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Abstract

This thesis attempts to use literature, document analysis, and interviews with industry professionals to identify evaluation tools for arts programs and their relationship to public value. I interviewed staff from a variety of organizations in Columbus Ohio and used the “Framework for Understanding the Benefits of Arts” to analyze the results and documents. This research identified that there is a relationship between evaluation and public value. The relationship is most evident when analyzing the evaluation tools. The tools recognize the results the programs are attempting to achieve and those results can be compared to the benefits mentioned in the “Framework for Understanding the Benefits of Arts.”
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Statement of Purpose

This research seeks to use literature and interviews with industry professionals to identify evaluation tools for arts programs and its relationship to public value. Arts program evaluation is important because it links an arts experience to specific outcomes that benefit the community. This research will identify the methods of evaluation used in these troubling economic times to validate arts programs. Public value reflects how and why these arts programs are important. For instance, creativity is a characteristic that employers seek, yet arts programs that foster creativity are cut. This example reveals the connection between value and the arts. Hopefully, evaluation tools can help validate the arts. Unfortunately, arts programs receive inefficient evaluations because of lack of funds, time or expertise. The audiences for this research are arts administrators, arts funders, arts evaluators, and arts educators. Each of these groups is impacted by evaluation of arts programs and their connection to public value.

Research Questions

What tools are used to evaluate arts programming in Ohio and how do they relate to Ohio’s definition of public value?

Sub-Questions
What tools do arts organizations use to evaluate their programs?

What kinds of results, outcomes are the evaluation tools designed to assess?

What is the definition of public value?

How did you determine your definition of public value?

How does the structure of your evaluation tools relate its outcomes to public value?

How do you analyze them and what do you do with the results?

**Significance to the Field**

I hope to add to current literature on public value and arts evaluation by establishing a relationship between these two seemingly disparate concepts. This relationship could also impact the sustainability of programs. Currently, the literature fails to account for the importance of public value and evaluation for sustainability. This project will raise awareness for public value and arts evaluation and could be a tool for arts professionals. Public value reflects how and why these arts programs are important. This disconnect in the literature must be addressed if we hope to validate arts programs to sustain them. This validation impacts program participants, educators, administrators, funders and tax payers.

**Scope and Limitations of Study**

The research I will use qualitative methods. I will use literature on arts program evaluation to identify evaluation tools and explain public value. Drawing from
professional sources will highlight the relationship between the evaluation tools and public value.

Many of my data sources are public information found via the internet or public documents that have been published in journals, or by arts agencies. I will conduct interviews to gain an understanding of the relationship between evaluation tools and public value. I have identified 10 interviewees that are arts industry professionals. They include arts educators and arts administrators who influence arts program evaluation.

The participants have been identified through my knowledge of the art programming field as well as public documents that identify arts programs and evaluation practices. Through internships, employment, and networking, I was able to make connections with these potential participants. The participants have expertise in the art programming sector. They are related to program creation, funding, or evaluation. For this research, I am particularly interested in working with a variety of arts professionals in order to gain diverse perspectives on arts evaluation. For instance, a teaching artist may have a different view on evaluation and public value in comparison to an education director. The participants were sent a recruitment letter. The letter explains the research, its significance, and the expectations of participants. A follow-up call was made by the researcher to answer any questions the potential participant may have.

I collected data through structured interviews. Each interview was conducted in person, over the phone, or via email and recorded for transcription and validation purposes. These procedures will identify the process for evaluation.
To avoid bias and ensure validity I used an extensive literature review and interviews. Recordings and transcriptions of the interviews allowed research participants to confirm the accuracy of his or her representation.

**Methodological Paradigm**

I focused on evaluation methods and the concept of public value. Public value, public interest, and public benefit are interrelated and connected concepts. I hope my research will reveal how these ideas relate. My experiences with evaluation and lack of exposure to public value have led me to this research topic.

I have experienced inefficient evaluation methods in my professional career. My first experience with inefficient evaluation occurred at the Mutual Musician’s Foundation in 2008. As the program coordinator, I was responsible for organizing the day to day activities between the students and jazz masters. Unfortunately, evaluation was not a priority for the program director. It was not even mentioned until the final day of the program because it was a grant requirement. The evaluation measures resulted in a rushed video recording that did not accurately portray the impact of the program. There was no discussion of public value.

Another professional experience with Victory Gardens Theatre impacted my perspective on the practice of arts evaluation. In spring 2009, my interest in arts assessment began to develop because I had the opportunity to become the Arts Education Intern at Victory Gardens Theatre, a theatre company in Chicago, Illinois. One of my responsibilities was to record approximately 1000 student’s vocabulary, group, and teaching artist assessments from the Drama in the Schools program, an arts integration
program. Although the program had positive effects on the students, the evaluations did not represent that. For instance, ten people would take the pretest and only five students would take the post test. Thus, the results of the program were skewed. My internship at Victory Gardens Theatre perked my current research interest because I wanted to find a way to correct this evaluation problem that arts organizations face every day. I began investigating effective models of program evaluation to communicate program success to donors and administrations. This would have been an excellent opportunity to explain the educational benefits or public value of this program. Unfortunately, there was no connection to public value stated.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Arts program evaluation is important because it links an arts experience to specific outcomes that are transformed by public value into benefits for the community. There are different types of evaluation tools and a variety of arts programs in Ohio. The outcomes of these evaluation tools reflect social, educational, and economic benefits. These benefits reveal public value. This literature review attempts to define quality and excellence with regard to arts programs. These articles strive to give examples of planning for arts programs and its connection to public value. Lastly, the literature review seeks to define public value of the arts for the state of Ohio. Currently, the literature lacks a clear understanding of specific evaluation tools that are used to inform the public value. Although it is not discussed, I deem evaluation a significant element of public value. It matters because evaluation is a means to identifying public value which impacts the sustainability of arts programs. Ultimately, the compilation of these articles makes an effort to answer the following research question.

What tools are used to evaluate arts programming in Ohio and how do they relate to Ohio’s definition of public value?

Public Value Defined by the Ohio Arts Council

State Arts Agencies are the leaders and supporters for arts within their designated state. Thus, Ohio Arts Council, Ohio’s State Arts Agency, influences the state
perspective on public value. The Ohio Arts Council, OAC, cites the following publications as it defines the state’s position on this idea.

Firstly, *Creating the Public Value through State Arts Agencies* by Mark H. Moore and Gaylen Williams Moore highlights conversations between arts communities and state arts agencies about the public value of arts stemming from the State Arts Partnerships for Cultural Participation (START)initiative. This publication correlates to the research question because it identifies one element of Ohio’s perspective on public value and is one of the leading publications that define the benefits the arts produce. It asserts “that art is good for its own sake; … that individuals spend time and money on the arts because they value them; that the arts produce economic benefits for individuals …; that the arts help make better neighbors, better citizens, and a stronger civic and democratic culture…” (Moore and Moore 31). Moore and Moore also present the Transformational Framework for the Arts that designate elements of the public value as personal, social, relational, and economic.

The second publication on the OAC website is *Gifts of the Muse: Reframing the Debate About the Benefits of the Arts* by Kevin F. McCarthy, Elizabeth H. Ondaatje Laura Zakaras, and Arthur Brooks. It defines three ways that arts can benefit individuals and communities. Firstly, the authors identify the personal or individual benefits of the arts that can improve one’s life. The other element is that the individual’s benefits spill over to improve the community. Thirdly, the arts can improve economic growth and social capital (Rand Corporation 69). These definitions relate directly to how Ohio perceives how the arts benefit individuals and communities. The publication also asserts “The arts produce benefits—economic growth, education, and pro-social behavior—that
all Americans (not just those involved in the arts) recognize as being of value” (1). The publication also stresses that the most influential time for exposure to the arts that will result in more arts involvement occurs during childhood (xvii) The Rand Corporation classifies instrumental benefits of the arts as measurable benefits like economic growth. The publication also defines intrinsic benefits as enhancing to peoples’ lives. This publication disputes that all intrinsic benefits of the arts are private and do not affect the public. These private benefits can indirectly spillover to the public. The next step in this research is to define the tools that are employed to measures these benefits. The authors state “the arts experience can promote greater individual receptivity to new perspectives and tolerance for others, two private benefits that provide clear spillover benefits to a society whose population is growing increasingly diverse and whose central values include free speech and freedom of religion” (69). The most useful element of Gifts of the Muse is the “Framework for Understanding the Benefits of the Arts” for this inquiry because it creates a spectrum of benefits that can be used to compare instrumental, intrinsic, public, and private benefits.

![Framework for Understanding the Benefits of the Arts](image)

Figure 1. Framework for Understanding the Benefits of the Arts
The third publication that OAC cites is *An Architecture of Value* by Alan Brown. Unlike *Gifts of the Muse*, this article tries to define arts value through different perspectives for artists and arts administrators in order to make the ideas more implementable. He breaks down the dimensions of value into five categories; personal development, imprint of the arts experience, human interaction, economic and social benefits, and communal meaning. Brown explains personal development as growth, maturity, health, mental acuity, and overall development of the person, all of which have value for both the individual and society. He continues to explain the “imprint” of an arts experience. These elements include what happens to an individual during and immediately after an arts experience, including intrinsic benefits such as captivation, spiritual awakening, and aesthetic growth. This publication is one element of Ohio’s definition of public value. Next, Brown defines human interaction as benefits that improve relations between friends, family members, co-workers, and others because they enhance personal relationships, family cohesion, and expanded social networks. Another element that Brown suggests is the communal meaning and civic discourse which includes positive outcomes at a community level that are inherent in the arts experiences available to members of that community. These include both benefits that occur at the time of the experience and also those that occur over time. Lastly, economic and macro-social benefits community benefits. Tangible benefits such as economic impact and lower school drop-out rates, and intangible benefits such as civic pride and social capital are examples of these benefits (Brown 19-20).

Participation is another dimension of the value of arts that Brown does not include in the five clusters. Inventive, interpretive, curatorial, observational and ambient are all
modes of participation that An Architecture of Value emphasizes. Brown explains each of them. Firstly, the inventive arts participation mode does not require any skill and engages the mind, body and spirit in the act of art creation. Secondly, interpretive arts participation adds value to existing works of art. Curatorial participation is another mode that refers to the selection, organization, and collection to the approval of one’s artistic sensibility. The fourth mode of participation is observational and emphasizes an arts experience that one selects because he or she is motivated by the expectation of value. Lastly, ambient participation stresses experiencing art consciously or unconsciously that one does not select. This source is beneficial because it provides additional support for public value of arts through its examples of human interactions and civic discourse.

