO. The original scale was comprised of 45 questions concerning these concepts. While the test was found to be highly reliable and valid, the length was a concern. The Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale (M-GUDS-S) was developed as a shorter version of the original Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale to address this problem. The M-GUDS-S was used in a study which indicated that those who exhibited positive feelings towards themselves and their community were more likely to provide answers indicating a greater sense of UDO (Fuertes, Miville, Mohr, Sedlacek, and Gretchen, 2000; Miville, Romans, Johnson, & Lone, 2004).

**Conclusion**

This literature review provided the background and history of the creation of ArtStreet and its programming. The relevant question is whether the mission and vision
ArtStreet have been realized. This study begins to answer that question by examining archival data, as well as through the creation of a streamlined instrument that stems from the mission and goals of ArtStreet: community, creativity, and diversity.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

This chapter describes the study’s two research objectives and the research design. Participants and materials, including existing data and instruments. The chapter concludes with a step-by-step description of the study’s procedures across phases of data collection. The overall purpose of this study was to conduct a program evaluation of ArtStreet. This was a multi-phase project that first analyzed archival data and information pertaining to student and instructor responses to ArtStreet programming and facilities. The second phase included the construction of an assessment instrument.

Research Objective I

The first objective of this study was to review and analyze the surveys that have been administered since ArtStreet’s opening in 2004. The intent was to generate an understanding of the responses to the questions the residents of ArtStreet had been asked, to date, particularly with regards to the ArtStreet goals of promoting the three domains: community, creativity, and diversity.
Research Objective II

The second objective of this study was to construct, validate, implement, and analyze the results of an instrument that will measure or monitor change in those students selected to live in ArtStreet for the targeted domains.

Research Design

This program evaluation project took place in two phases. Phase 1 incorporated the descriptive analysis of aggregated archival data. Through the descriptive study, current available data was used to answer the question “Of the items included in the ArtStreet Experience Supplemental Evaluations, which address the question ‘What do we know about community, creativity, and diversity for students and faculty?’” Phase 2 incorporated the construction, validation, implementation, and analysis of an instrument. This part of the study focused on streamlining the future data collection processes utilized by ArtStreet into a standardized method. This involved creating an assessment instrument that provides information about the development of community, creativity, and diversity. This part of the study, in terms of research design, included a validation and reliability component.

Participants

The first phase of the study involved the analysis of preexisting data and did not require involvement from any current participants. Instead it focused on a review of surveys completed by past residents of ArtStreet and instructors who had utilized the space in various capacities.

The second phase of the study required human subject participation. There were three sessions in this second phase: The first session was a pilot study and focus group
aimed at honing the ArtStreet Instrument into a clear, concise instrument. The purpose was to remove extraneous questions and clarify confusing questions. Participation in the first session included 6 non-ArtStreet resident graduate volunteers. These volunteers were recruited by the researcher from ArtStreet staff and students from various graduate programs across campus who were involved in ArtStreet in some way.

The second session involved participants who were administered the ArtStreet instrument, as well three additional instruments to determine the validity of the assessment. These students were selected from the 2009-2010 ArtStreet residents. All 54 residents were given the option to participate, and consisted of juniors and seniors ages 19-22. They represented a wide variety of majors. The third session involved re-administration of the ArtStreet Instrument to the second session participants in order to determine test reliability. To encourage participation in both sessions, participants who attended both sessions received a gift card to a popular restaurant. In an ideal situation, all 54 residents would have participated in the second and third sessions. However, the sample size was limited to 21 students who participated in both sessions.

**Materials**

Materials in this study included existing data, informed consent forms, and the three already established instruments that were used to demonstrate concurrent and construct validity with regards to the newly created instrument.

**Existing data.** Existing data on ArtStreet included: original documents from the ArtStreet planning committee, student and faculty feedback surveys, supplemental evaluations, survey feedback from various events and programs at ArtStreet, Event Management System (EMS) reports and many other sources. The primary focus of the
review of existing data for this study was on faculty feedback and supplemental student evaluations which are surveys that were administered to ArtStreet residents at the end of each semester (with the exception of a few semesters). The faculty feedback and supplemental student evaluations were either anonymous, or have been purged of names. No identifying information is included.

Data collection methods for the archived data were not standardized or consistent across time. Because of the varying methods of data collection, many questions have been addressed over the years. Many of these questions have similarities, while others are completely independent of each other. For example, the ArtStreet Experience Class Supplemental Evaluations, which have been administered to ArtStreet residents at the end of each semester of living at ArtStreet (with some exceptions), have included more than 70 different questions (Appendix A). These evaluations were administered Winter 2005, Fall 2006, Winter 2007, Fall 2007, Winter 2008, and Fall 2008.

Informed consent. All participants involved in Phase 2 Sessions 1, 2 or 3 were signed an informed consent form (Appendices B and C) prior to beginning any assessment. This form included information about the procedure involved in the study and contact information of those conducting the study.

Existing instruments. Concurrent validation of the new instrument was determined by comparing the results from the new instrument with three existing assessments purported to measure the constructs of interest. The three instruments that were chosen for use in the study are the Sense of Community Index II (SCI-2, Chavis, Lee, & Acosta, 2008), the Abbreviated Torrance Tests for Adults (ATTA, Goff &
Torrance, 2002), and the Miville-Guzman Universality Diversity Scale-Short Form (MGUDS-S, Marie Miville, personal communication, November 11, 2008).

**Community.** The Sense of Community Index II consists of a 25 item Likert scale type questionnaire. The first question is phrased on a 6 point Likert style continuum (from prefer not to be part of this community to very important), and the following 24 questions are on a 4 point Likert style scale (from not at all to completely). Scoring of the SCI-2 occurred following the guidelines provided with the instrument. The original SCI has been a strong predicator of behaviors (such as participation) and a valid measure of the four dimensions of Psychological Sense of Community (Obst & White, 2004). The revised SCI was renamed the Sense of Community Index II (SCI-2). An analysis of the SCI-2 showed that it is a very reliable measure (coefficient alpha= .94). The subscales also proved to be reliable with coefficient alpha scores of .79 to .86 (Obst & White, 2004).

**Creativity.** The Abbreviated Torrance Test for Adults consists of 3 activities. Participants are given 3 minutes to complete each. The first activity consists of providing a verbal response to the prompt about an unusual problem solving situation. The second and third activities require using images as starting points for the creation of pictures or objects. Scoring of the ATTA follows the guidelines provided in the Abbreviated Torrance Test for Adults Manual. Internal consistency between the overall creativity index and the subscales representing the four underlying abilities ranged from .38 to .90. There is no report on reliability or standard error of measurement for the creativity indicators. Although there were concerns due to wide ranging reports of internal
consistency and no report on reliability or standard error of measure, this instrument was chosen due to lack of other available instruments that assess creativity.

Diversity. The Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale-Short Form (M-GUDS-S) consists of 15 Likert scale type items. The ratings on this 6 point scale range from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The scoring process followed the guidelines provided in the M-GUDS Short Form Scoring Key. The M-GUDS-S has demonstrated reliability and initial construct validity in 3 distinct but modestly interrelated domains: behavioral, emotional, and cognitive (Fuertes, et al., 2000). Internal consistency and retest reliability for the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale (M-GUDS) ranged from .89 to .95 (Miville, et al., 1999). The M-GUDS significantly correlated with measures of racial identity, empathy, healthy narcissism, feminism, androgyny, homophobia, and dogmatism (the last 2 correlations were negative).

Procedure

Phase 1. As stated previously, the primary focus of the review of existing data was on faculty feedback and supplemental student evaluations. Qualitative analysis was used to determine patterns of the responses to the faculty feedback form. Supplemental student evaluations were analyzed using quantitative and qualitative analysis methods. The information gained from the review of surveys was analyzed to identify components that could be incorporated into an assessment instrument that is succinct, easy to use, and addresses the specific questions that need to be answered.

Phase 2. Phase 2 consisted of the construction of the ArtStreet Instrument, and Sessions 1, 2, and 3 which were designed to pilot test, and determine validity and reliability of the new instrument.
**ArtStreet Instrument: Initial Development.** A large group of questions was generated from four sources: (1) the list of questions that have already been used to evaluate ArtStreet, (2) the definitions generated from the literature review regarding community, diversity and creativity, (3) discussions held by a panel of experts, and (4) instruments that exist to measure these three domains.

The panel of experts consisted of faculty from the University of Dayton. Members of the panel were included due to their expertise in these areas. Karen Abney Korn was an Adjunct Professor of Anthropology and a Doctoral Graduate Assistant in the Doctoral Program in the School of Education and Allied Professions. Susan Byrnes was the Director of ArtStreet. Dr. Sawyer Hunley was an Associate Professor and Coordinator of the School Psychology Program. Dr. Molly Schaller was an Associate Professor and Coordinator of College Student Personnel Services. Dr. Michele Welkener was an Assistant Professor in the College Student Personnel and Higher Education Programs. The list of questions from past surveys and evaluations was compiled by the researcher during Phase 1. The panel discussed what was known and should be known regarding the main areas of focus, as they developed additional questions. From this large list of questions, the panel of experts and the researcher selected the most salient items and edited out the inappropriate items. The specific questions and comments about their development/origin can be found in Appendix D. The product of this work included the first draft of ArtStreet Instrument.

**ArtStreet Instrument: Session One.** The ArtStreet instrument was created as described above to address the three domains of community, creativity, and diversity. The goal was to create an instrument that is short (approximately 3 quantitative, Likert
scale type questions for each domain, and approximately 1 qualitative question per
domain, for a total of 12 questions), easy to use, easy to score, and yet effective.

A small group of graduate students was recruited to pilot test the instrument. Immediately following the pilot test, a focus group was conducted to collect reactions to all items on the instrument. Feedback from this group was used to further hone the questions by eliminating unnecessary questions, clarifying confusing questions, and otherwise attempting to make the instrument the most user-friendly, effective, and efficient tool possible. Participants in this pilot session answered the items provided in the initial list of questions. The following discussion allowed for the disposal of irrelevant questions, clarification of unclear items, and selection of the most crucial questions. The scoring procedure required the summation of the Likert scale scores for each of the three quantitative questions. The qualitative responses were to be used to explain the selection of the quantitative responses.

*ArtStreet Instrument: Session Two.* After the initial pilot session, to determine the best questions, a second pilot session was conducted in order to administer the instrument, along with instruments that have been chosen to represent the constructs of interest. During the session, the participants completed each of the four instruments, providing identification on each by creating their own designated number following the procedure set forth in the administration directions. These numbers were used to match up the instruments completed by an individual, while still retaining anonymity.

The new instrument was administered first. Participants were read written directions that detailed the procedure for completing the test with an unlimited amount of
time for completion. When all surveys had been completed, they were collected by the test administrator.

The SCI-2 was administered second. The SCI-2 does not include standardized directions for administration including a time limit for administration; therefore, students were given the questionnaire, the test format was explained, and they were allowed unlimited time to complete the measurement. Once all participants had completed the questionnaire, it was collected by the moderator, and the next section of the session began.

The ATTA was administered third. The administration of the ATTA followed the exact procedure outlined in the Abbreviated Torrance Test Adult Manual. The verbal prompts are described explicitly in the manual. These include exact directions detailing when and how the pages of the protocol should be turned, along with timing specifications. After the participants had completed the ATTA, the administrator collected the protocols.

The M-GUDS-S was the final instrument administered. The M-GUDS-S does not have detailed administration directions. After each participant received the questionnaire form, the question format was explained. Participants were given an unlimited amount of time to complete the questionnaire and indicated that it had been completed by turning the paperwork face down on their workspace.

Each test was scored according to the scoring procedures provided with the individual test. The resulting scores from the newly created instrument were compared with the results from the already established instruments. Those scores were then statistically transformed into z-scores, which allowed for appropriate comparison. Once
concurrent validity was determined from the second pilot session, a third pilot session was conducted in which the test-retest reliability was determined.

*ArtStreet Instrument: Session Three.* The third and final session required the participants to re-take the ArtStreet Instrument within a short period of time to determine reliability of the test. If the instrument was reliable, the scores should have been approximately the same for both administrations. Again, participants identified themselves through the same method used in Session 2. This administration of the instrument followed the same procedure as the first administration, including the timing element.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this section the descriptive aspect of the study and the technical adequacy of the newly developed ArtStreet Instrument is first discussed. The descriptive study primarily consisted of a review of currently available information collected from past instructors as well as residents of the ArtStreet community. Next, technical adequacy, including reliability and validity, of the ArtStreet Instrument are described. Reliability was checked using the techniques of test-retest; internal consistency analysis and content and concurrent validity were also measured.

Phase 1: Descriptive Study

ArtStreet Instructor Feedback response analysis. For many of the survey questions posed to instructors utilizing the space, similar types of responses were provided. Several instructors indicated that the classrooms in ArtStreet call for more creativity and flexibility of teaching methods within the classroom. One of the most frequently represented responses indicated more discussion occurs in the ArtStreet classroom setting than in the traditional classroom setting. Discussion was, in fact, within the top three responses provided for the following three questions. Do you think that having your class at ArtStreet impacted student learning? Has teaching at ArtStreet
impacted your teaching methods? If you have other sections of this class not held at ArtStreet, did you notice any differences in student participation or work for the classes held at ArtStreet. Instructors also indicated that this environment lent itself to much more group work than the traditional classroom setting. This may be largely influenced by the space and flexibility of seating (as reported by instructors). Instructors also seemed to highly value the resources that were available in ArtStreet, from the whiteboards to the AV cart to the film room.

The convenience and or/proximity of ArtStreet was also frequently discussed, indicating such things as the proximity of the complex to the student neighborhood as a plus, as well as the proximity and convenience of art events as having an impact on curriculum and student experiences. Instructors also indicated that most of them (88%) had attended other events or used other areas of the complex for activities outside of their class time. Many reported having eaten in the Café, attended meetings, art shows/exhibits, or other activities.

Despite the overwhelmingly positive feedback from the ArtStreet instructors, there were several suggestions and/or complaints. The most commonly discussed negatives about ArtStreet were not having resources such as a copier, permanent computer, overhead projector, or printer. These items were indicated to be important for instructor preparation and classroom teaching. Also, several instructors indicated that not having parking passes for the semester was an inconvenience. Overall, it seems that the instructors who provided feedback find teaching at ArtStreet to be a positive experience. This is evident from the responses provided as well as the 94% of respondents indicating
a strong desire to bring their classes back to ArtStreet. Please refer to Appendix E and F for the full reports.

**ArtStreet Experience Class Supplemental Evaluations.** Review of archived data uncovered a wealth of information regarding the programming and ArtStreet experience. However, due to the differing data collection processes utilized, comparisons between activities, semesters, and years proved to be exceedingly difficult. Thus, the large majority of questions had to be analyzed as independent entities. These analyses can be located in Appendices G-J.

As a result of the review of the archived data as well as through the development of the instrument, it became apparent that an additional measure would be necessary in order to address the course specific questions that had been previously addressed in the ArtStreet Experience Supplemental Evaluations. While the questions did address specific events/activities/programs held during the duration of the course, the questions were not asked in a systematic or standard way each semester. This made the analysis and comparison of data from semester to semester very difficult. A new ArtStreet Experience Supplemental Evaluation (see Appendix K) was created by evaluating the questions that were previously included in the evaluations, and pulling out the concepts that were repeated throughout the various versions of the evaluations. Many of the concepts were tailored to specific events, but were revised to broaden the scope of the questions on the new evaluation in order to be applicable from one semester to the next. The ability to generalize the same questions from semester to semester and year to year will allow for a more streamlined and directed analysis of resident perceptions of events, activities, programs, and the facilities. This will help with the evaluation of the course requirements.
for future semesters, as it will provide an indication of the level of impact, positive or negative, of the events, activities, and programs. See Appendix L for results of the first administration.

**Phase 2: Survey Development**

The ArtStreet Assessment tool was developed specifically for ArtStreet to address the newly identified significant constructs. The intention of the survey was to serve as a dependent variable in order to measure the impact of participation within ArtStreet. Technical adequacy was investigated to determine the reliability and validity of the instrument.

**Reliability.** Reliability was evaluated using the techniques of test-retest and internal consistency analysis. Participants were administered the test a second time, the week following the initial assessment to determine the test-retest reliability. The scores were compared using a Pearson correlation analysis. Overall, the first and second administrations yielded a strong correlation with $r=0.91$. A more detailed analysis was conducted for the specific subsections of the new assessment instrument in comparison with the second administration, the correlation between the community section provided an $r=0.83$, the creativity section provided an $r=0.88$, and the diversity section provided an $r=0.84$. All three subsections had high correlation values indicating good test-retest reliability.

Two internal consistency estimates of reliability were computed for each of the three subscales of the ArtStreet Instrument using the data collected from the initial administration: a split-half coefficient expressed as a Spearman-Brown corrected correlation and co-efficient alpha. For the split-half coefficient, the scales were split into
two halves such that the two halves would be as equivalent as possible. In splitting the items, the sequencing of questions was taken into account. In the Community subscale, one of the halves included items 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9, while the other half included items 2, 4, 6, and 8. The value for the coefficient alpha was .83, and the value for the split-half coefficient was .93 using the unequal length method, each indicating satisfactory reliability. In the Creativity subscale, one of the halves included items 12, 15, 17, 19a, and 19c, while the other half included items 13, 16, 18, and 19b. The value for the coefficient alpha was .63, and the value for the split-half coefficient was .81 using the unequal length method, each indicating satisfactory reliability. For the Diversity subscale, one of the halves included items 20, 22, 24, 26, and 28, while the other half included items 21, 23, 25, and 27. The value for the coefficient alpha was .82, and the value for the split-half coefficient was .90 using the unequal length method, each indicating satisfactory reliability.

**Validity.** A valid instrument is one that has been demonstrated to measure what it is intended to measure. For the purposes of this study, content and concurrent validity were measured.

**Content Validity.** Analysis from the first part of the study, including review of mission, vision, interviews, and expert panel discussion, including an Adjunct Professor of Anthropology and a Doctoral Graduate Assistant in the Doctoral Program in the School of Education and Allied Professions, Director of ArtStreet, an Associate Professor and Coordinator of the School Psychology Program, an Associate Professor and Coordinator of College Student Personnel Services Program, and an Assistant Professor in the College Student Personnel and Higher Education Programs. Through review of
archived data, literature review, and multiple panel discussions, the three domains, creativity, community, and diversity, were determined to be the most salient aspects of ArtStreet. As such, these activities provided a basis for content validity for the new assessment instrument.

**Concurrent Validity.** All four measures, and their relative subsections (ArtStreet Instrument: Total, Community, Creativity, and Diversity; Sense of Community Index-2: Total Sense of Community Index, Reinforcement of Needs, Membership, Influence, and Shared Emotional Connection; Miville-Guzman Universality Diversity Scale-Short Form: Diversity of Contact, Relativistic Appreciation, and Comfort with Differences; the Abbreviated Torrance Test for Adults: Creativity Index), were administered and scored according to the individual measure directions. These scores were then transformed into z-scores for comparison purposes. Correlation coefficients were then computed among the four measures and their subsections.

To determine concurrent validity for the community subsection of the new instrument correlation coefficients were computed between the ArtStreet Instrument subsection Community and the Sense of Community 2: Total Sense of Community Index, and the four subsections of Reinforcement of Needs, Membership, Influence, and Shared Emotional Connection. Using the Bonferroni approach to control for Type I error across the correlations, a p value of less than .013 (.05 / 4 = .0125) was required for significance. The results of the correlational analysis are presented in Table 1. Two of the 5 correlations were statistically significant and were greater than or equal to .585, and one was approaching significance. In general, the results suggest that the ArtStreet
Instrument subsection Community does tend to predict Total Sense of Community Index-2 and Membership scores.

Table 1
*Bivariate Correlations among the ArtStreet Instrument Community Subsection, and the Sense of Community Index-2 (N = 21)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sense of Community Index</th>
<th>Reinforcement of Needs</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>Shared Emotional Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ArtStreet Instrument Community Subscale</td>
<td>.585*</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.643*</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .013

To determine concurrent validity for the diversity subsection of the new instrument, correlation coefficients were computed between the ArtStreet Instrument subsection Diversity and the Miville-Guzman Universality Diversity Scale-Short Form: Total Score and subsections of Diversity of Contact, Relativistic Appreciation, and Comfort with Differences. Using the Bonferroni approach to control for Type I error across the correlations, a p value of less than .017 (.05 / 3 = .0166) was required for significance. The results of the correlational analysis are presented in Table 2. Two of the 4 correlations were statistically significant and were greater than or equal to .495. In general, the results suggest that the ArtStreet Instrument subsection Diversity does tend to predict Miville-Guzman Universality Diversity Scale and Comfort with Differences scores.
Table 2
Bivariate Correlations among the ArtStreet Instrument Diversity Subsection, and the Miville-Guzman Universality Diversity Scale-Short Form (N = 21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M-GUDS-S Total Score</th>
<th>Diversity of Contact</th>
<th>Relativistic Appreciation</th>
<th>Comfort with Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ArtStreet Instrument Diversity Subscale</td>
<td>.495*</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.583*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .017

To determine concurrent validity for the creativity subsection of the new instrument correlation coefficients were computed between the ArtStreet Instrument subsection Creativity and the Abbreviated Torrance Test for Adults to reveal a correlation that was not statistically significant, r=.14, indicating that the relationship between the two tests may not measure the same construct. It should be noted that the internal consistency between the overall creativity index and the subscales representing the four underlying abilities on the ATTA ranged from .38 to .90, and there is no report on reliability or standard error of measurement for the creativity indicators on that assessment. This assessment was chosen due to the limited availability of instruments that measure creativity. The results of this current study do not contradict the earlier findings about the lack of reliability or validity of the ATTA, thus no conclusions can be drawn.

The technical adequacy of this instrument can be supported by reliability as supported by both the techniques of test-retest and internal consistency analysis. Content validity is supported by significant review of archival data along with expert panel
opinion. Concurrent validity is supported by significant correlations between the
Community and Diversity subsections with their selected corresponding measures.
Concurrent validity was neither supported nor disputed for the domain of Creativity due
to lack of adequate corresponding measure. See Appendix M for the final assessment
tool and administration and scoring directions as developed through this study
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This assessment process was intended to complete a program evaluation of ArtStreet, a living-learning community at the University of Dayton. There was a vast array of data from every year of operation of ArtStreet. While the data provided a wealth of information, the past collection processes were not standardized or streamlined. Therefore, the data tended to be difficult to compare and analyze as a whole. This study involved taking the individually constructed questions of earlier data collection methods and bringing them together to form a more cohesive form of analysis of ArtStreet in the new instrument.

As a result of initial review of archival data, a more streamlined process of data collection and review was deemed necessary to aid in continued program evaluation. Through this process, archived data was synthesized and distilled in order to provide an overview of the ArtStreet experience and two new evaluative procedures were created. A thorough check for reliability and validity was conducted to determine the technical adequacy of the ArtStreet Instrument.

From the beginning of the process, there were hints at strengths in certain areas and weaknesses in others, but they could neither be confirmed or denied due to lack of
consistency in identifying, measuring, and monitoring of targeted areas. But perhaps the most important finding of this study was that data collection for the sake of data collection, while potentially providing a wealth of information, may not be the most effective or efficient use of resources. Intentional gathering of pertinent data can yield results much more effectively and efficiently, given that the administrators of the program in question is aware of what specifically they are seeking to gain from the information. Within the context of this study, the three most crucial elements of desired impact were identified and defined (community, diversity, and creativity), to serve as the focus of the assessment and more importantly to assist in aligning future goals.

Limitations

Several limitations exist regarding this study. First, the three domains that were deemed to be the targeted assessment areas are complex, abstract, and difficult to assess through an objective, quantitative approach. This difficulty is particularly evident when looking at the research pertaining to creativity and the lack of available assessments. Additionally, the evaluation was limited to the participants that were available at the ArtStreet location, thus the sample size was small and homogeneous in nature. Generalizability was inferred through the relationship that was demonstrated for both community and diversity constructs. Still, the participants in the current study were limited to residential students at a moderate size mid-western Catholic university. Future investigations of the appropriateness of the instrument for other populations may be appropriate. The Supplemental assessment tool, which was developed as a secondary result of this program evaluation, was not assessed for reliability or validity due to the primary focus on the ArtStreet Instrument, as well as due to the qualitative nature of the
questions. It has, however, been used to assess student feedback to the ArtStreet Experience course through a more systematic approach. This assessment tool may provide an opportunity for future investigation.

**Strategic Plan Goals**

ArtStreet has included the following goals in a newly created strategic plan as a result of this program evaluation:

Increase opportunities for student engagement in the arts by providing intentional, accessible, diverse, and continuous arts and creativity-based experiences for all students (1st year through alumni) including community-oriented leadership development opportunities. Continue to assess impact of ArtStreet programs on creativity, diversity, and community on UD students and the campus culture. Deepen campus and community stakeholder arts engagement with ArtStreet by augmenting faculty, artist, campus, and community partner involvement with ArtStreet in a way that is integrated with goals, strategic, and sustainable. Improve governance, infrastructure, and funding by developing an improved support network of partners and funding for ArtStreet, and maintaining/upgrading its physical space and human resources to enable continued achievement of objectives and overall goals. (University of Dayton, 2010)

As a result of having a more consistent instrument, ArtStreet will likely be more efficient at collecting targeted data concerning the areas deemed most salient, more effective at utilizing the data to make decisions regarding future programming, and potentially providing a basis for future funding opportunities.

**Implications for Future Research**
Future investigation could examine the results of the administrations of the new instrument going forward. Other populations on campus, around the community, and other campuses could potentially use the ArtStreet Instrument to determine generalizability. Additional research may be completed to determine the reliability and validity of the Supplemental Evaluations.
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APPENDIX A

ARTSTREET EXPERIENCE SUPPLEMENTAL EVALUATION
(INCLUDING SEMESTER AND QUESTION INFORMATION)

1. Did this project help connect you to the campus or Dayton Community? If so, how? (Fall 2006-1.d, 2.d, 3.d, 4.d)
2. Did this project help connect you to other ArtStreet residents? (Fall 2006-1.e, 2.e, 3.e, 4.e; Winter 2007-2.b, 3.d)
3. Did this project help connect you to UD faculty? (Fall 2006-1.f, 2.f, 3.f, 4.f; Winter 2007-2.b)
4. Helped me develop a feeling of community with other residents at ArtStreet (Fall 2007-1.e, Winter 2008-2.e)
5. Do you feel that you know many other residents in the ArtStreet complex? Why or why not? (Fall 2007-3.e)
6. What has provided the best opportunity to get to know neighbors? (Fall 2007, 3.f, Winter 2008-5.b)
7. Can you suggest other things that would help ArtStreet residents get to know each other better? (Fall 2007-3.g; Winter 2008-5.c)
8. Did you fulfill your own expectations for living at ArtStreet (as a resident) for yourself and for your community? How? (Fall 2008-1)
9. Were the class sessions helpful in building community among the ArtStreet residents? If so, how? If not, what could be done to improve that? (Fall 2008-17)
10. Did you initiate any opportunities to get to know your neighbors outside of class? Why/why not? (Fall 2008-18)
11. What could be done to help facilitate more interactivity among residents? (Fall 2008-19)