Figure 2. Five Clusters

“Three (Short) Detours Back to Public Value a keynote address by Andrew Taylor is the fourth publication that OAC cites. It centers on the question of how can or
do state arts agencies create public value? According to Taylor, it is not possible for arts agencies to create public value, but they can aid in its construction. This different perspective puts more responsibility on arts leaders and advocates on the role in ensuring the outcomes are benefits to society. The next step would be to identify how these benefits are measured. He compares the creation of public value to the construction of a building. Taylor states that “If value is co-constructed, and structure influences behavior, then perhaps your larger role, while you’re being advocates, funders, advisors, researchers, and connectors, is to be architects – defining and refining the structures that foster the rich and textured expressive life of your state” (7). He continues to address a second question which is how do you align your governance, leadership, staff, and constituents to maximize that value over time? He represents grant guidelines, incentive programs and technical assistance as structure. Taylor also asserts that advocacy and strategic partnerships are the tools that are necessary to build the structure (8).

Lastly, “Focusing the Light: The Art and Practice of Planning” is a program that was developed by the Ohio Arts Council to help organizations with strategies, tips, and techniques for successful project planning, advocacy and evaluation. The creation of a comprehensive plan is the first point. The second point is to define and describe a course of action. To gain support for the plan and implement plan activities are the third and fourth points according to “Focusing the Light: The Art and Practice of Planning.” The fifth point is to document the program’s successes and failures. The final point is to evaluate and redefine the plan.

The Ohio Arts Council cites publications that are the foundation for the current perspectives on public value. Through publications from the Rand Corporation and Alan
Brown the OAC supports the concepts like community benefits and personal development as evidence of public value. Since the OAC is the state arts agency, it influences arts organizations’ perspective on concepts. Arts organizations in Ohio refer to similar publications for information on public value.

**Other Perspectives on Public Value**

The OAC provides a definition of public value that includes foundational publications. In order to have a complete perspective of public value, I have included other articles to have a more comprehensive discussion on public value.

Not unlike “Focusing the Light: The Art and Practice of Planning”, *Arts for All: The Vanguard Districts CASE STUDIES FROM THE FIRST FIVE YEARS* provides an organization with strategies as well as evaluation tools. This publication exposes the process of the creation and implementation of a strategic plan for an arts program. This case study works as a blueprint for other arts programs because it displays how community advocates, arts district leaders, and teachers can work together via meetings to create a collective vision for the arts program. “There were 5 Case Studies of the 11 schools in the Vanguard District. The researcher reviewed hundreds of pages of related documentation and conducted focus group interviews with representatives from each district’s Community Arts Team (CAT). Also two surveys were conducted at the close of the interview”(4).

The purposes of the case studies are to “document lessons learned in creating and implementing a strategic plan for building a comprehensive district arts education program” and to “document changes in student access to quality instruction in the arts as
the Arts for All initiative matures” (5). The findings are” intended to inform the design of further technical assistance programs aimed at sustaining each district’s implementation efforts and to guide the development of a longitudinal study on student access across Los Angeles County.( 6)” This article presents an example of how to implement a strategic plan for an arts education program.

This research relates to the importance of sustainability. Three important elements of quality arts programs are “instructional content, district infrastructure and arts program sustainability”( 9). This is the first of hopefully many articles that emphasize the creation of sustainable arts programs. The next step will be to connect the longevity of these arts programs to a focus on public value and the prominence of public value in the planning and implementation of the arts program. Program sustainability highlights its value to the community.

To understand the trajectory of public value I have included From START to Finish: Lessons from The Wallace Foundation’s Work with State Arts Agencies that focuses on the impact the START program had on arts organizations, specifically in public value. For instance the report “describes what the START or State Arts Partnerships for Cultural Participation initiative set out to do, discusses its achievements and shortcomings and reflects on the findings”(1) The information is presented through reviews surveys and reflection on training sessions. There are many findings from this document. Firstly, “START spurred most grantees to place more emphasis on arts participation and START training left a positive imprint on the SAAs”( 3) The most important element of the literature review is “The agencies were greatly influenced by ideas about public value”( 3). This publication documents the evolution of emphasis on
public value, specifically Mark. H. Moore’s work with the Wallace Foundation. The growing awareness of public value is essential to the outcomes of arts programming. The lessons that are exposed through this article are a learning community can be invaluable and initiatives need a map and measures (13). The importance of assessment continues throughout the article and connects to the research question of what tools are necessary for evaluation. The article focuses on the complexities of evaluation. For instance, it states “Difficulties range from the expense and time it consumes to political tensions over what should be quantified and assessed” (12). The link between outcomes of the arts programs and social, educational, or economic benefits also important to emphasize because that highlights public value.

The metrics needed to measure benefits to the community are discussed in Public Value: Theory and Practice by John Benington and Mark H. Moore. This book revisits the concept of public value in the midst of political, economic, social, and ecological crisis (1-2). One method for evaluating public value is through a monetary perspective.

Benington and Moore explain “the methods which try to monetize public value usually draw either on what people say they would pay for a service or outcome (stated preference methods) or on choices people have made in related fields (revealed preference). There are also methods which try to attempt to adjust the cost of public services with references to quality – for example comparing school exam results” (Benington and Moore 212). Through these economic metrics the relationship between public value and evaluation tools can be established.

The ability to identify more perspectives on public value provides more insights into this topic. These publications focus on sustainability, impact and possible metrics. They also draw important conclusions on the possible relationship between evaluation tools and public value.
QUALITY

Quality is used to define arts programs and the outcomes of these programs. It is important to understand the definition of quality in order to connect program outcomes to public value. “The Qualities of Quality Understanding Excellence in Arts Education” commissioned by the Wallace Foundation attempts to answer these questions “How do arts educators in the United States – including leading practitioners, theorists, and administrators conceive of and define high quality arts learning and teaching? What markers of excellence do educators and administrators look for in the actual activities of arts learning and teaching as they unfold in the classroom? How do a program’s foundational decisions, as well as its ongoing day-to-day decisions, affect the pursuit and achievement of quality?”(Seidel et al. III). The ability to define quality is an important element in evaluating arts programs.

The first scope of the research includes ages of children grades Kindergarten through 12th. The locations are in school and out of school; urban, suburban, and rural sites.(Seidel et al. 5). “The last scope of the research represents the art forms. These art forms include dance, music, theater, visual arts, and some emerging forms, such as spoken word.”(Seidel et al. 5). The variety of arts disciplines offers an inclusive view of quality for the arts in general. There are three strands of research within The Qualities of Quality Understanding Excellence in Arts Education. Firstly there is a literature review. Secondly there are interviews with 16 recognized theorists and practitioners in the field. Lastly, there are site visits to 12 notable programs yielding interviews with over 250
people. There is a nomination process for each research strand. Nominations were solicited by email from several hundred arts. Another nomination process is the education professionals in a wide range of roles across the United States. Ultimately, there are 465 nominations (Seidel et al. 5). This intensive data collection provides many different perspectives on the definition of quality arts programming. Although there are a variety of definitions, this article was able to find to a consensus that quality in arts learning must involve authentic artist process and materials, exploration of big ideas about art, and direct experience with works of art (Seidel et al. 16).

The data collection led to findings and conclusion for administrators, professional development leaders, teachers, and students and highlights three significant elements. Firstly, the priority that student learning is the compass and measure of all arts experiences (Seidel et al. 85) Arts learning and teaching are important factors of arts programming. These factors can affect the outcomes of the program. Determining the elements of teacher quality and arts learning quality is essential in the determination of a quality arts program. The second element is “Teachers need professional development experiences that allow them to reflect on their philosophy of practice through the lens of quality, considering their purposes, approaches, and effectiveness." (Seidel et al. 86) Excellence is a term that is used interchangeably with quality. Professional development increases teacher quality which in turn will positively influence arts program experiences. These program experiences encourage social, cultural, and economic benefits for the community. Thirdly, the article “Suggests the critical importance of creating opportunities for educators close to the classroom and administrators farther away from it to reflect together regularly on the quality of their
programs and how best to continue – and improve – their efforts to achieve it” (Seidel et al. 86). Reflection tends to be the common element of program assessment.

R. Stake and A. Munson also attempt to define quality in “Qualitative Assessment of Arts Education.” It is pertinent to the literature review because quality is a term used to describe outcomes of evaluation. Stake and Munson state “we search for an understanding of quality, finding quality, and representing quality: three fundamental responsibilities in assessment.” (13) The authors explain quality’s connection to comparison. For instance, they assert to “understand quality one must consistently recognize differences among gradations in quality. Identifying quality is, in large part, a matter of comparison. High quality cannot have meaning without experiences of low quality…Understanding quality in arts education is greatly a matter of experience.” (Stake and Munson 15). Although quality is difficult to determine. But it is important to attempt to define because it impacts the description of the outcomes.

Ultimately, quality is a term that is used to describe arts programs. This term refers to what arts industry professionals strive to achieve. The outcomes of arts programs are related to the program experience. The program experience is connected to teacher quality and the ability to compare to other experiences.

**EVALUATION METHODS**
The following publications give accounts of evaluation processes and their shortcomings. They do not explain the purpose of evaluation or its connection to public value outside of an academic context. Given the scope of their research, it is necessary to identify these models to develop a clear idea of relevant evaluation models in the field. The evaluation models identified in the publications could be applied to current arts programs by arts industry professionals.

Firstly, *Program Evaluation* by Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Worthen define formative and summative evaluation and give examples of methods for these specific evaluation methods. The authors explain that formative evaluation provides information on program improvement (16). This information is usually collected through surveys, interviews, and focus groups (16). The next evaluation method is summative evaluation. This publication’s definition differs from Popovich’s definition. According to the authors it is “concerned with providing information to serve decisions or assist in making judgments about program adoption, continuation, and expansion” (17). The publication successfully determines difference between formative and summative evaluation through a simple analogy. “When the cook tastes the soup, that’s formative evaluation; when the guest tastes it, that’s summative evaluation” (qtd in Scriven 19).

Secondly, it is necessary to recognize how to document outcomes from arts programs. *Real Learning Real Work* by Adria Steinberg highlights the six A’s that are essential to the design of a project - based learning: authenticity, academic rigor, applied learning, active exploration, adult relationships, and assessment practices. The evaluation section focuses on reflection, development of standards, and exhibitions. This document
is pertinent to the literature review because it gives examples for documentation.

Documentation links the goals of an arts program to the program’s public value.

Unfortunately, it does not identify which option for documentation is appropriate for specific arts program activities. For instance, is an exhibition of the participants work the only form of assessment necessary?