12. Were you able to participate in the ArtStreet community in a way that you expected? Why or why not? (Winter 2007-5.b)
13. In what ways do you feel you have contributed to some aspect of community at ArtStreet? (Fall 2007- 3.a)
14. What has been most helpful to support/inspire/encourage your participation? (Fall 2007- 3.b)
15. What has been a barrier to your participation? (Fall 2007- 3.c)
16. In what way or ways have you not been involved that you would like to be? (Fall 2007- 3.d)
17. What activities/events did you participate in at ArtStreet this year? If yes, what specifically? (Please circle any activities you were involved in creating). (Winter 2008- 5.a)
18. How would you summarize your experience of living at ArtStreet this semester? (Fall 2007- 3.h; Winter 2008- 5.d)
19. Is this experience of living at ArtStreet meeting your expectations? Why or why not? (Fall 2007- 3.i; Winter 2008- 5.e)
20. Did the ArtStreet staff and leaders meet your expectations? Why/why not? (Fall 2008- 2)
21. Do you feel this project provided you with the opportunity for creative exploration? (Fall 2006- 1.h, 2.h, 3.h, 4.h; Winter 2007- 3.f)
22. The ArtStreet Experience Class has (Fall 2007- 1.a-c; Winter 2008- 2.a-c)
   a. Increased my awareness of different kinds of art
   b. Impacted my participation in the arts
   c. Enhanced my connection of my major to my interest in the arts
23. Have the arts impacted your life this semester more than previous semesters? In what way? (Fall 2008- 4)
24. Do you observe or see things differently as a result of participating in this class? (Fall 2008- 5)
25. What new ideas about art have you considered as a result of the ArtStreet class? (Fall 2008- 6)
26. Do you feel you learned something about the arts as a result of this project? If so, what? (Fall 2006- 1.g, 2.g, 3.g, 4.g)
27. Do you feel you learned something about the arts as a result of this workshop? If so, what? (Winter 2007- 3.e)
28. Did you do any research on this topic on your own? If so, what? (Fall 2006- 1.b, 2.b, 3.b, 4.b)
29. Did you feel you had the skills or knowledge to address this topic? (Fall 2006- 1.c, 2.c, 3.c, 4.c)
30. Do you feel you learned something as a result of this event? If so, what? (Winter 2007- 2.c)
31. Did the instructor work with you at your level of skill? (Winter 2007- 3.c)
32. Have you gone to any events or shows or used the facilities outside of class? (not including the Café) (Winter 2005- 6)
33. If yes, any comments? If not, why? (Winter 2005- 7)
34. Do you think there should be any class/learning/organized resident activity component be part of living here? If yes, what? (Winter 2005- 8)
35. Did you attend any other Samputu events outside of those required? If so, what? (Winter 2007- 1.a)
36. If you had not have been required to, would you have attended the Samputu performance? (Winter 2007- 1.b)
37. What other performances did you attend as a requirement for this class? (Winter 2007- 1.e)
38. Would you have attended these if it had not been a course requirement? (Winter 2007- 1.f)
39. Which ArtStreet workshops did you attend? (Winter 2007- 3.a)
40. Did you spend additional time on this activity as a result of the workshop? (Winter 2007- 3.h)
41. Outside of class activities, what did you participate in at ArtStreet? (Fall 2008- 7)
42. Did you enjoy participating in the resident events (Haunted House/Chinese International Night)? (Fall 2008- 11)
43. Do you feel that the residents should be required to produce an event each year? Why/why not? (Fall 2008- 13)
44. If so, what support is needed to help the events succeed? (Fall 2008- 14)
45. Outside of class activities, did you initiate activities/events/meetings/concerts at or sponsored by ArtStreet? If so, what? (Fall 2008- 20)
46. How much time did you spend outside of class on this project? (Fall 2006- 1.a, 2.a, 3.a, 4.a)
47. All in all, thinking about how you feel today, are you glad you lived here this year? (Winter 2005- 1)
48. If ArtStreet’s programming had been as active when you got here as it is now, would this change your last answer? (Winter 2005- 2)  
49. What has been your favorite part of being part of this project? (Winter 2005- 3)  
50. List anything you think should be repeated next year: (Winter 2005- 4)  
51. Do you think other students are coming to accept/understand/like ArtStreet more? (Winter 2005- 5)  
52. Do you feel like you were able to make the most out of living at ArtStreet this semester? Why or why not? (Fall 2006- 5.b)  
53. What did you think of the Samputu performance? (Winter 2007- 1.c)  
54. Should UD support similar visits and activities with artists? (Winter 2007- 1.d)  
55. Did you think attending these performances benefited you in any way? (Winter 2007- 1.g)  
56. Did you enjoy this topic? Why or why not? (Winter 2007- 2.a)  
57. Do you recommend that ArtStreet continue to host salons with varied topics? (Winter 2007- 2.d)  
58. Were you satisfied with this workshop? (Winter 2007- 3.b)  
59. Should this specific workshop be repeated? (Winter 2007- 3.g)  
60. Did you like the workshop series format for this semester’s ArtStreet Experience class? Why or why not? (Winter 2007- 4.a)  
61. Do you recommend that it be repeated for next year’s ArtStreet residents? (Winter 2007- 4.b)  
62. Overall, what were your two favorite ArtStreet experience activities this year? What were your two least favorite? (Winter 2007- 4.c)  
63. Overall, did living at ArtStreet meet your expectations? Why or why not? (Winter 2007- 5.a)  
64. What two things would improve the experience of students living at ArtStreet? (Winter 2007- 5.c)  
65. Would you recommend ArtStreet to other students as a good place to live? Why or why not? (Winter 2007- 5.d)  
66. The ArtStreet Experience Class has: (Fall 2007- 1.d; Winter 2008- 2.d)  
   a. Provided opportunities for me to experience new things  
67. Any suggestions to improve the course? (Fall 2007- 2; Winter 2008- 4)  
68. Was this a valuable experience for you? Why or why not? (Winter 2008- 1.a.i- vi.)
69. What do you like best about the course? (Winter 2008- 3)
70. Did the ArtStreet staff and leaders meet your expectations? Why/why not? (Fall 2008- 2)
71. Did ArtStreet programs and facilities meet your expectation? Why/why not? (Fall 2008- 3)
72. Did you enjoy the class sessions? Which ones did you like most/least? Why? (Fall 2008- 8)
73. Was the reading useful/interesting/relevant to you? Why or why not? (Fall 2008- 9)
74. What would you like to see more of in class? (Fall 2008- 10)
75. What did you like best and least about the experience? (Fall 2008- 12)
76. Did you enjoy Urban Nights? (Fall 2008- 15)
77. Did you enjoy attending performances (Slavic Soul Party and Project)? Why/why not? (Fall 2008- 16)
APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT: SESSION 1

Project Title: ArtStreet Assessment: Instrument Creation

Investigator: Kristen Lovins, MA

Purpose of Research: This research is intending to create and validate an instrument for assessing community, creativity, and diversity in ArtStreet residents.

Expected Duration of Study: This research should take less than one hour for you to complete.

Procedure: You will provide written answers to several Lykert scale type questions examining your ideas and perceptions of community, creativity, and diversity. After the completion of these questions, you will be asked to talk about the experience in a focus group type of discussion setting. During this discussion, you will be asked to determine which questions you felt were relevant and clearly stated, and those that were not relevant or clearly stated. The discussion will also open up to additional commentary regarding the format and questions.

Alternative Procedures: No alternative procedures exist in this research project.

Anticipated Risks and / or Discomfort: No risks or discomforts are anticipated.

Benefits to the Participant: Participants of this session will be offered refreshments. You will also gain knowledge of how psychological research is performed.

Confidentiality: No records of your participation in this research will be disclosed to others. Your data will be pooled with data from other research participants and only summary results will be made public. Your name will not be revealed in any document resulting from this research. Your data will be recorded anonymously.

Contact Person for Questions or Problems: If a research-related injury occurs, or if you have questions about the research, contact Kristen Lovins, ArtStreet Studio O2, 229-5104, or contact Dr. Susan Gfroerer, Chaminade Hall Room 301, 229-3652. Questions about the rights of the subject should be addressed to Jon Nieberding., Chair of the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects, Kettering Labs Room 542, +0104, 229-4053.
Consent to Participate: I have voluntarily decided to participate in this research project. The investigator named above has adequately answered all questions that I have about this research, the procedures involved, and my participation. I understand that the investigator named above, or one of her assistants, will be available to answer any questions about experimental procedures throughout this research. I also understand that I may refuse to participate or voluntarily terminate my participation in this research at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am entitled. The investigator may also terminate my participation in this research if he feels this to be in my best interest. In addition, I certify that I am 18 (eighteen) years of age or older.

__________________________________________________________________________    
Signature of Subject                           Date

__________________________________________________________________________    
Signature of Investigator                     Date
APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT: SESSIONS 2 & 3

Project Title: ArtStreet Assessment: Instrument Creation

Investigator: Kristen Lovins, MA

Purpose of Research: This research is intending to create and validate an instrument for assessing community, creativity, and diversity in ArtStreet residents.

Expected Duration of Study: This research should take less than one hour for you to complete.

Procedure: You will provide answers to four different assessment instruments. These instruments include the new ArtStreet Assessment tool, the Sense of Community Index II (SCI-2), the Abbreviated Torrance Test for Adults (ATTA), and the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale-Short Form (M-GUDS-S). Materials will be passed out and instructions will be given before the individual assessment instruments are completed. The materials will be collected at the end of each segment of the session. The ArtStreet Assessment tool consists of Likert scale type questions, and short answer questions. Participants will be given unlimited time to complete this instrument. Then, participants will be given an additional time to complete the SCI-2, a 25 item Likert scale type questionnaire. The third segment of the session will be the administration of the ATTA. During the ATTA, participants will be given three minutes to create responses for each of three activities. The first requires a written response to a story starter. The second and third require drawing pictures or objects. The final segment of the session will focus on the M-GUDS-S. Participants will be given unlimited time to complete this 15 item Likert scale type questionnaire. While the new assessment tool, SCI-2 and M-GUDS-S do not have specific time lengths, it is approximated that the completion of all four measures (including the ATTA) will require less than an hour of time.

Alternative Procedures: No alternative procedures exist in this research project.

Anticipated Risks and / or Discomfort: No risks or discomforts are anticipated.
Benefits to the Participant: By participating in both sessions of this research project, you will receive a gift card to a popular restaurant. You will also gain knowledge of how psychological research is performed.

Confidentiality: No records of your participation in this research will be disclosed to others. Your data will be pooled with data from other research participants and only summary results will be made public. Your name will not be revealed in any document resulting from this research. Your data will be recorded anonymously. Only the last four digits of your social security number will be recorded with your data; your name or other identification will not be recorded with the data.

Contact Person for Questions or Problems: If a research-related injury occurs, or if you have questions about the research, contact Kristen Lovins, ArtStreet Studio O2, 229-5104, or contact Dr. Susan Gfroerer, Chaminade Hall Room 301, 229-3652. Questions about the rights of the subject should be addressed to Jon Nieberding, Chair of the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects, Kettering Labs Room 542, +0104, 229-4053.

Consent to Participate: I have voluntarily decided to participate in this research project. The investigator named above has adequately answered all questions that I have about this research, the procedures involved, and my participation. I understand that the investigator named above, or one of her assistants, will be available to answer any questions about experimental procedures throughout this research. I also understand that I may refuse to participate or voluntarily terminate my participation in this research at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am entitled. The investigator may also terminate my participation in this research if he feels this to be in my best interest. In addition, I certify that I am 18 (eighteen) years of age or older.

______________________________  ________________________________
Signature of Subject                     Date

______________________________  ________________________________
Signature of Investigator               Date
APPENDIX D

ARTSTREET INSTRUMENT WITH DEVELOPMENTAL COMMENTARY

ArtStreet Instrument

Last four digits of Social Security Number: ____________

Age: _______ Gender: _______ I live/have lived in the ArtStreet complex (Circle one) Yes No

Year(1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th): _______ If yes, how many academic years of

Major: ____________ residence? ____________

Community

(please note that this/the community refers to the ArtStreet community.)

1. In general, the notion of community is _______ to me. (Circle one)

   Not Important Not Very Important Slightly Less than Average Importance Average Importance Slightly More than Average Importance Important Extremely Important

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. How involved do you feel you are currently in the community? (Circle one)

   No Involvement Very Little Involvement Average Involvement Slightly More than Average Involvement Highly Involved Extremely Involved

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I feel that I belong in this community. (Circle one)

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Neutral Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I feel that being a part of this community is beneficial to me. (Circle one)

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Neutral Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I feel that I can contribute to this community. (Circle one)

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Neutral Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I generally feel that I am a valuable part of this community. (Circle one)

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Neutral Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. I feel bonded to people in this community. (Circle one)

   Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Neutral Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Comment [a1]: Community questions were developed by looking at McMillan and Chavis, 1986. This is directly related to the sense of community (Habits of Inquiry and Reflection)

Comment [a2R1]: McMillan and Chavis said that there were four main components of community: Membership, boundaries, feelings of belonging, personal involvement, and emotional safety.

Comment [a2R1]: Elaborate on the necessity of the group. It is necessary not only for the survival, but also needs and desires.

Comment [a3R1]: Members feel they have a say over what happens in and with a group, and the group has a say over what happens with its members.

Comment [a4]: Shared emotional connection. Bonds are created and nurtured by the interaction between members of the community.
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Comment [a5]: Habits of Inquiry and Reflection.

Comment [a6]: Membership.

Comment [a7]: Influence.

Comment [a8]: Shared emotional connection.
ArtStreet Instrument

8. Actively seek out opportunities to be involved in this community [Circle one]
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Slightly Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Slightly Agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree
   [Comment [a09]: Habits of Inquiry and Reflection]

9. Actively initiate opportunities for myself and others to become involved in this community [Circle one]
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Slightly Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Slightly Agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree
   [Comment [a10]: Habits of Inquiry and Reflection]

10. Where there is a problem within this community, community members are able to resolve conflicts peacefully [Circle one]
    - Strongly Disagree
    - Disagree
    - Slightly Disagree
    - Neutral
    - Slightly Agree
    - Agree
    - Strongly Agree
    [Comment [a11]: Habits of Inquiry and Reflection]

11. What are three things that you perceive to be most valued in this community?

Creativity

12. What does creativity mean to you?

13. According to your definition, how creative are you? [Circle one]
    - Not Creative
    - Not Very Creative
    - Slightly Less Creative than Average
    - Average
    - Slightly Creative
    - Fairly Creative
    - Highly Creative

14. How important is creativity to you? [Circle one]
    - Not Important
    - Not Very Important
    - Slightly Less than Average Importance
    - Average Importance
    - Slightly More than Average Importance
    - Important
    - Extremely Important

[Comment [a12]: Questions were developed by looking at our discussions, in which we decided to use a general defining question followed by a self-reported rating of the individual’s perceived level of creativity (from Wallander, 2000). The idea of convergent and divergent thinking were discussed during our meetings and included in the questions (a12). The questions were tailored to the specific situation. Also, we talked about creativity as being product oriented, so the two questions regarding creativity were included in the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection]

[Comment [a13R12]: Items are designed to be comprehensive]

[Comment [a14]: Habits of Inquiry and Reflection]

Scholarship: All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate advanced habits of academic inquiry and creativity through the production of a body of artistic, research, or community-based work intended for public presentation and defense. (Roome et al., 2006, p. 1) Moreover, the focus for all programs is always necessarily on products for public presentation and defense.