Thirdly, the ability to identify evaluation methods and create the tools is a necessary skill. Eric E. Vogt, Juanita Brown, and David Isaacs explain how to create evaluation tools in “The Art of Powerful Questions Catalyzing Insight, Innovation, and Action.” The language used to create questions is essential to the quality of the survey. According to Vogt, Brown and Isaacs, most questions begin with who, what, when, where or why. This book describes three dimensions of creating powerful questions which are the construction of the question, the scope of the question, and the assumptions within the question. Vogt, Brown, and Isaacs explain in the first dimension, the questions that arouse the most conversation and thought begin with why, how, and what (4). At times “why” questions can arouse defensive responses, it is necessary to develop a question that originates from curiosity. This creates the possibility for creative thought. Secondly, the scope of the question must be appropriate to the subject matter. It has to fall in the boundaries of the situation. Thirdly, it is necessary to examine the question to prevent any unconscious beliefs assumptions the question may contain (Vogt, Brown, Issacs 5). The creation of a survey can relate to the goals of an arts program and public value.
Fourthly, The Ohio Arts Council provides resources for evaluation. The “Artist in Residency Handbook” provides another example of evaluation methods on the Ohio Arts Council’s website. According to the Ohio Arts Council’s Artist in Residency Handbook, portfolios are effective means to assess their programs. The purpose of the portfolio is to focus on the process and not the product (AIE Handbook). It allows the students and the teaching artist to continually refine and reflect during the process. This formative evaluation demonstrates the qualitative data through journals, interviews, documentation, group interviews and through artistic work. Another means of evaluation for the Artist in Residency program is the closure meeting. It allows the cooperating teacher to identify the residencies strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for future residencies (AIE Handbook). The structure of the Artist in Residency program’s evaluation is effective for qualitative data. The most important aspect of this model is the portfolio. It allows not only the student to view his or her progress, but the donor as well. It gives the teaching artist a guide as to how he or she should alter the teaching methods to best assist the student. Although this handbook presents a clear process for evaluation, it does not connect the outcomes of these evaluations to public value.

Fifthly, the Kellogg Foundation is another organization that provides insights into the evaluation process. The Kellogg Foundation presents information for an interview, a method used for evaluation in the Evaluation Handbook. This handbook explains the types, characteristics, strengths, and weaknesses for interviews. This document gives insights as to what interview approach would be appropriate for different situations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Interview</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal Conversation Interview</td>
<td>Questions emerge from the immediate context and are asked in the natural course of things; there are no predetermined questions, topics, or wordings.</td>
<td>Increases the salience and relevance of questions; interviews are built on and emerge from observations; the interview can be matched to individuals and circumstances.</td>
<td>Different information collected from different people with different questions. Less systematic and comprehensive if certain questions do not arise “naturally.” Data organization and analysis can be quite difficult.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Interview Guide Approach | Topics and issues to be covered are specified in advance, in outline form; interviewer decides sequence and wording of questions in the | The outline increases the comprehensiveness of the data and makes data collection somewhat systematic for each respondent. Logical gaps in data | Important and salient topics may be inadvertently omitted. Interviewer flexibility in sequencing and wording questions can result |

Table 1. Kellogg Foundation Interview Guide
| Standardized Open-Ended Interview | The exact wording and sequence of questions are determined in advance. All interviewees are asked the same questions in the same order. Questions are worded in a completely open-ended format. | Respondents answer the same questions, thus increasing comparability of responses; data are complete for each person on the topics addressed in the interview. Reduces interviewer effects and bias when several interviewers are used. Permits evaluation users to see and review the instrumentation used | Little flexibility in relating the interview to particular individuals and circumstances; standardized wording of questions may constrain and limit naturalness and relevance of questions and answers. |
Table 1 Continued

| Closed-Field Response Interview | Questions and response categories are determined in advance. Respondent chooses from among these fixed responses. | Data analysis is simple; responses can be directly compared and easily aggregated; many questions can be asked in a short time. | Respondents must fit their experiences and feelings into the researcher’s categories; may be perceived as impersonal, irrelevant, and mechanistic. Can distort what respondents really mean or have experienced by so completely limiting their response choices. |
In conclusion, the identification of different evaluation concepts and tools provides examples of concepts and tools that Ohio Arts Industry professionals could currently be employing. The next step in this research is to connect the evaluation tools with outcomes and relate those outcomes to public value.

The following publications on evaluation describe different methods for evaluation. The impacts do not directly fit within OAC definition of public value, I can infer it from their described outcomes. Ultimately, public value and can inexplicitly connect the outcomes of the evaluation tools to public value.

Firstly, G. Burnaford in “Moving Toward a Culture of Evidence: Documentation and Action Research in the practice of Arts Partnerships” highlights different methods for evaluating students’ performances and products. Through this publication the author relates evaluation tools, outcomes, and public value. For instance, G. Burnaford explains “Arts partnerships are developing sophisticated methods of synthesizing student performances and art products, including online templates, Web-based Power Point presentations, live discussions of student work via the Web, and accessible video clips that illustrate classroom teaching and learning…” (36). The publication demonstrates how certain evaluation methods are employed for specific situations. It also provides arts organizations the ability to identify a program and the best method to evaluate it. It is important to note that product based or summative evaluation relates to professional development and reflection on the practice of arts education. Burnaford supports this claim when he states:

“This kind of documentation serves multiple purposes…The works become a contribution to the field of arts inquiry beyond the individual classroom. Inquiry
based documentation invites teacher and artist partners into an ongoing exploration of their practice, rather than into a closed system of discrete activities. It also provides tools for peer-to-peer professional development that engages other teachers and artists outside of a particular partnership… (36).

Ultimately, the publication indicates several summative evaluation tools that connect to outcomes that can improve an arts program and its educators. These outcomes, like contribution to the arts field, represent public value.

Secondly, K. Popovich explains the impacts of collaboration in evaluation in this article,” Designing and implementing exemplary content, curriculum, and assessment in art education.” Collaboration between teachers and students not only empowers the students, but also builds relationships. These relationships can form through communication and using appropriate social skills. Popovich explains this partnership in the following statement “emphasized the importance of using criteria developed collaboratively to assess student work based on reflective methods as a component of visual culture in art education. Through this process, students are empowered to take ownership of their educational experience. Electronic portfolios created by students demonstrate their lived experience through documentation and reflection” (38). ( qtd in Boughton 2002). The partnerships between student and teacher can produce successful evaluations because both groups have a vested interest in the outcome and have a voice in its creation and dissemination. The outcomes that occur during the process of the evaluation embody public value.

Popovich also asserts the different categories that evaluation can fulfill. Popovich explains in the article “Formative assessment examines student learning outcomes through the process of the learning experiences” ( qtd in Noonan, & Duncan, 2005).This
process is important because it gives arts administrators an opportunity to improve their programs before they end. Formative assessments can be conducted through “interviews, journals, critiques, and conversations” (38). The next form of assessment is summative, which focuses on the end product. “This end product is most effectively assessed using scoring rubrics. Scoring rubrics establish the criteria for student performance at different levels of achievement and can help clarify teaching objectives and promote clarity and consistency in the evaluation” (38) Understanding the forms of evaluation is important because it determines when a conversation or a rubric is the best manner to assess a program. These elements of evaluation can connect the goals of the program and display the program’s public value.

“Champions of Change the Impact of the Arts on Learning” is a collection of works that explore the impact of arts experiences. The author highlights this idea when stating “We developed the Champions of Change: Impact of the Arts on Learning initiative in cooperation with The Arts Education Partnership and the President’s Committee on the Arts and Humanities to explore why and how young people were changed through their arts experiences” (iv). The outcomes and tools used to measure these outcomes can reflect public value.

One publication by James Catterall uses many assessment models to determine the affect the arts had on other academic subjects in “Chicago Arts Partnerships in Education Summary Evaluation. “The purpose of this article to the literature review is to provide an example of a collaboration between industry and academia. The North Central Regional Laboratory (NCREL) contracted with CAPE to with evaluation services from 1995-1998 (48). NCREL analyzed data on student achievement in mathematics and
reading on a national basic skills test, specifically the Iowa Test of Basic Skills or ITBS from 1992-1998 (48). The Imagination Project under the direction of UCLA Professor James S. Catterall was contracted to focus on a specific set of evaluation-related questions during the 1998-1999 school year (48). This article gives examples of evaluation methods. For instance, “NCREL watched teachers and artists over four years through nearly all of their evaluation lenses: regular surveys, classroom observations, interviews, focus groups, document review, and case studies” (50). The evaluation focused on other elements besides student development. District-wide student and teacher surveys administered by NCREL highlighted the development of CAPE schools. The survey scales for school climate, quality of relationship with parents, professional development, instructional practices and relationships with community. (50)

The combination of standardized test scores, observations, interviews, focus groups, document review, case studies, and surveys of teachers, students, artists, and community members provided a holistic perspective on the data. It also fulfills Chicago Arts Partnerships in Education or CAPE’s “commitment to assessment stretching from the first planning period, comprising the 1993-1994 school year, to what CAPE refers to as its implementation years, particularly from 1995-1998” (48). These assessment tools were funded by a grant from the GE fund (48). This article does not address the impacts of the data.

Although Catterall’s publication does not highlight the impacts of a program, Suzanne Callahan in Singing Our Praises: Case Studies in the Art of Evaluation explains logic models. A logic model is a guide and highlights the goals and the outcomes of the program. These outcomes reflect the goals of the program and possibly the public value.
Callahan explains the “logic model reflects rather than dictates your thinking and builds understanding of how a program functions” (30). Logic models include inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes. It is necessary to identify a goal that states the purpose of the program. “Inputs are the resources involved in your program including human resources, space, materials, and equipment, including technology” (30). Activities are what happens during the program that are usually the action steps that are implemented to reach the goal (30-31). There is a difference between outputs and outcomes. Outputs are elements that can be measured. According to Callahan, outputs are what the program produces (31). Outcomes focus on the long term impacts of the program. They reflect the intended results of the program (31). Outcomes can represent the public value of a program.

Callahan includes a table that explains four ways to gather information. The table states that talking to people, written responses, review documentation and existing data, and observation are the four ways to gather information (125). Intake and exit interviews, interviews, focus groups, discussion groups, and telephone interviews are examples of taking to people.

In conclusion, the impacts of arts programs of the programs are highlighted by the evaluation tools and logic models. Whether it is professional development or student climate, the outcomes of the arts programs are not explicitly related to public value.

**STANDARDS**

Although there are many publications about assessment, the 1997 Arts Education Framework is the only nationally representative and continuing assessment of what
America’s students know and can do in various subject areas…” (National Assessment Governing Board U.S. Department of Education i). National Assessment of Educational Progress report on arts assessment is based on national arts standards, its model for theatre assessment is applicable to non-academic settings. This is pertinent to the literature review because it is a national standard. According to the National Assessment Governing Board U.S. Department of Education, the framework process should include creating, performing and responding. The content of the art should have two components which are knowledge and skills. Knowledge includes cultural, historical, social, and personal contexts. Skills include perceptual, intellectual, reflective, expressive, and technical contexts (14). The report continues to state videotaping the performance in order to view the collaboration is a means of assessment. Facilitators must create a comfortable atmosphere so that the material can create an expressive tone (National Assessment Governing Board U.S. Department of Education 27). This publication does not explicitly connect assessment to public value. Yet, it does identify skills that can spillover for public benefits.

“Guidelines for Arts Assessment” Arts Assessment Training Series By SCASS Arts is based on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) steering committee guidelines, published in the 1997 Arts Education Assessment Framework (1994) as part of the Arts Education Consensus Project (slide 3). It highlights the elements of assessment and the impact of the results. This publication highlights the importance of the results to the public.

There are 12 guidelines that begin with unified expectations of curriculum, standards, instruction, and assessment (slide 5). These next guidelines explain the modes
of evaluation. The second guideline is that “the assessment should assess students' knowledge, attitudes, and performance in the modalities and forms of expression characteristic of the discipline as well as verbal or written linguistic modes” (slide 6). The 5th guideline explains that portfolios that include on demand as well as curricular embedded and collections of student work. Assessment systems should also explore performance tasks, open-ended, constructed responses as well as traditional forced choice formats (slide 7). Each of the collections and responses are important to the evaluation process and can be applied to different arts programs. The publication also asserts that assessment should reflect students’ critical judgment and the reporting should include descriptive and numerical data on student performance (slide 10). The ninth guideline asserts that “assessments should use a common list of background variables or contextual information to recognize differences and inequities in school resources and conditions related to achievement, such as teacher qualifications, instructional time, school structure, cultural and social background of the school community, and incentives. This recognition must be evident in reporting the data. Results are meaningful only in terms of availability and continuity of meaningful instruction” (slide 9). This is an important guideline because it connects the results to the community. This can lead to recognition of public value. The assessment should reflect process and product and also expand the public’s information about their importance (slide 10). “Hence, exercises should model multifaceted and thoughtful activities, without making unreasonable demands on time, materials, and human resources.” is the 11th guideline (slide 15). The variety of audience represents the massive impact evaluation can have outside of the arts program. The final guideline supports this claim as it states that the assessment “should
recognize needs and produce helpful information for a variety of audiences—students, parents, teachers, and administrators; local, state and national policymakers; and community members such as business persons,—and be disseminated in a variety of ways for the different audiences” (slide 16). The data that evaluation collects highlights the impact on the community and could connect evaluation to public value.

Theatre companies and organizations can use publications like “Guidelines for Arts Assessment” Arts Assessment Training Series By SCASS Arts and Envisioning Arts Assessment a Process Guide for Assessing Arts in Education in School Districts and States by Nancy Pistone and Debra Brzoska to set standards for evaluation. According to Pistone and Brzoka the purpose of standards based assessments was to create a standard that was more clear and unbiased. Assessments are based on multiple choices evaluation and performance assessments. This evaluation model allows the students to be more responsible and accountable, gives more info to parents, and helps teachers create new curriculums. Thus, students reach higher academic successes (5-6). Academic success or the improvement of education are examples of public value. Yet, non-academic theatre program do not have to meet state or national standards. Donors and program directors can decide what the model to use when evaluating the program.

It is important to recognize different evaluation modes that are in practice in the arts field. Arts industry professionals can refer to the standards in regards to their evaluation tools. There is no explicit connection to the impacts that the tools measure and Ohio’s definition of public value.

CRITIQUES
Jim Coe and Rhond Schlangen warn against the overuse of evaluation in “Looking Through the Right End of the Telescope.” The authors assert that “a disproportionate focus on tools can cause other important issues to be overlooked—in the context that not everything that can be measured matters and not everything that matters can be measured” (1). Although this publication does not highlight evaluation methods or public value, it characterizes the dangers of evaluation. It also provides guidance for the evaluation. Vigilance to the risks of overemphasis on tools, and understanding their limits, improves the chances of developing new—and using existing—tools or models in a way that helps support more effective advocacy”(1).

Rob Horowitz and Jaci Webb-Dempsey critique the evaluation of arts learning in “Promising Signs of Positive Effects: Lessons from the Multi-Arts Studies.” The publication explains “most arts transfer studies measure participation in arts classes as a surrogate for assessing arts learning, but then measure learning outcomes directly, be they creativity, self-concept, or math performance” (99). The authors continue to claim that transfer studies will continue to be insufficient, but do not explain what methods or measures of evaluation would be most effective.

For instance, the authors assert “transfer studies in arts education will always be somewhat insufficient until we can more effectively measure arts learning. The quality of arts programs should be considered, as well. We can’t predict a transfer outcome unless we are first confident that there is a properly defined causal event: in this case, arts learning”(99).

The authors do give a solution to improve arts evaluation. Horowitz and Webb-Dempsey explain “We also should pursue more precise identification, definition, and measurement in three areas: (1) arts learning; (2) outcomes of arts learning, including cognitive and social competencies, and personal dispositions; and (3) characteristics of
the contexts, processes, and environments of arts teaching and learning” (100). The purpose of this article is to highlight the need for effective evaluation. It would be difficult to connect public value to outcomes based on an incorrect evaluation.

Although the tools for evaluation are important, it is also important to understand some of the challenges that can occur during their implementation. For instance, organizational history and culture impact how an organization operates. In “What Evaluation Can Do” Chelimksy explains that it is necessary to understand the history of the organization because the past will determine how an organization reacts to evaluators (15). The evolution of evaluation methods depends on the organization’s history. The relationship between evaluators and organizations hinge on the past of the organization. The ability to understand and recognize an organization’s quirks allows an evaluator to work successfully. Organizational culture and history make it difficult for it to change. Chelimksy highlights this difficulty when she states “In short, change rarely comes easy to organizations. Neither is it cost-free” (16).

An organization’s resistance to change is directly influenced by its culture. Chelimsky emphasizes this connection, “To sum up, then, my argument here is that organizations are political entities with individual cultures built upon their past histories, and that they often possess a self-protective infrastructure that cushions them splendidly against demands for change.” (16). It is necessary to understand the history of an organization in order to understand how its programming represents public value.

**CONCLUSION**
This literature review describes public value quality, evaluation methods, evaluation critiques, and standards. Unfortunately, the reviewed literature does not distinctly draw conclusions between public value and evaluation. The literature defines public value. It also defines evaluation but does not connect the two. The connection must be inferred. The publications provide a clear description of the Ohio Arts Council’s perspective on public value. This includes the concept of public benefit. The publications also present ideas on evaluation methods. These methods could relate to the tools arts industry professionals are currently using. The articles provide information, but do not completely address my research question. Interviews with arts professionals about the outcomes of their arts programs and methods of evaluation could emphasize the connection between evaluation and public value.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Upon entering graduate school I had the experience of researching evaluation methods, however it was during my course work that I decided to use a qualitative approach. Qualitative methods such as literature reviews and semi-structured interviews were used to relate evaluation tools to public value in this section of my thesis. It highlights the process I used to answer the question: what tools are used to evaluate arts programming in Ohio and how do they relate to Ohio’s definition of public value? To begin to answer this question I developed an interview protocol, and analyzed the responses of the participants and archival documents using the Gifts of the Muse Framework for Understanding the Benefits of the Arts. Please see below a visual representation of my inquiry.
Figure 3. Visual Representation of Research
Framework

I used the Gifts of the Muse’s Framework for Understanding the Benefits of Arts as a model for analyzing participant responses to get a better understanding of how their perspective of public value is related to their evaluation tools. Although much work has been done in public value, I return to Gifts of the Muse as a foundational piece of literature based on citation analysis using Google Scholar. The Ohio Arts Council, which impacts arts programming and funding throughout the state, also references this text in its definition of public value. By using this framework, I compared Ohio’s definition of public value which is supports the concepts like community benefits and personal development as evidence of public value to the participants’ definition.

Selection Process

I conducted ten interviews with a variety of arts industry professionals in Columbus, Ohio. I selected each person based on their expertise in evaluation, public value or arts education through professional and educational contacts. Through these interviews, I sought to gain perspectives on evaluation and public value from funders, administrators, consultants, and teaching artists. The following individuals were interviewed:

- Tony Aueson-Columbus Children’s Theatre, Former Education Director
- William Goldsmith, Columbus Children’s Theatre, Artistic Director
- Heather Burley-The Phoenix Theatre for Children, Education Director
- Whitney Thomas Eads, The Phoenix Theatre for Children, Arts Educator
- Todd Camp-The King Arts Complex, Education Director
- Catherine Willis-Friends of Arts for Community Enrichment, Member
I selected these participants based on the art discipline, type of institution, and role of individual. These distinctions are important to note because they could impact their perspective on public value and evaluation. For instance, a smaller institution may not have access to resources necessary to create an evaluation tool or funds to devote to evaluation. A larger institution may have connections to academic endeavors in order to gain the latest insights on public value. The following paragraphs highlight the reasons that impacted selection of the participants.

Personal or educational contact or experience also impacted the selection of each participant. It was important to include a variety of perspectives and experiences. For instance, I selected Columbus Children’s Theatre and the Phoenix Children Theatre because of my professional-relationships with the organizations. This relationship presented an opportunity to relate perspectives on public value and evaluation from two
similar organizations. Both organizations provide opportunities for children to engage with theatre in central Ohio and have incomes over $750,000 according to Guidestar.

I also chose to interview two employees at Columbus Children’s Theatre and Phoenix Theatre for Children because there could be differing opinions on the topic based on their position. For example, Tony Auseon, the former education Director of Columbus Children’s Theatre, may have different experiences with evaluation than William Goldsmith, the Artistic Director for Columbus Children’s Theatre. Heather Burley, Education Director for Phoenix Theatre for Children, may approach evaluation methods differently than Whitney Eads, Arts Educators for Phoenix Theatre for Children, because Burley focuses on in school programming and Eads focuses on afterschool programming.

Todd Camp from the King Arts Complex was selected to participate in this research because of the organization’s commitment to programming for a variety of arts disciplines. For instance, one of its programs is the Afterschool Arts Institute which includes visual art, music, dance, and theatre. I wanted to investigate if the variety of arts disciplines could impact the evaluation. I selected Kayla Jackmon and Catherine Willis because they were professional contacts and were available to participate in the research. David Guion’s input as the Executive Director for the Dublin Arts Council provided a funding agency’s perspective on public value and evaluation. Contrastingly, Sheri Chaney Jones offered a different point of view because she is the president of Measurement Resources, which is a company that consults with arts organizations. Lastly, I selected individuals from the Columbus Museum of Art because they focus on
programming for visual art. The variety in the organizations and individuals ultimately provided a complete perspective on what tools are used to evaluate Ohio arts programs and how they relate to public value.

- What tools do you use to evaluate your arts programs?
- What kinds of results, outcomes are your evaluation tools designed to assess?
- What evaluation tools would you like arts programs to use to relate the outcomes to public value?
- What is your definition of public value?
- How did you determine your definition of public value?
- How does the structure of your evaluation tools relate its outcomes to public value?
- If the outcomes of your arts programs do not relate to public value, how could they?
- How do you analyze the results and what do you do with them?
- Is there anything else you would like to add?

The interview process has some strengths and weaknesses; however, I made certain that all interview questions tied back to my research interests. All questions were established before the first interview. While I knew that responses to questions regarding concepts like evaluation and public value could be varied; using the same questions ensured that all topics were covered. I generally did not find the semi-structured interview approach limiting to the participants because I would ask is there anything else he or she would like to add to the interview. At times a participant would answer one question and begin to answer an out of sequence question without it being
asked. Instead of interrupting the participant, I would allow him or her to answer the question to maintain continuity and substance of the person’s response. In order to remain impartial and true to the interviewee’s perspective, I chose to include passages from the interview to illustrate my findings.