[Comment [a15]: Wallander, 2000]
# ArtStreet Instrument

15. I generally feel that I am able to come up with many original ideas. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [a16]: Discrepancy thinking ability to think of many original, diverse, and elaborate ideas

16. I generally feel that ideas I generate are innovative. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [a17]: Habits of inquiry and reflection

17. I generally have an interest in learning about new ideas, approaches, and innovative solutions to problems. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [a18]: Habits of inquiry and reflection

18. I generally feel that I am able to take the best parts of others’ ideas and apply/integrate them into my own ideas. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [a19]: Engaging thinking ability to synthesize, evaluate, combine, and choose the best ideas from a selection of ideas

19. I often follow through with my own creative ideas. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [a20]: Habits of inquiry and reflection, Stemberg, 2006

20. I generally feel that I am capable of making/producing something creative. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [a21]: Habits of inquiry and reflection, Stemberg, 2006

21. I generally feel that creativity is valued in this community. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [a22]: Habits of inquiry and reflection (Community focus)

Comment [a23]: These questions were developed from expert panel discussion and the definition developed, partially centered around the nature of developing habits of inquiry, universality, acceptance, and self-expression. These ideas are drawn primarily from Mishler et al. (2003), and University of Dayton’s Habits of inquiry and reflection.

22. How much is diversity a part of your life right now? (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Part at All</th>
<th>Not Much</th>
<th>Slightly Less than Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Slightly More than Average</th>
<th>A Large Part</th>
<th>A Very Large Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [a24]: Diversity: Habits of inquiry: “All undergraduates will develop and demonstrate intellectually informed, empathetic, and critical understanding of the cultures, histories, times, and places of multiple others.” (Student understanding will reflect inquiry, experiential immersion and reflection. (Bissell et al, 2003, p. 3)

- University awareness of similarities among people
- Acceptance: acceptance and openness towards the differences among people

---

If you need additional space to complete your responses, please continue on the back of this sheet.
ArtStreet Instrument

23. I generally feel that diversity is valuable. (Circle one)  
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Neutral | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   
   Comment [a25]: Tolerance

24. I am generally able to recognize similarities between myself and people who are different from me. (Circle one)  
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Neutral | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   
   Comment [a26]: Universality

25. I am generally able to recognize differences between myself and people who are similar to me. (Circle one)  
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Neutral | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   
   Comment [a27]: Self-expression

26. I generally desire to seek out new opportunities to experience diversity. (Circle one)  
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Neutral | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   
   Comment [a28]: Acceptance

27. I generally feel comfortable in situations that expose me to people who are different from me. (Circle one)  
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Neutral | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   
   Comment [a29]: Self-expression

28. I generally feel comfortable expressing who I really am. (Circle one)  
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Neutral | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   
   Comment [a30]: Self-expression

29. I feel that there are opportunities available for me to express myself within this community. (Circle one)  
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Neutral | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   
   Comment [a31]: Identity of inquiry and reflection (Community focus)

30. I generally feel that differences are valued in this community. (Circle one)  
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Neutral | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   
   Comment [a32]: Identity of inquiry and reflection (Community focus)

31. I feel that I have knowledge and understanding of many different cultures, histories, times, and places. (Circle one)  
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Neutral | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   
   Comment [a33]: Identity of inquiry and reflection (Community focus)

If you need additional space to complete your responses, please continue on the back of this sheet.
ArtStreet Instrument

32. I generally take advantage of opportunities to develop my understanding of cultures and people of different backgrounds than mine. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [e33]: Habits of Inquiry and Reflection

33. I generally am not afraid to voice opinions/ideas that are different from the majority. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [e34]: Self-expression

34. If you ranked any items in any section with a rating of 1 or 2 and would like to explain your reasoning, please do so in the space provided below. This information will help us make this program/experience more enjoyable and beneficial to current and future residents and users of ArtStreet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Response Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you need additional space to complete your responses, please continue on the back of this sheet.
ARTSTREET EXPERIENCE INSTRUCTOR FEEDBACK ANALYSIS

ArtStreet Assessment Report
Report Title: ArtStreet Experience Instructor Feedback Analysis
Author(s): Kristen Lovins
Date of Report: April 23, 2009

Background
At the conclusion of each semester (beginning during the Winter 2007 semester), instructors holding classes in the ArtStreet facility were asked to complete a questionnaire regarding their experience teaching at ArtStreet. Sixteen questionnaires were completed and returned. The questionnaires for each semester followed a similar format.

Summary of Data
A thematic analysis was conducted for each of the questions as an individual entity. The analysis consisted of identifying main ideas within the responses, and marking tallies for each possible response on an Excel Spreadsheet. The responses were then analyzed for percentages of respondents providing answers corresponding to each possible response category. The percentages were then used in conjunction with the actual responses to create a narrative mini-report. Many of the response examples provided for individual categories also fell under other categories. Some of the responses to particular questions did not naturally lend themselves to categorical analysis. For each of these questions, response examples are provided.

Overall, instructors (94%) indicated that they believed that having their classes at ArtStreet impacted student learning. They indicated that this was due to the atmosphere/environment (57%), more discussion (50%), comfort (38%), nice setting (31%), and proximity to arts/culture (25%).

They also indicated (87%) that teaching at ArtStreet has impacted their methods of teaching by including more discussion (40%), group work (27%), and available resources (27%). All instructors (100%) indicated that some particular aspect of ArtStreet positively impacted their teaching. Sixty-seven percent indicated that this was due to space, 53% due to resources, 40% due to flexibility, 40% due to available technology, and 33% indicated that it was due to the seating. However, sixty-three percent of the instructors also reported that there was something lacking in the
ArtStreet facility that impacted their teaching. They commented on the lack of copier (19%), permanent computer (19%), overhead projectors (19%), and parking pass problems (19%). Ninety percent of the instructors also indicated that the use of ArtStreet had some impact on their overall teaching experience at UD. This was due to the fact that it was perceived to be more fun/enjoyable (20%) and because of the lighting within the complex (20%). Ninety-four percent of the participating instructors indicated that they plan to teach at ArtStreet in the future, and 6% stated that they would if necessary.

Of the instructors who participated, 67% indicated that they had sections of the courses they were teaching both at ArtStreet and in other locations. Of those participants, 80% indicated that there was a difference in student participation or work for the courses held at ArtStreet. The biggest reasons reported were more discussion (30%), more student participation (20%), and more group work (20%).

Eighty-five percent of the respondents indicated that they thought that ArtStreet was impacting student culture at UD. The following are some of the responses provided by the instructors:

- “Students like it. Faculty are more and more beginning to learn about the teacher opportunities there, and the learning and living communities will, I’m sure, be scheduling more events there.”
- “I sure hope so! It is bringing so much needed culture into the neighborhood. I am an alum. I was really hesitant when they tore all those houses down, but now, I am so happy that they did. ArtStreet is just such a lovely addition to UD.”
- “It is giving the students somewhere to go other than the bars and parties. It is definitely impacting student culture. They are more well-rounded, cultured, and educated due to ArtStreet.”
- “When I first arrived here 4 years ago, I heard lots of negative talk about ArtStreet. In the 4 years since I’ve been here, I think students are more excited to use the space and find it attractive for what it offers.”

Eighty-eight percent of the instructors indicated that they had come to ArtStreet for various reasons other than to teach their classes. These reasons included: food/café (38%), meetings (25%), and art shows/exhibits (19%). When asked to provide suggestions to attract more faculty to events or to use ArtStreet for their classes and programs, 38% indicated that we should “spread the word,” and 25% indicated that ArtStreet should just continue what it was already doing. When asked for other suggestions or comments, most respondents provided positive feedback, including:

- “The ArtStreet director, facility coordinator, and student workers in ArtStreet are all nice and friendly and were available if I had any questions or if there were any problems. Also, the student workers made sure that the studio was cleaned up quickly in between classes.”
- “A great place for students and faculty, thanks!”
While the majority of the feedback was positive, two respondents indicated that they would like to see the white boards cleaned more often.

**Recommendations**

For many of the questions, similar types of responses were provided. Several instructors indicated that the classrooms in ArtStreet call for more creativity and flexibility of teaching methods within the classroom. One of the most frequently represented responses indicated more discussion occurs in the ArtStreet classroom setting than in the traditional classroom setting. Discussion was, in fact, within the top three responses provided for three questions. Instructors also indicated that this environment lent itself to much more group work than the traditional classroom setting. This may be largely influence by the space and flexibility of seating (as reported by instructors). Instructors also seemed to highly value the resources that were available in ArtStreet, from the whiteboards to the AV cart, to the film room.

The convenience and or/proximity of ArtStreet was also frequently discussed, indicating such things as the proximity of the complex to the student neighborhood is a plus, as well as the proximity and convenience of art events as an impact on curriculum and student experience.

Instructors also indicated that most (88%) had attended other events or used other areas of the complex for activities outside of their class time. Many reported having eaten in the Café, attended meetings, art shows/exhibits, or other activities.

Despite the overwhelmingly positive feedback from the ArtStreet instructors, there were several suggestions and/or complaints. The most commonly discussed negatives about ArtStreet were not having resources such as a copier, permanent computer, overhead projector, or printer. These items were indicated to be important for instructor preparation and classroom teaching. Also, several instructors indicated that not having parking passes for the semester was an inconvenience. Overall, it seems that the instructors who provided feedback find teaching at ArtStreet to be a positive experience. This is evident from the responses provided as well as the 94% of respondents indicating a strong desire to bring their classes back to ArtStreet.

**Notes**
APPENDIX F

ARTSTREET INSTRUCTOR FEEDBACK RESPONSE ANALYSIS

ArtStreet Instructor Feedback Response Analysis
At the conclusion of each semester (beginning during the Winter 2007 semester), instructors holding classes in the ArtStreet facility were asked to complete a questionnaire regarding their experience teaching at ArtStreet. Sixteen questionnaires were completed and returned. The questionnaires for each semester followed a similar format (the Fall 2007 and Winter 2008 questionnaires are exactly the same, the questions on the Winter 2007 questionnaire are in a different order, do not have the __Yes __No component, and two questions are not represented as indicated by *).

The questions are as follows:
1. Do you think that having your class at ArtStreet impacted student learning?
   __Yes __No. If so, in what way(s)?
2. Has teaching at ArtStreet impacted your teaching methods?
   __Yes __No. If so, how?
3. Is there anything specific (technology, amount of space, proximity to art gallery, etc.) that positively impacted your teaching?
   __Yes __No. If so, please explain.
4. Is there anything lacking in the ArtStreet facility that negatively impacted your teaching (i.e. no office space, etc.)?
   __Yes __No. In what ways can we improve your experience here?
5. Has the use of ArtStreet impacted your overall teaching experience at UD?
   __Yes __No. If so, how?*
6. Do you plan to teach here again?
   __Yes __No. Why or why not?
7. If you have other sections of this class not held at ArtStreet, did you notice any difference in student participation or work for the classes at ArtStreet?
   __Yes __No. If so, how?
8. In your opinion, is ArtStreet impacting student culture at UD?
   __Yes __No. Please explain.
9. Other than teaching your class, have you come to ArtStreet for other reasons/events/activities?
   __Yes __No. If so, for what?
10. What can we do to attract more faculty to events or to use ArtStreet for their classes and programs?*
11. Other suggestions/comments?
Analysis

A thematic analysis was conducted for each of the questions as an individual entity. The analysis consisted of identifying main ideas within the responses, and marking tallies for each possible response on an Excel Spreadsheet. The responses were then analyzed for percentages of respondents providing answers corresponding to each possible response category. The percentages were then used in conjunction with the actual responses to create a narrative mini-report. Response examples were provided for each of the categories. Many of the response examples provided for individual categories also fell under other categories. Some of the responses to particular questions did not naturally lend themselves to categorical analysis (see questions 6, 8, and 11). For each of these questions, more extensive response examples are provided.

1. Do you think that having your class at ArtStreet impacted student learning?  
   __Yes __No. If so, in what way(s)?

   Of the sixteen responses provided for this question, fifteen (94%) reported that, yes, having class at ArtStreet impacted student learning. The responses provided were categorized by theme. Examples for the various categories are also included.

   Atmosphere/Environment (9/16 = 56.25%)
   - “The atmosphere in ArtStreet relaxed the students and made them feel more comfortable than if they were in a regular classroom.”
   - “I believe the environment enhanced student learning because students were able to move fluidly through formal instruction to group learning.”

   Discussion (8/16 = 50%)
   - “I think it facilitates discussion.”
   - “Being in a flexible, ‘non-industrial’ space has encouraged collaboration and conversation.”

   Comfort (6/16 = 37.50%)
   - “Students are more comfortable and tend to ask more questions.”
   - “I believe that this comfortable atmosphere allowed students to interact more and get to know each other better, which was one of the class goals.”

   Seating (5/16 = 31.25%)
   - “The seating and casual and flexible”
   - “The movable nature of the chairs allowed students to set up seating according to the project or activity at hand.”

   Arts/Culture (4/16 = 25%)
   - “We discussed writing and the arts, while they were surrounded by and immersed in art.”
   - “The students had such a richer experience with the exposure to art/culture that I know they will appreciate for a lifetime.”

   Resources (3/16 = 18.75%)
   - “The large TV screen makes viewing of course related material more effective.”
   - “The room allows a class size of 60+ (this requires set-up of 30+ additional chairs and is always ready for our class.”

   Interaction (3/16 = 18.75%)

69
“In Studio C students feel much freer to interact with each other and with me.”
“The classroom allows more interaction and encourages discussion.”

2. Has teaching at ArtStreet impacted your teaching methods? __Yes __No. If so, how?

Of the fifteen responses provided for this question, thirteen (87%) of the respondents indicated that, yes, teaching at ArtStreet had impacted their teaching methods, and two (13%) respondents indicated that teaching at ArtStreet had no impact on their teaching methods. The responses provided were categorized by theme.

Discussion (6/15 = 40%)
• “Much more discussion driven, which students love.”
• “Studio C facilitates discussion.”

Group Work (4/15 = 26.67%)
• “We did more group work - easy to divide them into teams at each white board.”
• “I did more group work activities.”

Available Resources (4/15 = 26.67%)
• “Both studios encouraged daily use of the computer because of the equipment’s availability.”
• “The purpose of the class was to engage students in and develop their critical thought. The classroom structure and resources definitely gave us better opportunity to do this rather than more traditional classrooms.”

Film (3/15 = 20%)
• “Studio B is one of the best venues for showing and discussing films on campus.”

Convenience (3/15 = 20%)
• “I believe ArtStreet is much more appropriate for this class and is very proximate for the mostly seniors that take this class.”
• “How convenient and how pleasurable.”