Before the interview, each participant was sent a recruitment letter and consent form detailing the nature of my research in order to have an opportunity to ask any questions prior to their interview. All recruitment letters did not get responses. I conducted interviews between January 2012 and April 2012. The semi-structured interviews took place at the convenience of the participant, in person, via Skype internet phone or via email and took approximately fifteen to twenty minutes. This process allowed each person to answer the questions in a manner that was most effective for them. The interviews were recorded, converted to MP3 format, and transcribed using Express Dictate Recorder. Following the interviews participants were sent the transcriptions for their review.

Document Analysis

I examined available documents from the organizations of the interviewed participants which included evaluation tools or anything relevant to their perspective on public value or evaluation. I had the opportunity to work with some of the organizations and have helped create or implement some of the evaluation tools. These documents revealed crucial information about these concepts and supported the participants’ responses during the interview. I used Gifts of the Muse Framework to analyze each document. Relying on the same framework for analyzing the interviews and documents provided continuity.
Chapter 4: Research Findings and Analysis

Introduction

Most arts industry professionals are familiar with program evaluation and the concept of public value, but there is no consensus on tools or a definition. The Ohio Arts Council is a leader and supporter of arts in Ohio. The state arts agency’s influence should impact local arts organization’s perspective on public value. Local arts organizations refer to a variety of tools and origins of their definition of public value. There are some similar themes and ideas that emerge concerning evaluation tools, measurements, and definition of public value. Through interviews my findings demonstrate an unclear link between evaluation tools and public value. The explicit relationship between public value and the evaluation tools is demonstrated through document analysis.

Evaluation Tools

Evaluation tools are important because public value can’t be proven or relate to anything unless you can demonstrate impact through data. Evaluation tools can take many different forms. Through interviews arts industry professionals acknowledged the tools they use for their programs. There is no consensus on tools because each program had different goals and access to different resources. Then arts programs use data to determine program sustainability and effectiveness. The evaluation tools that were highlighted were pre and post tests, observations, surveys, and retention rates.
Firstly, pre and post tests are tools that many arts organizations employ for measurement. Through these measures they can assess growth and the overall impact of a specific program. The ability to have a before and after perspective on the program provides validity to claims of program effectiveness. “Many use pretests as benchmarks to report a change that has occurred in those participating in the program from before the program to its conclusion” (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, Worthen 312) At times, it can be difficult to get data for pre and post tests. There needs to be some consistency in the group being measured before and after. Arts organizations do not have control over the attendance of students and the lack of attendance can skew the results. Growth or change over time is an important element for program evaluation. It can give a nuanced perspective because it can highlight the impact the arts program has on its participants.

The participants in my research explained how they use pre and post tests to evaluate their programs. Kayla Jackmon, theatre coordinator and prevention specialist, explained her experience with pre and post tests. “One of the big things that we use are pre and post tests… That evaluate how they feel about their friends, friendships, relationships with others, bullying, and it’s the same pre and post test before and after over the course of 3 months that these students take” (personal communication, February 28, 2012). Todd Camp also acknowledged his use of pre and post tests. The results from the tests explain the influence of the program. Heather Burley supports this idea when she states

“Basically we give a pre and post tests also a pre and post evaluation from teacher. You know what are you expecting from the program and the post test and the outcomes to what had the student learned… And then we also try to take photographs and things like…” (personal communication, February 1, 2012).
Whitney Eads expands on the use of pre and post tests. She explains that she uses the results to compare to a control group. A control group is a group that did not participate in the arts program. This is a more extensive evaluation design that is used to account for variables that might impact the results.

“For our after-school program, STEAM, we’ve been employing an interest survey for participants and non-participants. The survey asks opinion questions regarding the students’ enthusiasm for Science, Math, Theatre, and other art forms. The survey is taken at the start and end of the program. The results are compared with a control group of non-participant surveys to evaluate the efficacy of the program goal: to increase interest in the STEM fields through the Arts” (personal communication, March 6, 2012).

Ultimately, there are a variety of experiences with pre and post tests. Some industry professionals use this tool within the organization, while other industry professionals institute a more complex usage of pre and post test when comparing the results to a control group. Although there is diverse practice in pre and post testing, the industry professionals are competent in this method and use it appropriately in evaluating arts programs.

Secondly, observation is another tool that organizations implement in order to understand their programs. Using this tool, arts organizations can target a specific type of idea or concept that is important to their mission or values. This process allows for organizations to view the process in action. “Observations are used more extensively to learn more about program operations and outcomes, participants’ reactions and behaviors, interactions and relationships among stakeholders, and other factors vital to the study” (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, Worthen 336). This is a formative type of assessment.
Observations can occur at any time during a program and effect change while the program occurs. Observation could also be an example of summative evaluation. For instance, one could observe a presentation that is supposed to be representative of a cumulative experience.

One element of observation is a rubric. The rubric is a guide for measurement. Measurements can come in many forms. For instance, there can be a numeric value placed on a measure. There results could also be presented in narrative form. David Guion explained why he implemented observations “We also do observations for qualitative information” (personal communication, April 3, 2012).

Thomas Eads explained how she applied rubrics into the STEAM program. She stated, “For process based lessons (such as short-term residencies where we teach cross-curricular lessons based on a grade-level standard), we use a rubric to evaluate what the students retained. This rubric is explored by way of follow-up questions and discussions that enhance connection between the art and the standard” (personal communication, March 6, 2012).

Based on the interviews, the industry professionals use rubrics to collect qualitative data instead of quantitative data. Qualitative data provides a narrative and gives detail to the results. This data can be more accessible to arts organizations that may lack the skills or the time to analyze raw data in a quantitative form.

Thirdly, surveys provide feedback for arts organizations. Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Worthen explain “…the purpose of the survey is to measure opinions, behaviors, attitudes or life circumstances quite specific to the program to be evaluated…” (342). For
the purposes of this research the terms survey and questionnaire are used interchangeably. The structure of the survey reflects what the organization seeks to find. The survey using specific questions or wording can hone in on specific goals or concepts the organization deems as important. The structure of the survey can create open ended questions that allow for a variety of responses. This feedback can be received through a diversity of means. For instance, parents can send their responses to a survey via email or they can turn in a paper copy to the arts program an arts administrator.

Tony Auseon clarifies how and why he uses surveys to evaluate the Academy.

“We have two tools. One is a customer survey or participant survey. We do that with both programs basically asking pretty open ended. We have a few things on there that are like rate these aspects from 1 to 5. It is typically like rating the academy, facility, price, overall experience those have a 1 to 5 scale most of the forms. The information that is open ended. What are we doing well. How can we improve. What else would you like to see offered. Then there is an open area for other comments. You know that gives me a sense of what the experience was after its been offered” (personal communication, January 30, 2012).

Based on the interviews, surveys focus more on satisfaction than content, unlike through observation. The purposes of surveys are to determine the perception of stakeholders. The survey places arts programs in the role of a service or product and the stakeholders in the role of the consumer. It is necessary for arts industry professionals to gauge not only whether they met their objectives but also how satisfied the stakeholders were with the experience.

Fourthly, focus groups and interviews are evaluation tools that allow the arts organizations to gain perspectives via qualitative information. “Focus groups are like an interview in that they involve face-to-face interaction, but they build on the group
process…Discussion in focus groups is not always interviewer to interviewee, but often dialogue continues among focus group participants” (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, Worthen 351).

Arts professionals implement interviews and focus groups in a variety of setting. Catherine Willis explained her experience with interviews. Willis stated “oral and written evaluations. Many times when we work with seniors it is much easier to get an oral evaluation from them rather than written. When we work with young people who don’t have some of the same challenges as seniors we use written” (personal communication, March 26, 2012).

Arts professionals from Columbus Museum of Art reiterate the idea of choosing an evaluation tool that fits the situation and their practice of focus groups.

“What they helped us learn which there are lots of ways of doing it from it logic models to exhibition art, program planning forms, setting goals and outcomes that have direct links to evaluation mechanism and tools. Now we use a variety a wide variety of tools and implementation depending on the program or project” ((personal communication, April 9, 2012).

“We did two family focus groups…12 different families that had relationships with the museum. We brought them in a t 2 separate times for conversations asking questions that would guide us. The first one was a formative evaluation input about what families want. It also about creativity which was a concept we knew we were going to follow. Then also they came in after the wonder room was open and gave us feedback… We have a person observing and having conversations with visitors in the galleries to find out if they are responding the way we expected and what else are they doing” (personal communication, April 9, 2012).

Ultimately, arts professionals in Ohio are very practical in their use of interviews and focus groups. If they have an issue with one means of data collection they change it to more effective manner. For instance, Willis faced challenges gaining information from
her senior program participants. She altered her tactics to use interviews in order to gain
the pertinent information. Also the staff at the CMA used focus groups in a manner to
determine how to create a program and their reaction to the finished program.

Lastly, retention is also a means of evaluation. The ability to track participants’
attendance for a program can highlight participant commitment and program quality.
Repeat participants demonstrate program satisfaction. A high number of participants
reflect the popularity of a program. Auseon explains the how he implements this
measure.

“The other thing that I will use to evaluate is the how well received something
was. I typically look at that in terms of capacity. I mean if we sell something out.
Session after session. I will consider that to be more successful than something
that only runs with only five students. That is just looking at it from a numbers
point of view. I look at capacity over time. We offer this many classes over this
age group. We filled this many spots. This will help me adjust. If we offer 100
classes and 30 of them are for the youngest age group. Only 70% purchase…I will
adjust that to fit the response” (personal communication, January 30, 2012).

Although not many interview participants mentioned retention as a means for
evaluation, it is an inherent part and cost effective method for determining program
success. I believe that arts organizations use retention rates informally for evaluation. It is
a quantitative tool that is used more for observation of trends, not necessarily analysis.

Future Tools

Arts industry professionals can lack the resources to generate tools that would
most appropriately evaluate their arts programs. Through my interview process, the
participants identified specific tools or evaluation methods that would be beneficial in
demonstrating the impact of their programs. These tools are not currently in use. These evaluation tools include process methods of evaluation, program specific evaluation, focus groups, self assessment, and more immediate tools. Through this discussion alternative means for evaluation were identified.

Thomas Eads demonstrated frustration with funders and arts products being intangible.

“My only qualm with this is that many funders don’t get the opportunity to see this work. I do collect thank you letters and statements from the students—and the reactions to the programs are great—but the actual work is lost on those that keep the value of the work financial relevant. They have to “take our word for it”. Theatre products are immediate and intangible, as are the tools and values that the students learn from their work in the theatre. It’s not a measurable outcome. We may need to try to reevaluate our tools for evaluation to better meet funders’ needs for public value” (personal communication, March 6, 2012).

She continued to explain how to document the process of creating a theatre product.

“I wish that the public could watch the *process* of artforms—therein lies some really amazing moments of discovery, confidence building, teamwork, and transformation. Unfortunately, the public seems to expect *product*. In addition to making the product more accessible to the public, thus increasing its public value, I also think there is a place for documenting the process students venture for the art—ie. pictures, video, documentary” (personal communication, March 6, 2012).

Jackmon identified a need for more program specific evaluation tool to better evaluate the unique program within Directions for Youth and Family.

“I think the first thing is to be able to use a evaluation system based on what the children are doing in each program. Whether it is music theatre or art or dance. They are able to evaluate that benefit specifically to their outcomes in their daily life. I think a lot of the questions on the evaluation do not address that specifically for Short Shop. I think they use the same evaluation tool for every program with in Directions for Youth and Family. Short stop is very specific under Direction for Youth and Family that it is the only performing arts program and everything else is very social counseling rehabilitation kind of programs” (personal communication, February 28, 2012).
Guion highlighted the connection of creating a focus group to the identification of public value. Guion claimed, “I think one of our biggest priorities would be a focus group with our stakeholders represented. I think that would be the most effective way at this point in our strategic planning to talk about public value. Because then you are getting a direct conversation with your stakeholders” (personal communication, April 3, 2012).

Similar to Guion, Camp also wanted the stakeholder’s perspective presented when he identifies self assessment. Camp “Again whether that is through portfolio or through self assessment. Those are things we spoke of before. Really being able for them to be able to go back and peer assessment. Look at the work they have done in a sort of portfolio review situation and base their work perceptions on what they accomplished” (personal communication, February 1, 2012).

The immediacy of the tool is a concept that Goldsmith commented on during the interviews. Goldsmith stated, “I think in today’s world it’s going to be the immediate tools. Of course now they are doing experiments with tweeting during performances. Maybe it would be as much as the responses are more accurate and more likely. So writing an evaluation tool that is more immediate and easy that the audience can respond to” (personal communication, February 10, 2012).

Discussions of the possible evaluation tools demonstrate the quality and purpose of evaluations that the participants seek. For instance, the evaluation could be program specific or could be conducted immediately. Although there could be barriers to accessing these tools, arts industry professionals can alter or amend their current tools to reflect these changes.

Data is an important element to program sustainability. In order to gain this data evaluation tools must be implemented. Arts industry professionals competently use tools
to appropriately evaluate their programs. These tools expose the arts industry professional’s perspective on the purpose of evaluation. For instance, it could be to measure the growth of a program participant over time, customer satisfaction, or the popularity of a program. In conclusion, the identification of current and possible evaluation tools highlight capable knowledge of the evaluation. The next step is to acknowledge the purpose of the tools.

**Purpose for Evaluation**

Arts industry professionals have many purposes for evaluations that are associated with specific approaches. These approaches reflected in my findings are management oriented evaluation approaches and objective oriented evaluation approaches. How the results reflect the impact of the program is another purpose for the evaluation. Through investigation of different approaches the purposes for the evaluations became clear and as well as the impact of the programs.

**Management-Oriented Evaluation Approaches**

One of the goals of the evaluation is to gather data to present to current and future funders. This data is the key to secure this funding. This targets some of the elements of management oriented evaluation. Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Warren define management oriented evaluation as “the central concern is on identifying and meeting the informational needs of managerial decision makers” (67). The concept of conducting evaluation solely for collecting data for funding purposes limits the possibilities of evaluation and the program.
Firstly, some arts professionals identified the need to use the results of the evaluation to gain funds and to influence funding agencies. Willis explains how she uses the results of FACE.

“We use the results to write grants and to encourage people to participate. Then as a form of education to make people aware of what it is that we have been presenting. Whether they have a need to have as much if not more of what is we have done” (personal communication, March 26, 2012).

Burley stated a similar path for the results of the program evaluations for the Phoenix Theatre for Children. Burely stated “All of those go to our grant manager Judy. She uses the results. The pre and post test, the teacher comments and uses that information for grant purposes… It helps us evaluate ourselves and provide information for funders to use to get them excited about our program” (personal communication, February 1, 2012).

The relationship between future programming and the results of the evaluation are highlighted by Jackmon, Camp, and Goldsmith. Jackmon explains how undesirable results could cause a reduction in funding even if the program is not the cause for the result.

“They bring all of the pre tests together and find the certain amount of percentage out of the 33 questions that is positive and negative. Then they assess them analyze them against the post tests and compare. After the course of 3 months which is usually what they are trying to do. To see if those test scores improve. Then if they do improve I believe we do not get extra funding. We just keep the same amount funding that we have. If they do go down by 15 to 20% then we lose our funding that can significantly affect short stop as far as staffing goes and the caliber of programs we are able to offer. It will ultimately result in Short Stop being shut down… The problem with the structure of it. It does not. The outcomes are used to provide funding to short stop. If the outcome for the student evaluations is low. Then short stop in turn loses money. It may not be an exact correlation. Sometimes these students have other things going on in their lives that short stop can’t help or Directions for Youth and family can not help. It relates it by providing funding and not necessarily sure” (personal communication, February 1, 2012).

This also highlights how the context of the results is important to understand the impact
of the program. Camp echoes some of Jackmon’s sentiments.

“The outcomes and the things we track relate back to dollars... The funders see as public good or public value how their mission aligns with what they believe in and what we are producing so there is physical visual representation of their mission in place at play. It was good enough to or met what their needs were... plugs that into demographic information, plugs that into funding information to fit or to show that yes we are making improvements we are making strides although it may be miniscule to whatever” (personal communication, February 1, 2012).

Management-oriented evaluation approach creates a system that focuses on the qualification or characteristics the funding agencies deem important. Although funding agencies attempt to create opportunities with regard to community needs, the needs of the community and the funding agency’s perceived needs do not always match. It is difficult for arts organizations to meet the needs of their stakeholders if they are funded to concentrate on other needs. It is a negative cycle that focuses on evaluations for funding purposes. Although arts programs do receive funding, the arts organizations may not do effective programming that meets the needs of their stakeholders. If the funding agencies do not meet the needs of the community, they can be held accountable.

Objective-Oriented Evaluation Approaches

Measuring program effectiveness is another purpose for evaluation. There are objectives that each program strives to achieve. Through the use of evaluation tools arts industry professionals determine if the program objectives are met. Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Warren explain this as “the focus is on specifying goals and objectives and determining the extent to which they have been attained” (68). Program effectiveness is linked to the organization’s mission. Organizations create programs that reflect their
mission. Objectives can reflect program sustainability and effectiveness. The link between recognizing the organization mission and program objectives help measure program effectiveness. Ultimately, an important element of program evaluation occurs at the program design stage.

Willis highlighted the relationship between evaluation tools and program objectives. “How it affects you emotionally. The value of it in terms of does it make a difference in how you perceive the arts. We also evaluate them in terms of their experiences with the arts” (personal communication, March 26, 2012).

The Columbus Museum of Art staff also identified the achievement of predetermined program outcomes as a means for evaluations. I interpret their use of the word outcomes to be interchangeable with objectives because of the following statement that refers to “what other things are they doing.” They explained “That how we set up the spaces. We are currently working on another evaluation, a yearlong evaluation. Looking at the different experiences we provide, exhibitions and gallery spaces. And if they are achieving the outcomes we established. If not, what other things are they doing? We are open to finding out things through this evaluation” (personal communication, April 9, 2012).

Program content is linked to the achievement of objectives. The ability to understand specific concepts within the content can inform future programming. Thomas Eads, Burley and Guion acknowledged this idea. Firstly Thomas Eads highlighted specific skills when she explained “Our evaluation tools are designed to test whether the
students absorbed the curriculum being taught—whether a state standard, performance skills, or interest in a new subject area…” (personal communication, March 6, 2012).

Next, Guion echoed that content analysis is a means to understanding results. “I think we use content analysis… I think that is how we analyze the results. And we use that to inform future programming” (personal communication, April 3, 2012). Burley reiterated Guion’s idea that objective-oriented evaluation impacts future programming. She explained “It helps us as teachers as in what can I improve on the next time I do this programming. It serves for us to see I could work on this. Or when I do this I might change this way that I teach” (personal communication, February 1, 2012).

Ultimately, the arts industry professionals acknowledged the relationship between objective achievement and future programming. Unfortunately, these findings do not reflect what program objectives are met, and they do not reflect the values of the stakeholders. The objectives of the program can reflect the desired impact to the stakeholders.

Impact

After meeting the needs for funders and understanding effectiveness of the program another purpose for evaluation is to measure the impact of the program to its stakeholders. The interview participants highlighted a variety of outcomes their evaluation tools measure. For instance, there is assessment of increased confidence or increased interest in a specific subject. The impacts of the programs are acknowledged through evaluation and can reflect public value.
Jackmon, Thomas Eads and Burley detailed social, emotional and academic impacts their tools evaluated. Jackmon highlighted some social measurements. Jackmon explained, “They are supposed to assess if these kids are improving in bullying and making friendships, and obeying rules. It does not have much to do with the arts itself. It has a lot to do with being there will help cause them to become more socialable friendly well rounded children” (personal communication, February 28, 2012). This is an explicit connection to public value.

Thomas Eads continued to highlight emotional impacts of the program.

“…This can be through written response, higher test scores and more confident participation in class, and/or the student using skills on their own without the educator’s prompt. Students may also be inspired to create their own art, beyond the length of the program, or participate in related extra-curricular activities” (personal communication, March 6, 2012).

Burley built on the idea of impact when she explained the possibility of increasing interest in academic subjects. Burley stated, “…. The question with content as well as interest. Are you interested? Have you gained interest in this subject? Using science and drama has that helped you to understand the concept” (personal communication, February 1, 2012)?

In conclusion, the purposes for evaluation reflected in my research were to gather data for funding purposes, identify objectives and management achievement, and to detect impact. The management-oriented and objective-oriented evaluation approach do not explicitly relate to Ohio’s definition of public value. Yet, the impacts the arts industry professionals were using their tools to measure directly relate to public value through the identification of social, private and educational benefits.
**Definition**

Although the Ohio Arts Council has a perspective on public value, arts organizations are not necessarily using the same one. There are implications and inferences on the purpose and impact of the programs. Public value is important to highlight because it reflects program impact. The idea that an arts program can create benefits to the greater society is difficult to define and explain clearly because of the variety of possible benefits. The definition of public value differs from participant to participant. Public value encompasses a variety of nuanced themes and ideas that each person highlights unique aspects.

**Implications**

The participants in this research had a variety of perspectives on public value. During the interviews the participants highlighted concepts about community, benefit, and impact. The participants connected ideas on public perception to assessment and value to relevance. Based on the interviews there were many concepts and ideas that implied public value without giving examples.

The industry professionals focused on the impact their arts programs have on their community. Chaney Jones highlighted the concept of giving back to the community. She explained, “I think that my definition of public value has to do with giving back or providing something that will benefit the community at large” (personal communication, January 30, 2012). Willis connected the idea of community and assessment. Willis stated, “I think public value is the assessment by the public or the community as to what the value is of what you are doing. I pulled those two words out. Value meaning
assessment and public meaning open for everyone” (personal communication, March 26, 2012).