Proximity to Art Events (3/15 = 20%)
• “I incorporated many lessons into the Writing and the Arts curriculum due to the Artist in Residence and exhibitions in the ArtStreet Village.”
• “Incorporating the various art events into the curriculum really engages the students both inside and outside the classroom.”

Try Different Approaches to Learning (3/15 = 20%)
• “I have been able to respond better to differing learning styles.”
• “Better able to try out different stances and approaches.”

Informal (2/15 = 13.33%)
• “Yes, more discussion and informal”

Flexibility (1/15 = 6.67%)
• “Podium teaching was available, but I could station myself in a variety of ways, something that kept the students and me more alert, more flexible and more relaxed.”

Made Teaching Goals Easier (1/15 = 6.67%)
• “It allowed me to more easily achieve my goals for active learning, but I have used these methods in prior classes.”

**Forced Me to Move More (1/15 = 6.67%)**
• “Forced me to move more.”

3. **Is there anything specific (technology, amount of space, proximity to art gallery, etc.) that positively impacted your teaching?**
   ___Yes ___ No. If so, please explain.

   Of the fifteen responses provided for this question, fifteen (100%) respondents indicated that, yes, something specific at ArtStreet had impacted their teaching. The responses provided were categorized by theme.

**Space (10/15 = 66.67%)**
• “The amount of space was important to my teaching as well as the ability to move the furniture easily.”
• “The large open space, flexibility of furniture, and white boards also impacted our ability to learn together.”

**Resources (8/15 = 53.33%)**
• “Space, flexible seating, and wide screen TV.”
• “Projection, sound, and comfortable viewing and discussion space impacted the teaching.”

**Flexibility (6/15 = 40%)**
• “Space and flexibility of moving.”
• “ArtStreet allowed the room to be set up in typical classroom style, but also allowed for smaller groups to be formed quickly and easily.”

**Technology (6/15 = 40%)**
• “The technology was great. It never failed me.”
• “The technology and the physical space lend themselves well to actively engaging students in the learning process.”

**Seating (5/15 = 33.33%)**
• “The space and the chairs.”
• “I think the seating caused the students to be more relaxed- which is a good thing.”

**Proximity (3/15 = 20%)**
• “I liked that walk through the gallery when entering the classroom.”
• “The more casual nature of the ArtStreet space and its proximity to a large portion of the senior students’ living spaces.”

**Environment/Atmosphere (3/15 = 20%)**
• “Just the overall atmosphere of the space.”
• “Overall atmosphere of both studios seems more ‘grown-up,’ less institutional, and more welcoming. The students loved it and so did I.”

**Dry Erase Boards (3/15 = 20%)**
• “The AV cart, white boards, and space.”
• “The dry erase boards spread out across the room were also helpful.”
Welcoming (2/15 = 13.33%)
- “The more open and welcoming environment has had a strong positive effect.”

4. Is there anything lacking in the ArtStreet facility that negatively impacted your teaching (i.e. no office space, etc.)? [ ] Yes [ ] No. In what ways can we improve your experience here?
   Of the sixteen responses provided for this question, ten (63%) respondents indicated that, yes, something at ArtStreet is lacking, and has negatively impacted their teaching. The responses provided were categorized by theme.

Copier (3/16 = 18.75%)
- “I do wish there was a printer, a copier, and an overhead available to instructors.”

Permanent Computer (3/16 = 18.75%)
- “I would like a computer permanently installed, so that it takes less time to set up for class.”

Parking Pass (3/16 = 18.75%)
- “The parking pass schlep is only annoying in bad weather. It would be great if parking could issue a semester pass for the specific time of the class for AS.”
- “A parking pass for our specified days?”

Overhead Projector (3/16 = 18.75%)
- “An overhead would also be nice.”

Printer (2/16 = 12.50%)
- “It would be nice to have a printer and a copier available for instructors.”

Noise (1/16 = 6.25%)
- “Also we always had to close the door leading to the art gallery because any noise in that room would be amplified by the open space and lead to class disruptions.”

No Hallways (1/16 = 6.25%)
- “The only problem with ArtStreet is that all the rooms are connected and there is not way to reach the office without either going outside or interrupting another meeting/class in the various rooms.”

Storage Space for Professors (1/16 = 6.25%)
- “A cubby hole or locker for book and coat storage?”

Tables and Chairs for Outside Use (1/16 = 6.25%)
- “More tables and chairs outside the studios in case weather permits moving class outside every now and then?”

White Boards Too Small (1/16 = 6.25%)
- “There wasn’t enough board space. The white boards were too small.”

No Desks to Write On (1/16 = 6.25%)
- “Not having something to write on (a desk) at times presented a problem.”

Dry Erase Pens Too Dry (1/16 = 6.25%)
- “Pens were often almost dry – for use on the white boards.”

Difficulties Seeing Films (1/16 = 6.25%)
- “Despite the fact that the bulb was replaced, the evening scenes in the films I showed were very difficult to see.”
Difficulties Operating Technology (1/16 = 6.25%)
• “It would be helpful to have a sheet of instructions regarding use of technology in Studio C.”

5. Has the use of ArtStreet impacted your overall teaching experience at UD?
___Yes ___No. If so, how?
Of the ten responses provided for this question, nine (90%) respondents indicated that, yes, the use of ArtStreet had impacted their overall teaching experience at UD. The low number of provided responses is accounted for by the fact that this particular question was not included on the Winter 2007 Instructor Feedback questionnaire. The responses provided were categorized by theme.

More Fun/Enjoyable (2/10 = 20%)
• “It’s more fun teaching THR 105.”
• “Teaching in ArtStreet (and the LTC, and in Marianist Hall) is much more enjoyable and more gratifying than teaching in, say, a Humanities classroom.”

Light (2/10 = 20%), Atmosphere (1/10 = 10%)
• “It’s wonderful to have the opportunity to teach in such a vibrant place with natural light!”

Space (1/10 = 10%)
• “I had tried rooms in Humanities, KU, and Miriam before trying ArtStreet and those spaces limited class size and were too inflexible to meet the needs of the Wines of the World Mini-Course. Since I can only offer the course once each semester and more than 200 students apply for the course every year it is important for me to enroll 60+ students each semester. The best we could do in other spaces was 45+ students per class.”

Student Involvement/Participation (1/10 = 10%)
• “It is helping me find ways to get students involved and participating in class.”

Facility (1/10 = 10%)
• “Wonderful light and facility.”

Experiential Learning (1/10 = 10%)
• “I have really found a home at ArtStreet. Partnered with Writing and the Arts, my classes have become homes for experiential learning: the artists in residence program had positively impacted the students’ learning and first-year experiences.”

Location (1/10 = 10%)
• “I love teaching Writing in the Arts at ArtStreet. It really brings the students into the campus neighborhood.”

Opportunity (1/10 = 10%)
• “It has also exposed me to some of the coolest artistic experiences of my life. For example, this year we worked closely with the Dayton Contemporary Dance Company. This is a once in a life opportunity for both my students and me. I love ArtStreet and all that it offers to me as an instructor and to my students as maturing young adults.”

Flexibility (1/10 = 10%)
• “Having the options for arranging the room and the comfortable furniture is fantastic.”

6. Do you plan to teach here again?
Of the sixteen responses provided for this question, fifteen (94%) respondents indicated that, yes, they plan to teach at ArtStreet in the future. One respondent (6%) indicated a desire to teach at ArtStreet again if necessary. No respondents indicated that they would not like to teach at ArtStreet again.
Some of the responses were accompanied by further information pertaining to why the respondent chose that particular response. The accompanying information indicated:

Yes (15/16 = 93.75%)
• “I would like ArtStreet to be the permanent location for UDI 350.”
• “I enjoyed the opportunity to teach at ArtStreet. The space is flexible and the chairs are comfortable.”
• “I just love the atmosphere, as do my students. The staff is excellent. Susan and Adrienne are wonderful people with whom to work. I love the partnership we started in Writing and the Arts. I hope it is one that lasts many, many years.”
• “The best location I have had for the course in the eight years since it was established. The course also gets great support from the ArtStreet Staff.”
• “The space is so inviting and un-oppressive.”
• “I would love to continue to teach this class on Monday nights in ArtStreet. Our intent for the RA class is to have it on Monday night from 7PM-9PM next fall.”

If Necessary (1/16 = 6.25%)
• “If necessary.”

7. If you have other sections of this class not held at ArtStreet, did you notice any difference in student participation or work for the classes held at ArtStreet? ___Yes ___ No. If so, how?
Of the fifteen responses provided for this question, ten (67%) respondents indicated that they had sections of their particular class that were not held at ArtStreet, three (20%) respondents only taught sections at ArtStreet, and two (13%) respondents indicated that the question was not applicable. Of the ten respondents indicating having sections of their particular class both at ArtStreet and in other locations, eight (80%) reported noticing a difference in student participation or work for the classes held at ArtStreet. The responses provided were categorized by theme.

More Discussion (3/10 = 30%)
• “Discussion is also better in the Studio C seating in the round.”
• “More discussion.”

More Student Participation (2/10 = 20%)
• “A little greater participation.”

More Group Work (2/10 = 20%)
• “It lends itself better to discussion and group work due to Studio C’s layout and the availability of white boards.”
Students Pay More Attention (1/10 = 10%), Able to Move More (1/10 = 10%)
• “In the past, I have taught THR 105 in Rm 128 in Music/Theatre. Student participation is less, small group work is difficult, keeping student attention is more difficult because I cannot move around the classroom. Just being able to move all around the room at AS helps me keep students’ attention on me.”

Less Resistance to Contemporary Art (1/10 = 10%)
• “There was a lot more resistance to contemporary art.”

More Interactive (1/10 = 10%)
• “It’s more interactive.”

Better Space Size (1/10 = 10%)
• “The other class met in the Studio space in the LTC. For the same reasons above, I believe the classes experienced similar experiences. However, the LTC class limited the space size. It would have been nice to have a few more students in the LTC to balance the two classes out.”

Better Experience (1/10 = 10%)
• “In the fall of 2007 I taught this same course in Humanities. This was a markedly better experience.”

8. In your opinion, is ArtStreet impacting student culture at UD? ___Yes ___ No. Please explain.

Of the thirteen responses provided for this question, eleven (85%) of respondents indicated that they thought that ArtStreet was impacting student culture at UD. Two (15%) of the respondents indicated that they did not know.

Some of the responses were accompanied by additional information pertaining to why the respondent chose that particular response. The information accompanying “Yes” responses indicated:

Yes
• “Students like it. Faculty are more and more beginning to learn about the teacher opportunities there, and the learning and living communities will, I’m sure, be scheduling more events there.”
• “I have heard that the idea for ArtStreet is good, but students would like to have bigger rooms to work/meet in. Also they think that the layout is confusing and that the addresses for the houses at ArtStreet make no sense. I have heard students say that the building itself is fitting in better with the student neighborhood now that many of the houses are being renovated and made to look nicer. I believe this will help students treat property better and feel a sense of ownership with ArtStreet and the houses.”
• “The good word will quickly pass from these Writing and the Arts students to others, and such networking has a definite impact on the culture. Dr. Fred Niles and Dr. Joel Whittaker also said that response has been really positive.”
• “I sure hope so! It is bringing much needed culture into the neighborhood. I am an alum. I was really hesitant when they tore all those houses down, but now, I am so happy that they did. ArtStreet is just such a lovely addition to UD.”
• “The arts are getting more respect, more interest. I think students who are not normally artistic are discovering the artist within and feeling safe about expressing themselves through art.”
• “I can’t say for sure, but it certainly adds to the emphasis on community.”
• “Helps to integrate their outside interests with their class experiences.”
• “It is giving the students somewhere to go other than the bars and parties. It is definitely impacting student culture. They are more well-rounded, cultured, and educated due to ArtStreet.”
• “When I first arrived here 4 years ago, I heard lots of negative talk about ArtStreet. In the 4 years since I’ve been here, I think students are more excited to use the space and find it attractive for what it offers.”
• “Wonderful to have classroom space in the neighborhood; it helps blend classroom life and living space.”
• “Being a UD grad, I think it has helped end the binge drinking. It gives students an opportunity to have something else to do on the weekends, not to mention that it brings a wealth of much needed culture to campus.”

9. Other than teaching your class, have you come to ArtStreet for other reasons/events/activities? __ Yes __ No. If so, for what?

Of the sixteen responses provided for this question, fourteen (88%) respondents indicated that, yes, they have come to ArtStreet for other reasons/events/activities. The responses provided were categorized by theme.

Food/Café (6/16 = 37.50%)
• “I eat at the café often.”
• “To meet students at the ArtStreet Café”

Meetings (4/16 = 25%)
• “For meetings”
• “Other meetings”

Art Shows/Exhibits (3/16 = 18.75%)
• “Photo exhibit, to consult with art students on a finial art project.”
• “The art shows and the café”

Speakers (2/16 = 12.50%)
• “Showings and special guests.”
• “I’ve been there for luncheons and dinners with speakers”

ArtBeat (2/16 = 12.5%)
• “ArtBeat”
• “I came to ArtBeat.”

Concerts (1/16 = 6.25%)
• “For outdoor concerts at the Amphitheatre”

Wine Tastings (1/16 = 6.25%)
• “In the past year for a wine tasting in Studio D for Club Six and the International Students.”

Puppet Show (1/16 = 6.25%)
• “I wanted to see how the amphitheatre ‘worked’, so I visited a puppet show there during the Stander Symposium. Weather permitting, teachers at ArtStreet should avail themselves more of the amphitheatre.”

Faculty Exchange Series (1/16 = 6.25%)
• “FES”

Exhibit Openings (1/16 = 6.25%)
• “Exhibit openings”

English Festival (1/16 = 6.25%)
• “English Festival”

Gatherings in Studio D (1/16 = 6.25%)
• “I have also attended many gatherings in Studio D”

Student Extracurriculars (1/16 = 6.25%)
• “I also use Studios for students’ extracurriculars sometimes”

10. What can we do to attract more faculty to events or to use ArtStreet for their classes and programs?

Of the eight responses provided for this question, three (38%) respondents indicated that they did not know or were not sure. The low number of provided responses is accounted for by the fact that this particular question was not included on the Winter 2007 Instructor Feedback questionnaire, and two participants chose not to respond. The responses provided were categorized by theme.