The following arts industry professionals echoed a similar sentiment that the arts programs do something of worth to the community. Thomas Eads stated, “When something has public value, it has relevance, and the surrounding community is willing to offer continued support to maintain that relevance” (personal communication, March 6, 2012). Burley highlighted the need for the community to support the arts program in order for it to have merit. Burley explained, “What the public is interested in what matters to them. Very generally speaking Public value is what the public wants and needs” (personal communication, February 1, 2012). Auseon adds to the concept of public value when he states that it must improve the community. “I would say something that enriches the community through opportunities to express and respond and something that incorporates local cultural artistry and gets people to be in community and be together” (personal communication, January 30, 2012).

Staff at the Columbus Museum of Art continued to construct their perspective on public value.

A “Our public value is that our community can acknowledge and recognize that that is something we accomplished. Also value that role in our community” (personal communication, April 9, 2012).

B “It maybe less to do with the artwork and the experience that they are having here at the museum. If they value that experience with the people they are with or if we create a contact or the environment to have that wonderful experience then it has been successful” (personal communication, April 9, 2012).

C “Public value For me…. it is not a strict definition…. I think it is really important that we offer an experience or a service that people outside of the museum need. Versus maybe how it has happened in the past where we provided
services for grants for what we need internally. Outside of the museum community that truly benefits from.” (personal communication, April 9, 2012)

Communities are made up of individuals with different perspectives. Camp illustrated the process for coming to a consensus on public value.

“Here is where it gets tricky because the public has different value systems. So what is valuable to one person may not be valuable to another… Then through surveys and through interviews you will find out a consensus of what is specific to communities. Whereas here the value may be placed on the academic piece versus learning a technique versus the more hands on type of learning. I would say it depends on location specifics. But public value would be the over all consensus of what is relevant what is keeping with the problems or success of a particular community” (personal communication, February 1, 2012).

Ultimately, the arts industry professionals had diverse points of view of public value. The participants connected their definition of public value to an element within definition established by Gifts of the Muse without being explicit. I interpret the idea of benefit from Gifts of the Muse to be synonymous with the terms like enrichment and relevance to the community.

**Explicit Examples**

During the interviews participants gave specific examples to express their definition of public value. The Gifts of the Muse explains the “arts produce benefits—economic growth, education, and pro-social behavior—that all Americans (not just those involved in the arts) recognize as being of value” (1). I related the arts industry professionals’ examples to the Gifts of the Muse definition because the Ohio Arts Council references the work in its description to the concept.

Burley connected the idea of evaluation to measuring potential educational benefits.
“So for giving the teachers pre and post tests. What do you expect? Within that this is something that could be strengthened within the evaluation process. What are the parents of the child participating what do they expect out of this program. That could be tied into it. This is something that have not done a lot of evaluation but, what the parents expect or maybe there are things that ties in with their homework assignments read the script with your child x amount of minutes a night. So that it goes beyond the classroom. So that the parents are more engaged” (personal communication, February 1, 2012)

Goldsmith continued Burley’s idea of the educational benefit of arts programs when he mentioned research studies. Goldsmith explained, “That’s a very positive statement. There is theatre. There are studies that show that a child that participates in theatre does better in school and does better categorically across scores. We believe that is because it involves a lot of mental exercises that stimulate the brain” (personal communication, February 10, 2012). Thomas Eads explained the educational purpose of arts programs in relation to relevance. Thomas Eads stated “I believe public value is relevance. Does the art form serve an educational purpose? Does it serve the community? Does it reach the goals of the proposed project ideas” (personal communication, March 6, 2012)?

Camp also stated the educational impact of arts programs. He added relevance to his claims by citing documentation and teacher perspectives.

“One of the things that I do is keep copies of credit cards [inaudible] of .report cards. When kids bring their report cards in [inaudible] we can keep it in their folders and we can look and see physical evidence from the school. You know is there improvement being made is it due to this program? I don’t know? Some of the comments I have received from the teachers. “What are you guys doing over there? Whatever it is it’s working!” So you know it’s that kinds of stuff that keeps it going.”

Jackmon echoed the concept from previous statements about the educational impacts of arts programs. She also illustrated social benefits.

“One of the things that I do is keep copies of credit cards [inaudible] of .report cards. When kids bring their report cards in [inaudible] we can keep it in their folders and we can look and see physical evidence from the school. You know is there improvement being made is it due to this program? I don’t know? Some of the comments I have received from the teachers. “What are you guys doing over there? Whatever it is it’s working!” So you know it’s that kinds of stuff that keeps it going.”

Jackmon echoed the concept from previous statements about the educational impacts of arts programs. She also illustrated social benefits.

“It would be the benefits of what a community has to offer their co partners in the community. Whether that is socially with providing outlets for kids and families
to get together outside of their work or their school that there is something or an outlet for them to go to... I think it directly relates by assessing how the kids get along with their family members and friends socially. As far as educationally, it asks a few questions about if it is helping improve their grades. If they get their homework done.

Guion supported his definition of public value with other examples. Guion explained, “I guess public value is the impact of creative impulse. How the arts communicate to a broader constituency that could be economically, aesthetically from an educational angle…”

Ultimately, the arts industry professionals I interviewed did not have a collective definition of public value. The participants gave specific examples to clarify their definitions of public value. They gave examples of educational and social benefits that relate to the Ohio Arts Council’s definition of public value. Although the arts industry professionals were aware of the concept of public value, there were few explicit connections of the concept to evaluation tools.

**Origins of Definition**

It is important to recognize the origin of the arts industry professionals’ definition of public value. The source of their definition could impact the relationship to evaluation tools. I also wanted to determine if there was a connection to consensus in definition to a consensus in source. Some participants based their definition of public value on their own experiences or from the Ohio Arts Council.

Thomas Eads stated her definition of public value was derived from her perspective on the concept.
“To me, the arts should not exclude, but include. They should serve the purpose of transforming or in some way affecting the lives of its audience. If a project has public value, it has relevance, it serves its community, it includes. I get this definition from the most basic understanding of the words—public: for the community/ value: worth, relevance, importance” (personal communication, March 6, 2012).

Auseon continued to develop his insights on public value based on his experience working in the arts. He explained, “It is a personal take on why I choose to work in the arts. Why I think they are important. What I aim for as far as to create things. What are things that I think are important. I think that most communities find those things important as well. I try to maintain and continue those ideals. That is where I come up with my own take on it” (personal communication, January 30, 2012). Camp identified that the definition of public value could change based on the community. Camp “And again I think it comes from my experience in different places I’ve been. For instance, there was a different system in place at Irving Crest then there was in Granville. Two very distinct communities.” (personal communication, February 1, 2012).

The staff at the Columbus Museum of Art explained how their perspective on public value is related to outcomes.

“Within the institution there is not set definition. For those of us you’re talking to, we are in the Education Department. That should be clarified. I think we are most aware of impact and setting outcomes through our experiences, experiences programmatically and within the institution itself. I think that public value is taking that impact those outcomes and saying if we are doing these our public value should align directly to those” (personal communication, April 9, 2012).

Guion specifically mentioned funding agencies as references for his perspective on public value “Well, I think that we garnered the definition of public value through our stakeholders. Who would be the Ohio Arts Council, the National Endowment for the Arts
and the Greater Columbus Arts Council. I think we used their ideas as sort of a model for us” (personal communication, April 3, 2012).

During the interview process there were a variety of perspectives on public value. Some participants in this research created their own definitions of public value. Other arts industry professionals based their definitions on publications. The disparity of definition was caused by the variety of sources for the definition.

**Document Analysis**

During interviews arts industry professionals mentioned evaluations tools they currently use. The relationship between the tools and public value was established using the Gifts of the Muse Framework for Understanding the Benefits of the Arts. I have included examples from evaluation tools, plans and surveys in order to connect the concepts. The documents are from the King Arts Complex Afterschool Arts Institute, Directions for Youth and Families, Phoenix Children’s Theatre, Columbus Museum of Art, and Measurement Resource Company. Each organization presented a document that contains references to public value.

Firstly, the King Arts Complex wanted to know how the Afterschool Arts Institute impacted the participants’ behavior and communication skills. In the parent and teacher survey, the King Arts Complex used a likert scale to determine if the program had a positive effect on the child’s behavior and communication skills. The parent survey went on to reveal the effect the program had on the child’s self esteem. These tools are measuring outcomes that represent private and intrinsic benefits of the program based on the Framework for Understanding the Benefits of the Arts.
Secondly, Short Stop under the administration of Directions for Youth and Families uses a pre and post tests to measure the success of its programs. Using a likert scale, the survey inquires about the participant’s self-esteem, problem solving skills, and emotion control. The purpose of this evaluation tool is to determine how the program impacts their participants over time. Self-esteem, problem-solving skills, and emotion control are concepts that directly relate to intrinsic benefits.

Thirdly, the Phoenix Children’s Theatre implements a pre and post test like Short Stop. The difference between the two evaluation tools is that the Phoenix Children’s Theatre focuses on obtaining knowledge in academic subjects. The evaluation for their Drama in Schools program uses a fill in the blank model to determine whether the children learned about the scientific method. This too exemplifies the instrumental benefits that the program is trying to measure.

Fourthly, the Columbus Museum of Art provided documentation for their programs that directly connected outcomes to public value. For instance, the Artful Reading Evaluation Report highlighted measures for critical thinking. Specifically “flexible thinking about multiple possibilities; seeing things from different perspectives, revising thinking.” The CMA also recognizes specific outcomes on the planning exhibition form like to work together. Ultimately, these outcomes reflect instrumental benefits that can be applied in an educational and social setting.

Lastly, Measurement Resources Company created an evaluation plan that highlighted the economic impact of a program. Chaney Jones measures the economic effect of the program by tracking the total amount of musicians paid. It demonstrates the
how the arts program contributes to economic development in Ohio. The economic outcome of the program is directly linked to public benefits instrumental benefits.

Ultimately, sample evaluation tools provided direct examples on the arts industry professionals’ perspective on the relationship between the tools and public value. Document analysis revealed a direct link between the results of the tools and the Ohio Arts Council’s definition of public value.

Conclusion

The interviews answered my research question, which is what tools are used to evaluate arts programming in Ohio and how do they relate to Ohio’s definition of public value? Firstly, there are a variety of tools ranging from pre and post tests to focus groups that Ohio arts professionals competently use to best evaluate their programs. Secondly, it was necessary to determine the arts professionals’ definition of public value before I could relate the tools to the concept. The Ohio Arts Council refers to many publications like Gifts of the Muse to determine its definition of public value. I decided to use the Gifts of the Muse framework to label the interview responses. All arts industry professionals could identify examples of public value within their programs. There were a variety of responses from acknowledging the needs of the public to identifying benefits to the community. Most of the participants did not refer to the works of the Rand Corporation or Brown to explain their position on public value like the Ohio Arts Council. They could acknowledge ideas and themes from the concept. Lastly, through document analysis the concept of public value was clearer. Some arts program asked questions that referred to public benefits. For instance, Chaney Jones created an evaluation plan that refers to
economic impact. Ultimately, the tools relate to Ohio’s definition to public value by specifically asking for responses that are linked to benefits to society.
Chapter 5: Conclusion

With this body of work, I feel as if I have added to the perspective on the relationship of evaluations tools and public value. I have found that there is no explicit connection between the two in the literature. The connection must be inferred. Arts industry professionals identified a variety of evaluation tools, provided their definition of public value, and explained the relationship between their evaluation tools and public value. Based on interviews with arts industry professionals, there is no consensus on the definition of public value. The arts industry professionals revealed a variety of responses about the benefits their program provide the community. There is an obvious connection between the results of the evaluation tools and public value. This research exposes the cyclical nature of arts program detecting outcomes through evaluation tools. Then arts professionals relate the outcomes to public value. Once public value is identified, programs can prove their impact to funders. Ultimately, funders will continue to support the arts program and the cycle will begin again.