Don’t Know/Not Sure (3/8 = 37.50%)
• “Not sure. I think is cool… Why wouldn’t everyone want to use it?!”
• “I’m not sure.”

Spread the Word (3/8 = 37.50%)
• “Just get the word out.”
• “I think that as word spreads more faculty will want to use the space.”

Keep Doing What You’re Doing (2/8 = 25%)
• “Just keep doing what you’re doing”
• “I think you are doing everything you can. Most faculty don’t want to leave their usual buildings. Their loss, more AS open time for me!”

UD Recruit More Art and Humanities Students (1/8 = 12.50%)
• “The students here tend to be hostile towards the arts and humanities. I think the university has to work harder to recruit art and humanities students.”

More Student Led Activities (1/8 = 12.50%)
• “And it would be wonderful if students led poetry readings, or art movie nights.”

Parking Pass (1/8 = 12.50%)
• “This is a very good question. It seems that many faculty don’t know much about ArtStreet, and see it as an inconvenience to walk over there from main campus. Finding a way to address this point would seem to be important. And while I have always walked from Humanities, I wonder if there would be a way to, say, provide faculty who teach there with a semester pass (as they do with folks
teaching UDLLI classes at McGinniss), as opposed to the daily pass system currently in place (which does seem pretty inconvenient).

11. Other suggestions/comments?
   Of the nine responses provided for this question, one respondent (11%) said “No”, while the other eight (89%) provided various responses. The responses that were provided by more than one respondent were categorized by theme.

Responses included:
• “A great place for students and faculty, thanks!”
• “Keep up the good work.”
• “The ArtStreet director, facility coordinator, and student workers in ArtStreet are all nice and friendly and were available if I had any questions or if there were any problems. Also the student workers made sure that the studio was cleaned up quickly in between classes.”
• “Your staff is fantastic. Hope you were able to hire same caliber of people for the coming school year’s student help! Could you work something out with Roesch Library and/or the Department of Fine Arts (and with your available space) to stock some artbooks so they are readily at hand? Keep trying to get Patrick Daugherty, twig sculptor, to create an awesome piece of art?”
• “Overhead projector in classrooms, copy machine, computer in Café”
• “A minor one: Have student workers clean whiteboards in classrooms on a monthly basis. Thank you for everything.”
• “Thank you for the opportunity to use the space. It was a great experience.”
• “Have students clean the whiteboards over the summer. 😊”

ArtStreet Instructor Feedback Response Analysis Conclusions
   For many of the questions, similar types of responses were provided. Several instructors indicated that the classrooms in ArtStreet call for more creativity and flexibility of teaching methods within the classroom.

   One of the most frequently represented responses indicated more discussion occurs in the ArtStreet classroom setting than in the traditional classroom setting. Discussion was, in fact, within the top three responses provided for three questions. Instructors also indicated that this environment lent itself to much more group work than the traditional classroom setting. This may be largely influenced by the space and flexibility of seating (as reported by instructors). Instructors also seemed to highly value the resources that were available in ArtStreet, from the whiteboards to the AV cart, to the film room.

   The convenience and or/proximity of ArtStreet was also frequently discussed, indicating such things as the proximity of the complex to the student neighborhood is a plus, as well as the proximity and convenience of art events as an impact on curriculum and student experience.

   Instructors also indicated that most (88%) had attended other events or used other areas of the complex for activities outside of their class time. Many reported having eaten in the Café, attended meetings, art shows/exhibits, or other activities.
Despite the overwhelmingly positive feedback from the ArtStreet instructors, there were several suggestions and/or complaints. The most commonly discussed negatives about ArtStreet were not having resources such as a copier, permanent computer, overhead projector, or printer. These items were indicated to be important for instructor preparation and classroom teaching. Also, several instructors indicated that not having parking passes for the semester was an inconvenience.

Overall, it seems that the instructors who provided feedback find teaching at ArtStreet to be a positive experience. This is evident from the responses provided as well as the 94% of respondents indicating a strong desire to bring their classes back to ArtStreet.
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ARTSTREET EXPERIENCE CLASS SUPPLEMENTAL EVALUATION EXTENDED
(WINTER 2005-FALL 2008): GENERAL QUESTIONS

ArtStreet Assessment Report
Report Title: ArtStreet Experience Class Supplemental Evaluations Extended (Winter 2005- Fall 2008): General Questions
Author(s): Kristen Lovins
Date of Report: April 23, 2009

Background
All ArtStreet residents are required to take the ArtStreet Experience course during both semesters of residence in the ArtStreet complex. The ArtStreet Experience course is comprised of a series of class sessions, supplemented by out of class performances, activities, and events that are meant to provide the students with artistic experiences, promote community, creativity and diversity, as well as involvement in the complex, University, and Dayton area. Each semester, the class changes, depending on the various events that are occurring within the complex, University, and locally in the Dayton area.

At the culmination of almost every semester, students are asked to complete a Supplemental Evaluation regarding their experiences with the course and the residential aspects of the complex.

This report is a compilation of the data collected from the Winter 2005 semester through the Fall 2008 semester. This particular report focuses on general questions about living and participating at ArtStreet.

Summary of Data
At the culmination of ArtStreet’s first year of operation during Winter 2005, residents indicated that overall (92%) were glad that they lived there. They also indicated that their favorite parts of being involved in the first year were being the first residents (59%), the new housing/facilities (38%), and participating in planning for ArtBeat (13%), and that they thought that the potlucks and cookouts (44%), festivals (19%), film screenings (14%), and ArtBeat (14%) should be repeated events. They believed that other students were coming to understand ArtStreet more (62%).
When asked whether or not they felt like they were able to make the most out of living at ArtStreet during the Fall 2006 semester, residents indicated that for the most part (61%) they did feel like they made the most out of the experience. Thirty-four percent indicated that they did not feel like they make the most out of the experience. This was due to being too busy (38%) and problems with the class (31%). Overall, during the 2006-2007 academic year, students indicated that the Samputu performances (43%), and Chicago trip (32%), and workshops (18%) were their favorite ArtStreet experiences. They also implied that the ArtStreet Salon: Art + Science (42%) and the sculpture project (38%) were their least favorite.

During the Winter 2007 semester, students were asked to provide responses regarding the Jean Paul Samputu performance. All residents indicated that the Samputu performance was a positive experience. Ninety-three percent of the residents believe that they received some benefit from attending the performances. When asked if UD should support similar visits and activities with artists, 97% indicated that these types of activities should be repeated. Residents appear to have had mixed feelings about the enjoyment of the ArtStreet Salon: Art + Science in the Winter 2007. Forty-eight percent indicated that they did not enjoy the topic, while 44% indicated that they did. However, 68% of residents indicated that ArtStreet should continue to host similar events. During this semester, residents participated in workshops during class time. Residents indicated that they were satisfied with the workshops, for the most part: Yoga (92%), Hip Hop (100%), Painting (100%), Film and Food (100%), Clay Tiles (100%), Print Making (100%), Audio Production (0%), and Piano (100%). They also indicated that overall, they liked the workshop series for that semester’s ArtStreet Experience Class primarily because it was fun and enjoyable (34%), they provided students with a choice (21%), and they offered hands-on experiences (17%). Ninety-seven percent recommended that the workshop format be repeated in future semesters, specifically: Yoga (91%), Hip Hop (82%), Painting (100%), Film and Food (100%), Clay Tiles (100%), Print Making (100%), Audio Production (50%), and Piano (100%). When asked if living at ArtStreet met their expectations, residents responded that yes (55%) it did, or no (39%) it didn’t. Of those that indicated that it did not, 42% stated that there were too many requirements. Seventy-one percent of the residents indicated that they would recommend ArtStreet to other students as a good place to live primarily because of nice housing (23%). Nineteen percent would not recommend ArtStreet to other students as a good place to live because there are too many requirements (33%). They thought that more workshops (29%), less class requirements (24%), more scheduling flexibility (19%), and more community building (14%) would help improve the experience of living at ArtStreet.

During the Fall 2007 semester, residents were asked to provide suggestions to improve the ArtStreet Experience Class, specifically regarding: time/day of class, activities of class, required events, student participation, and faculty participation. For time/day of class, 72% indicated that it was good as is. For activities of class, 76% indicated that they wanted more hands on activities and workshops, and 17% indicated that they class was good as is. For required events, 55% indicated that they felt it was good as is, and 23% would like more options. Student (68%) and faculty (73%) participation was also
found to be good as is. During each semester during the 2007-2008 academic year, residents were asked to rank (on a scale of 1=significantly to 5=not at all) the level of opportunities the ArtStreet Experience Class provided them to experience new things Fall 2007 responses (mean = 2.1) and Winter 2008 responses (mean = 2.26) were found to have no significant difference (Effect Size = .09).

During the Winter 2008 semester students were asked to report whether or not they felt that specific experiences were valuable to them: Dayton Art Institute visit (83% yes, 11% no), Dayton Contemporary Dance Company (78% yes, 22% no), Simon Shaheen Concert (78% yes, 9% no), Spike Lee film “Do the Right Thing” (60% yes, 29% no), Spike Lee lecture (56% yes, 32% no), and Stage, Song, and Self workshop (35% yes, 50% no). Students were also asked what they liked best about the course. Responses indicated that the residents particularly liked the Chicago trip (42%), performances (23%), community/bonding (16%), and other experiences (16%). They also provided suggestions to improve the course. The most popular responses were: more community building (17%), more options (13%), and less assignments (13%).

During the Fall 2008 semester, residents were provided with required reading materials. Seventy-six percent of the residents indicated that they did not find the reading useful or relevant. Of those that did not find the reading relevant, 24% admitted to not having read the material. Residents (85%) during this semester indicated that the ArtStreet staff and leaders met their expectations because they were helpful (25%), approachable/friendly (25%), and knowledgeable (14%). Residents (94%) indicated that the ArtStreet programs and facilities met their expectations and that they (70%) enjoyed the class sessions, particularly the improvisation activities (31%) and skeleton making activity (23%). However, they indicated they would like to see more hands-on activities (36%), improvisation exercises (11%), and visuals (11%) in class. Eighty-five percent of residents indicated that they enjoyed the Urban Nights experience and 81% enjoyed attending the Slavic Soul Party and project because it was a different experience (35%), thought it was cool/amazing (27%), and that it was fun and enjoyable (23%). For those that did not enjoy the experiences (16%), 40% indicated that it was due to the cost.

**Recommendations**

According to the responses provided on these evaluations, students indicated the most positive feelings towards the in-class workshop programming. It is recommended that this type of class format be utilized in the future.

During the Fall 2008 semester, students were asked to read required materials. The majority of students did not find the readings helpful, however, many also reported not having completed the readings. It is recommended to either hold the students accountable for completing the assigned readings, or eliminate that portion of the class.

Overall, students reported that they liked the Chicago trip and various performances, but that they felt that the community building activities were lacking. It is recommended that the Chicago trip as well as attendance at performances continue to be a part of the
ArtStreet Experience class. In addition, community building exercises, such as icebreakers, would likely aid in helping residents build a feeling of community.
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ARTSTREET EXPERIENCE CLASS SUPPLEMENTAL EVALUATION EXTENDED

(WINTER 2005-FALL 2008): COMMUNITY

ArtStreet Assessment Report
Report Title: ArtStreet Experience Class Supplemental Evaluations (Winter 2005- Fall 2008): Community
Author(s): Kristen Lovins
Date of Report: April 22, 2009

Background
All ArtStreet residents are required to take the ArtStreet Experience course during both semesters of residence in the ArtStreet complex. The ArtStreet Experience course is comprised of a series of class sessions, supplemented by out of class performances, activities, and events that are meant to provide the students with artistic experiences, promote community, creativity and diversity, as well as involvement in the complex, University, and Dayton area. Each semester, the class changes, depending on the various events that are occurring within the complex, University, and locally in the Dayton area.

At the culmination of almost every semester, students are asked to complete a Supplemental Evaluation regarding their experiences with the course and the residential aspects of the complex.

This report is a compilation of the data collected from the Winter 2005 semester through the Fall 2008 semester. This particular report focuses on the questions that primarily focused on the community aspect of living and participating at ArtStreet.

Summary of Data
In Fall 2006, residents indicated that the progressive party (82%), sculpture project (78%), ArtBeat festival planning (75%), Madame Butterfly (51%) activities all helped connect residents to other residents. They also indicated that the progressive party (29% yes, 66% no), sculpture project (53% yes, 18% no), ArtBeat festival planning (48% yes, 18% no), and Madame Butterfly (33% yes, 49% no) activities all helped connect residents to the campus or Dayton community. Over 50% or respondents reported that each of these activities did not help connect residents to the UD faculty.
During the Winter 2007 semester, residents participated in workshops during class time. Except for the Audio Production workshop, residents thought that these workshops connected them to other residents: Yoga (75%), Hip Hop (83%), Painting (92%), Film and Food (89%), Clay Tiles (100%), Print Making (100%), Audio Production (0), Piano (100%). For the ArtStreet Salon: Art + Science Program, a greater percentage of participants reported that the event did not help connect them with other residents or UD faculty (45%). For those respondents that reported a connection, the focus was on faculty, and not with other residents (35%). Also during Winter 2007, half of the residents reported that they were able to participate in the ArtStreet Community in the way that they expected.

For the 2007-2008 academic year, residents reported that the most highly attended events were concerts or festivals (32 respondents). Four out of the top five most attended events (informal activities with ArtStreet residents – 23, Saturday night events – 21, group/club meetings – 17, art in my house – 15) were organized at least in part, by ArtStreet residents. They also provided ratings ranging from 1 (significantly) to 5 (not at all) for how much the class was instrumental in developing a feeling of community with other residents. Fall 2007 responses (mean = 2.9, SD = .93) provided ratings that were moderately better than Winter 2008 responses (mean = 3.3, SD = .99) with regard to developing a sense of community with other residents (Moderate Effect Size = .4). They reported that the following opportunities have provided the best or useful opportunities to get to know neighbors: Chicago trip (94%), ArtStreet Experience Class (87.5%), project worked on with other ArtStreet Residents (81.5%), attending performances with other ArtStreet residents (74.5%), event or activity in ArtStreet building (62.5%), neighborhood dinners (57%), and event or activity in ArtStreet Amphitheater (51%). The following opportunities were rated as not useful: Project worked on neighborhood fellow (54%), and ArtStreet Café (72%). Eighty-nine percent of ArtStreet residents summarized their time at ArtStreet as being a positive experience. Eighty-nine percent also indicated that their experience met their expectations, particularly with regards to learning about/exposure to art (19%), and attending performances (13%).

In the Fall 2007 semester, of 36 respondents 53% indicated that they know many other residents in the ArtStreet complex. A variety of reasons were identified to promote knowing other residents. Only 31% (11) reported that they did not know many other residents. Residents also reported that activities/events/performances (32%) motivated them to participate at ArtStreet. They also reported that time/other obligation conflicts were the main barriers to participation (59%), and that they would have liked to participate in more workshops (38%) and more hands-on activities (19%).

During the Fall 2008 semester, 69% of ArtStreet course participants reported that the class sessions were helpful in building community among residents, primarily because they met new people. They also identified the primary ways that they contributed to community as participation/attendance (41%), and planning or organization of activities (24%). A majority (76%) of the residents reported that they initiated opportunities to get to know their neighbors outside of class because (12%) people seemed nice. In the Fall 85
of 2008, 92% of residents reported that ArtStreet staff & leaders met expectations. Residents indicated that the staff and leaders were helpful (28%), knowledgeable (24%), and approachable (20%), and that, as a measure of satisfaction, 94% felt that they fulfilled their own expectations for themselves and their community. The primary reasons were participation/attendance (43%), and meeting people (23%).

Residents were asked in each of the semesters during Fall 2007, Winter 2008, and Fall 2008 for recommendations for helping ArtStreet residents get to know each other better. The following responses were provided: social events (25%), dinner/food (23%), group activities (17%), trips (11%), arts and crafts workshops (10%).

**Recommendations for Future**

According to the results from the community focused questions on the supplemental evaluations from Winter 2005 through Fall 2008, many aspects of ArtStreet are indeed helping to promote community at ArtStreet. In order to continue promoting community at ArtStreet, it is recommended to continue providing residents with opportunities to participate in activities such as the progressive party, sculpture project, ArtBeat Festival planning, and in-class workshops (such as Hip Hop, Yoga, Painting, Film and Food, Clay tiles, Print making, and Piano. However, it appears that the Audio Production workshop was not helpful in promoting community, and is not recommended for continuation without revision of the workshop format.

Other programs and events that are recommended for continuation are the Chicago Trip, projects to work on with other ArtStreet residents, and attending performances with other residents.

From looking at the attendance of events reported by residents in correlation with the events that were planned/created by residents, the events that were planned/created by residents were the most attended. Therefore, it is recommended that the ArtStreet Experience course continue to encourage and promote student led activities and events.

While many programs and events were reported to be beneficial to community building among the residents, there were a few that were not, and are being recommended to be discontinued or to undergo revision. These programs include the Audio Production workshop, ArtStreet Salon: Art + Science, and the project worked on with neighborhood fellow.

**Notes**

Residents indicated that overall, they were pleased with their experience at ArtStreet the complex, with the course, and with the staff and leaders.
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ARTSTREET EXPERIENCE CLASS SUPPLEMENTAL EVALUATION EXTENDED


ArtStreet Assessment Report
Report Title: ArtStreet Experience Class Supplemental Evaluations Extended (Winter 2005- Fall 2008): Creativity and Learning
Author(s): Kristen Lovins
Date of Report: April 23, 2009

Background
All ArtStreet residents are required to take the ArtStreet Experience course during both semesters of residence in the ArtStreet complex. The ArtStreet Experience course is comprised of a series of class sessions, supplemented by out of class performances, activities, and events that are meant to provide the students with artistic experiences, promote community, creativity and diversity, as well as involvement in the complex, University, and Dayton area. Each semester, the class changes, depending on the various events that are occurring within the complex, University, and locally in the Dayton area.

At the culmination of almost every semester, students are asked to complete a Supplemental Evaluation regarding their experiences with the course and the residential aspects of the complex.

This report is a compilation of the data collected from the Winter 2005 semester through the Fall 2008 semester. This particular report focuses on the questions that primarily focused on the creative and learning aspects of living and participating at ArtStreet.

Summary of Data
During the Fall 2006 semester, residents attended/participated in several events. These events included ArtBeat festival planning, sculpture project, Madame Butterfly (the opera), and a progressive party. The residents indicated that they did not research these topics on their own, with the exception of Madame Butterfly (71% indicated they researched this topic): ArtBeat festival planning (73% no), sculpture project (80%), and progressive party (73%). For each of these topics, residents indicated that they felt they had the skills or knowledge to address the topic: ): ArtBeat festival planning (73%), sculpture project (23%), Madam Butterfly (45%), and progressive party (78%). The majority of participants in Sculpture Project (55%), Madame Butterfly (59%), and
Progressive Party (79%) reported that they felt they learned something about the arts as a result. However, the ArtBeat Festival planning did not have the same results (63% reported no effect). The hands-on activities were shown to provide more opportunity for creative exploration than the observer type activities: Progressive party (45%), sculpture project (70%), Madam Butterfly (51%).

During the Winter 2007 semester, residents participated in workshops during class time. Except for the Audio Production workshop, residents felt that they learned something as a result of the workshop: Yoga (58%), Hip Hop (75%), Painting (92%), Film and Food (67%), Clay Tiles (100%), Print Making (92%), and Piano (100%). Hands on workshops that focused on creating things (painting- 100%, clay tiles-100%, piano- 100%) tended to be perceived as providing students with opportunities for creative exploration at a higher rate than exercise (Hip Hop- 91%, Yoga- 73%) or observer based (Film and Food- 56%, Audio Production- 0%) activities. All residents indicated that all instructors worked with them at the level of their skill: Yoga (79%), Hip Hop (83%), Painting (100%), Film and Food (100%), Clay Tiles (100%), Print Making (100%), Audio Production (100%), and Piano (100%).

Also during the Winter 2007 semester, residents participated in the ArtStreet Salon: Art + Science program. Fifty-two percent of residents indicated that they did not learn something from this event.

During the 2007-2008 academic year, residents indicated (using a Likert type scale where 1=significantly, and 5=not at all) that the ArtStreet experience class impacted them moderately in the following ways: awareness of different kinds of art (2.48), participation in the arts (2.67), enhanced my connection between my major and my interest in the arts (3.1).

In the Fall of 2008, residents reported to have been impacted by the arts to a greater degree than in previous semesters by 62% of respondents. They indicated that this was due to more experience (38%), attendance of programs/performances (29%). They (63%) also reported that they viewed things differently as a result of their participation.

**Recommendations**

Responses indicate that residents benefit from a variety of activities and events for a variety of reasons, and that they tend to perceive more benefits from activities and events that require more hands-on participation. It is recommended that the ArtStreet Experience class continue to provide a variety of experiences in order to provide a variety of benefits. Also, it is recommended to continue to provide opportunities for hands-on participation in events and activities for residents, or to provide even more of these types of activities.

**Notes**
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ArtStreet Assessment Report
Report Title: ArtStreet Experience Class Supplemental Evaluations Extended (Winter 2005- Fall 2008): Involvement/Participation
Author(s): Kristen Lovins
Date of Report: April 23, 2009

Background
All ArtStreet residents are required to take the ArtStreet Experience course during both semesters of residence in the ArtStreet complex. The ArtStreet Experience course is comprised of a series of class sessions, supplemented by out of class performances, activities, and events that are meant to provide the students with artistic experiences, promote community, creativity and diversity, as well as involvement in the complex, University, and Dayton area. Each semester, the class changes, depending on the various events that are occurring within the complex, University, and locally in the Dayton area.

At the culmination of almost every semester, students are asked to complete a Supplemental Evaluation regarding their experiences with the course and the residential aspects of the complex.

This report is a compilation of the data collected from the Winter 2005 semester through the Fall 2008 semester. This particular report focuses on the questions that primarily focused on the involvement and participation aspects of living and participating at ArtStreet.

Summary of Data
At the conclusion of the first year of ArtStreet operation (2004-2005), residents (89%) indicated that they used the facilities (excluding the café) outside of class time and that they felt that there should be a class/learning/organized activity component as a part of living at ArtStreet.

During the Fall 2006 semester, residents participated in ArtBeat Festival planning, a sculpture project, attending Madame Butterfly (an opera), and planning and hosting a progressive party. Residents were asked to report on the amount of time they spent
working on these projects outside of class: ArtBeat Festival planning (range from 0-630 minutes, 74 minutes average), sculpture project (range from 0-180 minutes, 56 minutes average), Madame Butterfly (range from 0-240 minutes, 33 minutes average. Please note that some residents included the amount of time spent at the performance in this number, and others did not.), and the progressive party (range from 0-180 minutes, 57 minutes average).

When, in Winter 2007, residents were asked if they spent additional time on the activities they learned about/worked on during the workshops in class on their own time, most residents (for most activities) indicated that no, they did not spend additional time on the activity: Yoga (45%), Painting (100%), Film and Food (78%), Clay Tiles (75%), Print Making (82%), Audio Production (100%), and Piano (100%). When asked if the residents would have attended the Samputu performance without being required to, 47% indicated that yes, they would, and 17% indicated that they might have. Seventy-one percent of residents indicated that they did not attend any Samputu events other than those that were required.

On the Fall 2008 Supplemental Evaluation, residents were asked what activities they participated in at ArtStreet outside of class activities. Thirty-seven percent indicated that they participated in 0-2 activities, 40% participated in 3-4 activities, and 23% participated in 5-7 activities. These activities were: Cafe' concert (71%), group meetings (46%), art workshops (37%), academic classes (34%), films (34%), art openings (29%), and other (17%). Residents (88%) indicated that they enjoyed participating in the resident events (the Haunted House and Chinese International Night. They also indicated that they (64%) felt that the residents should be required to produce an event each year because it provides involvement and bonding opportunities (33%). For those that didn’t feel (36%), 42% indicated that the activities should be encouraged, but not required. Residents stated that, in order to help the events succeed, more support/leadership (29%), participation (24%), and money (24%) is needed.

**Recommendations**

According to the results of the evaluations, students would probably benefit from having a variety of events available for them to participate in at a variety of times. This would allow the students to have more choice in the events and activities in which they participate, something that they have indicated a desire for. This would also allow for more scheduling flexibility, addressing the major barrier of participation, by providing more opportunities for residents and increasing the likelihood of working events into their schedules.

**Notes**
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ARTSTREET EXPERIENCE SUPPLEMENTAL EVALUATION

ArtStreet Experience Supplemental Evaluation

Please indicate the semester and year of evaluation completion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL</th>
<th>SPRING</th>
<th>(Circle one)</th>
<th>Year 20_____</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. The ArtStreet Experience Class has:
   (Circle one for each question)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   a. Provided opportunities for me to experience new things | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   b. Increased my awareness of different kinds of art | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   c. Enhanced my connection of my major to my interest in the arts | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
   d. Impacted my participation in the arts | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

2. During the course of the semester/year, what was your favorite program/event/activity?

__________________________________________________________

3. Why?

__________________________________________________________

4. During the course of the semester/year, what program/event/activity took you the most out of your comfort zone?

__________________________________________________________

   a. In what way(s)?

      _______________________________________________________
      _______________________________________________________

   b. Did you learn anything from it?

      _______________________________________________________
      _______________________________________________________

5. What program/event/activity do you feel helped connect you the most to other residents?

__________________________________________________________

6. What could be done to help facilitate interaction between residents in the future?

__________________________________________________________

If you need additional space to complete your responses, please continue on the back of this sheet.
ArtStreet Experience Supplemental Evaluation

7. What program/event/activity do you feel helped connect you the most to UD campus?

8. What program/event/activity do you feel helped connect you the most to faculty?

9. What program/event/activity do you feel helped connect you the most to the Dayton area?

10. Overall, what, if anything, has helped you think in a more creative way?

11. What program/event/activity allowed you the most/best opportunity to explore/understand/learn about diversity?
   a. How so?

12. Do you feel like this course has met your expectations? Why or why not?

13. What, if anything, were barriers to your participation in ArtStreet programs/events/activities this semester/year?

14. What could be done to overcome them?

15. What two things could be done to make the experience of living at ArtStreet and taking this course more beneficial?

If you need additional space to complete your responses, please continue on the back of this sheet.
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ArtStreet Assessment Report
Report Title: ArtStreet Assessment Report Spring 2009 Supplemental Evaluation Analysis
Author(s): Kristen Lovins
Date of Report: April 1, 2009

Background
All ArtStreet residents are required to take the ArtStreet Experience course during both semesters of residence in the ArtStreet complex. The ArtStreet Experience course is comprised of a series of class sessions, supplemented by out of class performances, activities, and events that are meant to provide the students with artistic experiences, promote community, creativity and diversity, as well as involvement in the complex, University, and Dayton area. Each semester, the class changes, depending on the various events that are occurring within the complex, University, and locally in the Dayton area.

At the culmination of each semester, students are asked to complete a Supplemental Evaluation regarding their experiences with the course and the residential aspects of the complex.

Summary of Data
Results from the analysis of the Spring 2009 ArtStreet Experience Supplemental Evaluation indicated that, overall, residents agreed that the ArtStreet Experience Class provided opportunities for them to experience new things, increased their awareness of different kinds of art, and impacted their participation in the arts. They also indicated that they felt neutral about the idea of ArtStreet enhancing the connection of their majors to their interest in the arts.

When the residents were asked to provide their favorite program/event/activity, residents indicated that they liked the Brother Wolf performance (28%), Chicago trip (20%), Dallas Chief Eagle events (20%), and the art projects (12%) the most. When asked what program/event/activity took them the most out of their comfort zone, residents indicated the improvisation (27%) and compassion activities (27%), but they also indicated that they learned something from both activities.

When asked what program/event activities helped connect them with other residents, the respondents answered that the Chicago trip (24%), Haunted House (19%), and Little Red
Riding Hood (14%) activities helped connect them the most to other residents. They also indicated that more social events outside of class (45%), more group art activities (27%), and more in-class ice breaker type activities (14%) would help facilitate more interaction between residents in the future.

Residents felt that the Dallas Chief Eagle events (23%), Scavenger Hunt (18%), and improvisation activities (14%) connected them the most to UD campus. When asked what program/event/activities helped connect them with faculty, several residents (31%) indicated that none of the programs/events/activities helped connect them with faculty. Others indicated that the Brother Wolf performance (19%) helped with faculty connection. When asked what program/event/activity helped connect them to the Dayton area, many residents indicated the Brother Wolf performance (52%), Urban Nights (22%), and Dayton Arts Festival (13%).

Residents indicated that class (20%), the translation theme (20%), and observation activities (20%) helped them think in a more creative way. They also indicated that the Dallas Chief Eagle (58%) and Brother Wolf (26%) events allowed them the most/best opportunity to explore/understand/learn about diversity.

Many residents (64%) felt that the course met their expectations, several (27%) felt that the course did not, and a few (9%) felt that the course met some of their expectations, but not all. The majority of residents (71%) indicated that time/scheduling conflicts were the greatest barriers for participation in ArtStreet programs/events/activities. Many residents (32%) indicated that they did not know of or were not sure of anything that could be done to overcome these barriers. Several residents indicated that having events at a variety of times (23%), and changing the time and/or day of the course (18%) would be helpful. When asked what could be done to make the experience of living at ArtStreet and taking the course more beneficial, responses included more art projects (27%) and more community building activities (27%).

**Goal(s) for Next Year/Semester**

In this and many past semesters, students have requested more community building activities. Our goal for the Fall 2009 semester is to increase resident satisfaction with regards to community building. We will have met our goal if 80% of residents indicate that they feel like the ArtStreet class meetings were effective in increasing their sense of community with other residents.

**Action Plan to Meet Goal(s)**

**Goal One:**
During the first ArtStreet Experience Class meeting, residents will be put into groups of people from different houses, and will complete ice breaker games and community/team building activities. During the following meetings during the semester, students will again break into groups and complete one community/team building activity per class session.
Assessment(s) of Goal(s) Planning

Goal One:
An additional question will be added to the ArtStreet Experience Class Supplemental Evaluation. The question will ask ‘Were the class meetings effective in increasing your sense of community with other residents?’ If 80% of residents provide a positive response, then the goal will have been accomplished. When this occurs, a determination must be made to a) increase the goal, b) maintain the goal, or c) eliminate the goal.

Assessment Outcomes

Goal One:
At the time of this report, the goal outcome has not yet been assessed.
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ARTSTEET INSTRUMENT, ADMINISTRATION AND SCORING GUIDE

ArtStreet Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment ID #</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Fall/Spring</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I have/have lived in the ArtStreet complex (Circle one) Yes No
If yes, how many academic years (including the current year, if applicable) ________________

Community
(Please note that this/the community refers to the ArtStreet community.)

1. In general, the idea of community is _______ to me. (Circle one)
   - Not Important
   - Not Very Important
   - Slightly Less than Average Importance
   - Average Importance
   - Slightly More than Average Importance
   - Important
   - Extremely Important

2. How involved do you feel you are currently in the community? (Circle one)
   - No Involvement
   - Very Little Involvement
   - Slightly Less than Average Involvement
   - Average Involvement
   - Slightly More than Average Involvement
   - Highly Involved
   - Extremely Involved

3. I feel that I belong in this community. (Circle one)
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Slightly Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Slightly Agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

4. I feel that being a part of this community is beneficial to me. (Circle one)
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Slightly Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Slightly Agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

5. I feel empowered to contribute to this community. (Circle one)
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Slightly Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Slightly Agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

6. I feel bonded to people in this residential community. (Circle one)
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Slightly Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Slightly Agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

7. I actively seek out opportunities to participate in this community. (Circle one)
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Slightly Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Slightly Agree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

If you need additional space to complete your responses, please continue on the back of this sheet.
ArtStreet Instrument

8. I actively initiate opportunities for myself and others to become involved in this community. (Circle one)
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. When there is a problem within this residential community, community members are able to resolve conflicts peacefully. (Circle one)
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. What are three things that you perceive to be most valued by members of this community?
   
   ______________________________________  ______________________________________  ______________________________________

Creativity

11. What is your personal definition of creativity?

12. According to your definition, how creative are you? (Circle one)
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Creative</th>
<th>Not Very Creative</th>
<th>Slightly Less Creative than Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Slightly Creative</th>
<th>Fairly Creative</th>
<th>Highly Creative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How important is creativity to you? (Circle one)
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Slightly Less than Average Importance</th>
<th>Average Importance</th>
<th>Slightly More than Average Importance</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Why?

If you need additional space to complete your responses, please continue on the back of this sheet.
### ArtStreet Instrument

15. I generally feel that, if given a problem, I am able to come up with many original ideas. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. I generally have an interest in learning about new ideas, approaches and innovative solutions to problems. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. I generally feel that I am able to take inspiration from others' ideas and apply/integrate them into my own ideas. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. I often follow through with making/producing/implementing my own creative ideas. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. I generally feel that creativity is valued...
   ...at ArtStreet. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   ...on campus. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   ...in my classes. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diversity

For the purposes of this study, please consider diversity as an awareness of similarities among people, and an acceptance and openness towards the differences among people (such as race, age, ethnicity, culture, language, disability, academic major, socio-economic class, etc.)

20. I feel that, for me, diversity is valuable. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you need additional space to complete your responses, please continue on the back of this sheet.
21. I am generally able to recognize similarities between myself and people who are different from me. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. I generally feel comfortable in situations that expose me to people who are different from me. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. I generally feel comfortable expressing who I really am. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. I feel that there are opportunities available for me to express myself within this community. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. I feel that diversity is valued in this community. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. I feel that I have knowledge and understanding of many different cultures, histories, times, and places. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. I generally take advantage of opportunities to develop my understanding of cultures and people of different backgrounds than mine. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. I generally am not afraid to voice opinions/ideas that are different from the majority. (Circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ArtStreet Instrument

General
29. If you ranked any items in any section with a rating of 1 or 2 and would like to explain your reasoning, please do so in the space provided below. This information will help us make this program/experience more enjoyable and beneficial to current and future residents and users of ArtStreet.

Item # | Response

--- | ---

--- | ---

--- | ---

--- | ---

--- | ---

--- | ---

30. General comments?
ArtStreet Instrument

Administration Instructions
Prior to arrival of participants, copy the following onto a chalkboard, white board, or large piece of paper in a highly visible place, large enough for all present to see and read:

Social Security # 123-45-6789
Birth date 01/02/1990
Home Phone # (513) 777-5556
Assessment ID #

After participants arrive, provide them with an introduction to the assessment process. For the first semester, this could be something like:

“ArtStreet will be continuing to undergo an assessment process this year. In order to help us assess the impact ArtStreet has on resident perceptions of community, creativity, and diversity, you, as residents, will be asked to complete the ArtStreet Instrument. The first administration will be today, and a second administration will occur at the end of the year. The responses you provide will be kept anonymous, and will be compared to the next administration via the Assessment ID you will provide. Please try to be as truthful and honest with your responses as you can. At the end of the year, an overall summary of the differences between the first and second administration will be available for you to review, if you would like.”

For the second semester:

“As you probably remember, you took a survey at the beginning of the year that focused on community, creativity, and diversity. We are going to take the same survey again in order to determine if there were any changes in your perceptions in those areas. Please try to be as truthful and honest with your responses as you can. An overall summary of the differences between the first and second administration will be available for you to review, if you would like.”

After introducing the assessment process, pass out forms, but instruct the participants not to write anything until directed. After all participants have forms, instruct them to look at the board.

“Now we are going to create your Assessment ID#. This ID# will not be used to connect your identity to your responses in any way. The ID# will simply be used to compare your answers on this assessment to your answers on future or past assessments to try to determine if there was any change. Please take the middle two digits of your Social Security Number and place them on the line labeled Assessment ID#.” (Circle the middle two digits on the faux Social Security Number and write next to Assessment ID #).

“Next, write the two-digit day of your birth.” (Circle the day portion of the date provided under Birth date and write the numbers next to the numbers taken from the Social Security Number). Finally, take the last two digits of your home phone number and write the numbers following the previous numbers.” (Circle the last two digits of the home phone number and write the numbers next to the numbers taken from the birth date).

The Assessment ID# following the directions above should be 450266

“Are there any questions?” If so, answer them, if not instruct the participants to “You may begin.”

If you need additional space to complete your responses, please continue on the back of this sheet.
ArtStreet Instrument

Analysis of ArtStreet Assessment Instrument

The purpose of the ArtStreet Assessment is to determine whether there is a significant change in the three areas of community, creativity, and diversity as a result of ArtStreet participation.

1. Administer ArtStreet Instrument twice a year (early fall and later spring) to the ArtStreet residents.
2. After each administration score the instrument by adding up the Likert scale ratings for each section. You will have a score for Community, Creativity, and Diversity Subscales. Add the 3 Subscale scores together to obtain the total ArtStreet score.
3. Calculate a mean score for each subscale and the mean of the total scores for fall and spring administrations separately. In other words, you should have 4 scores for the fall administration and four scores for the spring administration. Enter scores on the ArtStreet Instrument Scoring Sheet.
4. Enter the data from each test protocol, including demographic information, test total score, subscores, and answers for individual questions, on an Excel spreadsheet to allow for calculations. (See sample file AS Instrument Response Sample.xl)
5. Convert Excel data to SPSS
   a. Open SPSS
   b. Click “Type in Data” (If you want to add to existing data spreadsheet, click on “File” then “Open” then “data” to pull up existing data)
   c. Go to variable view (click variable view tab at bottom left corner)
      i. In variable view Row 1 – type in AssessmentID (all one word for i-x)
      ii. Row 2 – type in PretestTotal
      iii. Row 3 – type in PostTestCommunity
      iv. Row 4 – type in PostTestCreativity
      v. Row 5 – type in PostTestDiversity
      vi. Row 6 – type in PostTestTotal
      vii. Row 7 – type in PostTestCommunity
      viii. Row 8 – type in PostTestCreativity
      ix. Row 9 – type in PostTestDiversity
   d. Shift back to Data View (tab at bottom of SPSS)
      i. Enter Assessment ID for each participant down 1st column labeled assessment ID
      ii. Enter data in appropriate column based on fall (pretest) or spring (posttest) administration, for the total score, community, creativity, and diversity associated with the corresponding ID number. For this you can copy and paste from the Excel file, just be sure to double check that the appropriate information was copied into the correct cells in SPSS.
   e. To determine whether or not there is a significant difference between the spring and fall administrations for the total score:
      i. Click – “analyze” at the top of the screen
      ii. Click – “compare means” from the drop down menu
      iii. Click – “paired samples t-test” from the next drop down menu
      iv. Select – “PostTestTotal” for variable 1 and move it to the box at the right side of the screen by clicking the arrow. Do the same for “PostTestTotal” for variable 2. Follow the same procedure for all subscales.
      v. Click – OK and a new window should appear. This window is entitled “Output”
         1. From the “Output data” you are interested in the column called “Sig (2-tailed).” The results indicated a significant difference (which means ArtStreet had an impact) if this column equals or is less than .05.
         2. Print “Output” and transfer requested data to the ArtStreet Instrument Scoring Sheet.

If you have any questions or wish to do more in depth analysis please contact Dr. Hunley at sawyer.hunley@notes.udayton.edu.

If you need additional space to complete your responses please continue on the back of this sheet.
### ArtStreet Instrument Scoring Sheet

**Fall**
- Mean Total Score ______
- Mean Community Score ______
- Mean Creativity Score ______
- Mean Diversity Score ______

**Spring**
- Mean Total Score ______
- Mean Community Score ______
- Mean Creativity Score ______
- Mean Diversity Score ______

### PreTest Total
- Mean ______ N ______
  - Std. Deviation ______ Std. Error Mean ______

### PostTest Total
- Mean ______ N ______
  - Std. Deviation ______ Std. Error Mean ______

#### PreTestCommunity
- Mean ______ N ______
  - Std. Deviation ______ Std. Error Mean ______

#### PostTestCommunity
- Mean ______ N ______
  - Std. Deviation ______ Std. Error Mean ______

#### PreTestCreativity
- Mean ______ N ______
  - Std. Deviation ______ Std. Error Mean ______

#### PostTestCreativity
- Mean ______ N ______
  - Std. Deviation ______ Std. Error Mean ______

#### PreTestDiversity
- Mean ______ N ______
  - Std. Deviation ______ Std. Error Mean ______

#### PostTestDiversity
- Mean ______ N ______
  - Std. Deviation ______ Std. Error Mean ______

### Total Paired Samples t Test
- Mean ______ Std. Deviation ______ Std. Error Mean ______ Confidence Interval: Lower ______ Upper ______
  - t ______ df ______ Sig. (2-tailed) ______

### Community Paired Samples t Test
- Mean ______ Std. Deviation ______ Std. Error Mean ______ Confidence Interval: Lower ______ Upper ______
  - t ______ df ______ Sig. (2-tailed) ______

### Creativity Paired Samples t Test
- Mean ______ Std. Deviation ______ Std. Error Mean ______ Confidence Interval: Lower ______ Upper ______
  - t ______ df ______ Sig. (2-tailed) ______

### Diversity Paired Samples t Test
- Mean ______ Std. Deviation ______ Std. Error Mean ______ confidence interval: Lower ______ Upper ______
  - t ______ df ______ Sig. (2-tailed) ______

### Significance of t Test(s) (Circle Yes if Sig. (2-tailed) is less than .05)
- Total Yes/No
- Community Yes/No
- Creativity Yes/No
- Diversity Yes/No

---

If you need additional space to complete your responses, please continue on the back of this sheet.
Example of Excel Spreadsheet Setup:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Assessm</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>PreTest</th>
<th>PostTest</th>
<th>PreTest</th>
<th>PostTest</th>
<th>PreTest</th>
<th>PostTest</th>
<th>PreTest</th>
<th>PostTest</th>
<th>PreTest</th>
<th>PostTest</th>
<th>PreTest</th>
<th>PostTest</th>
<th>PreTest</th>
<th>PostTest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example of SPSS Variable View Setup:

Example of SPSS Data View Setup:

If you need additional space to complete your responses, please continue on the back of this sheet.
Example of SPSS Output: (Note: You do not need to use the Paired Samples Correlations Output box)

### Paired Samples Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>PreTestTotal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>87.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.508</td>
<td>3.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PostTestTotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>172.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.003</td>
<td>3.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PreTestCommunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PostTestCommunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PreTestCreativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PostTestCreativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4</td>
<td>88.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.055</td>
<td>1.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PreTestDiversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PostTestDiversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Paired Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. Error Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 PreTestTotal - PostTestTotal</td>
<td>-84.67</td>
<td>10.066</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 PreTestCreativity - PostTestCreativity</td>
<td>-23.000</td>
<td>3.464</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you need additional space to complete your responses, please continue on the back of this sheet.