I recognize that my findings present a viewpoint of arts professionals in the Columbus area, not Ohio. If I continue with this research there are questions I can ask to gain a deeper perspective. For instance, why did that arts professional select a specific evaluation tool? This investigation could highlight the source of the arts professional’s evaluation knowledge. The identification of the source of knowledge could clarify the arts professionals’ perspective on the evaluation’s possible connection to public value. I would also be more specific questions about their programs. Another question that I could ask is what were the objectives of the arts
program? Having a richer understanding of the program objectives could provide insights to possible program impacts.

Given my findings the program evaluation tools revealed public value. There should be a more explicit conversation as to why they selected specific evaluation tools. Arts industry professionals can use this information to become more aware of the language they can use to describe program impacts. This knowledge could impact possible funding opportunities.

My next steps are to focus on the creation and application of evaluation tools. My current investigation concentrates on past literature and interviews which yielded similar results. The brief analysis of the evaluation tools illuminated the relationship of public value and evaluation. More investigation and focus on the evaluation tools could bring greater awareness to this topic and better answer the research question.
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Date 1/25/12
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Dear Participant

You are invited to participate in a research project as part of a Master’s thesis conducted by Tiffany Lewis from The Ohio State University’s Arts Policy and Administration program. The purpose of this research is to determine the evaluation tools that arts industry professional in Ohio use and how they relate to public value.

This research seeks to use literature and interviews with industry professionals to identify evaluation tools for arts programs and their relationship to public value. Arts program assessment is important because it links an arts experience to specific outcomes that benefit the community. There are different types of assessment tools and a variety of arts programs in Ohio. The outcomes of these assessment tools reflect social, educational, and economic benefits. These benefits reveal public value. The Ohio Arts Council’s definition of public value reflects the statewide perspective corresponding to my understanding of the idea. The literature defines quality and excellence in regards to arts programs. These articles strive to give examples of planning for arts programs and its connection to public value. Lastly, the literature review seeks to define public value for the state of Ohio. Currently, the literature lacks a clear understanding of specific assessment tools that are used to inform the public value.

This research will identify the necessary methods of evaluation in these troubling economic times to validate arts programs. Public value reflects how and why these arts programs are important. For instance, creativity is a characteristic that employers seek, yet arts programs that foster creativity are cut. Hopefully, evaluation tools can help validate the arts.

You were selected to participate in this study because of your experience and expertise as <Position> at <Location>. If you decide to participate in this research project, you will be asked to provide relevant organizational materials and participate in a semi-structured interview during the first months of 2012. Interviews will take place at your convenience, in person, via Skype internet phone or via email and take approximately 15 to 20 minutes. If you wish, interview questions will be provided beforehand for your consideration. In addition to taking handwritten notes, with your permission, I will use an audio recorder for transcription and validation purposes. You may also be asked to provide follow-up information through phone calls or email.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (816)914-6776 or Tiffany.Lewis3@gmail.com, or Dr. Margaret J. Wyszomirski at wyszomirski.1@osu.edu. For
questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complains with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact. Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at (800) 678-6251.

Thank you in advance for your interest and consideration. I will contact you shortly to speak about your potential involvement in this study.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (816)914-6776 or Tiffany.Lewis3@gmail.com, or Dr. Margaret J. Wyszomirski at wyszomirski.1@osu.edu. For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complains with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact. Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at (800) 678-6251. Please read and initial each of the following statements to indicate you consent:

___ I consent to use of audio recording and note taking during my interview.
___ I consent to my identification as a participant in this study.
___ I consent to the potential use of quotations from the interview.
___ I consent to the use of information I provide regarding the organization with which I am associated.
___ I wish to have the opportunity to review and possible revise my comments and the information that I provide prior to those data appearing in the final revision of any publications that my result from this study.

Your signature indicates that you have read and understand the information provided above, that you willingly agree to participate, that you may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty, that you have received a copy of this form, and that you are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies. You have been given a copy of this letter to keep.

Print Name:____________________________________________________________________
Signature:_________________________________________________________________________ Date:_______

Thank you for your interest and participation in this study.

Sincerely,

Tiffany Lewis
Arts Program Evaluation and Public Value

Tiffany Lewis
The Ohio State University
Arts Policy and Administration Program

Objective
Research Question

What tools are used to assess arts programming in Ohio and how do they relate Ohio’s definition of public value?

The purpose of this research is to determine the evaluation tools that arts educators in Ohio use and how they relate to public value. Through a literature review, I will identify evaluation tools that are used to evaluate arts programs in the United States. My objective is to identify different tools that arts educators use to assess their programs. Additionally, through interviews with Ohio arts educators, I will connect the outcomes of the evaluation tools to public value.

Background and Rationale

This research seeks to use literature and interviews with industry professionals to identify evaluation tools for arts programs and their relationship to public value. Arts program assessment is important because it links an arts experience to specific outcomes that benefit the community. There are different types of assessment tools and a variety of arts programs in Ohio. The outcomes of these assessment tools reflect social, educational, and economic benefits. These benefits reveal public value. The Ohio Arts Council’s definition of public value reflects the statewide perspective corresponding to my understanding of the idea. The literature defines quality and excellence in regards to arts programs. These articles strive to give examples of planning for arts programs and its connection to public value. Lastly, the literature review seeks to define public value for the state of Ohio. Currently, the literature lacks a clear understanding of specific assessment tools that are used to inform the public value.

This research will identify the necessary methods of evaluation in these troubling economic times to validate arts programs. Public value reflects how and why these arts programs are important. For instance, creativity is a characteristic that employers seek, yet arts programs that foster creativity are cut. Hopefully, evaluation tools can help validate the arts.
Program Evaluation by Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Worthen define formative and summative evaluation and give examples of methods for these specific evaluation methods. The authors explain that formative evaluation provides information on program improvement (16). This information is usually collected through surveys, interviews, and focus groups (16). The next evaluation method is summative evaluation. According to the authors it is “concerned with providing information to serve decisions or assist in making judgments about program adoption, continuation, and expansion” (17). The publication successfully determines difference between formative and summative evaluation through a simple analogy. “When the cook tastes the soup, that’s formative evaluation; when the guest tastes it, that’s summative evaluation” (qtd in Scriven 19). These methods are can be used to validate arts programs.

State Arts Agencies are the leaders and supporters for arts within their designated state. Thus, Ohio Arts Council, Ohio’s State Arts Agency, influences the state perspective on public value. The Ohio Arts Council, OAC, cites the following publication as it define the state’s position on this idea.

Creating the Public Value through State Arts Agencies by Mark H. Moore and Gaylen Williams Moore highlights conversations between arts communities and state arts agencies about the public value of arts stemming from State Arts Partnerships for Cultural Participation (START) initiative. This publication correlates to the research question because it identifies one element of Ohio’s perspective on public value and is one of the leading publications that define the benefits the arts cause.

Quality is used to define arts programs and the outcomes of these programs. The Qualities of Quality Understanding Excellence in Arts Education a publication commissioned by the Wallace Foundation explains quality. It is important to understand the definition of quality in order to connect program outcomes to public value. “The scope of the research is important because of the variety of locations, interviewees, and art forms. The integration of perspectives from theorists and practitioners provide a holistic view of quality arts programming. The publication explains“…most educators we interviewed wanted young people to have experience with quality – with excellent materials, outstanding works of art, passionate and accomplished artist-teachers modeling their artistic processes – and experiences of quality – powerful group interactions and ensemble work, performances that make them feel proud, rewarding practice sessions, technical excellence, and successful expressivity.”(III)
This literature review describes quality, evaluation methods, evaluation critiques, and standards. Unfortunately, it does not distinctly draw conclusions between public value and evaluation. The literature defines public value. It also defines evaluation but does not connect the two. The connection must be inferred. Unfortunately, this lack causes insufficient evaluation processes because they do not identify the ultimate outcomes. All of the evaluation methods can be applied to in school or out of school programs. The articles provide information, but do not completely address my research question. More case studies that highlight the connection to public value would be beneficial. Interviews with arts educators about the impacts of their arts programs and methods of evaluation could emphasize the connection between evaluation and public value. This research seeks to make the connection between public value and arts evaluation for arts professionals in order to influence more quality programs.

Procedure

Research Design

The research will use qualitative methods. I will use literature on arts program evaluation to identify evaluation tools and explain public value. Drawing from professional sources will highlight the relationship between the evaluation tools and public value.

Sample

Many of my data sources are public information found via the internet or public documents that have been published in journals, or by arts agencies. I will conduct interviews to gain an understanding of the relationship between evaluation tools and public value. I have identified 5 potential interviewees that are arts industry professionals. They include the arts educators and arts administrators who influence arts program evaluation. I plan to have structured questions for the interviewees.

Questions:

1. What tools do you use to evaluate your arts programs (after-school, artist-in – residency programs etc)?
2. What evaluation tools would you like arts programs to use to relate the outcomes to public value?
3. What is your definition of public value?
4. How did you determine your definition of public value?
5. How does the structure of your evaluation tools relate its outcomes to public value?
6. If the outcomes of your arts programs do not relate to public value, how could they?

**Detailed Study Procedures**

I will collect data through structured interviews. Each interview will be conducted in person and recorded for transcription and validation purposes. These procedures will identify the process for evaluation.

**Internal Validity**

To avoid bias and ensure validity the researcher will use an extensive literature review and interviews. Recordings and transcriptions of the interviews will allow research participants to confirm the accuracy of his or her representation.
Arts Program Evaluation and Public Value

Tiffany Lewis
The Ohio State University
Arts Policy and Administration Program

You are invited to participate in a research project as part of a Master’s thesis conducted by Tiffany Lewis from The Ohio State University’s Arts Policy and Administration program. The purpose of this research is to determine the evaluation tools that arts educators in Ohio use and how they relate to public value.

This research seeks to use literature and interviews with industry professionals to identify evaluation tools for arts programs and their relationship to public value. Arts program assessment is important because it links an arts experience to specific outcomes that benefit the community. There are different types of assessment tools and a variety of arts programs in Ohio. The outcomes of these assessment tools reflect social, educational, and economic benefits. These benefits reveal public value. The Ohio Arts Council’s definition of public value reflects the statewide perspective corresponding to my understanding of the idea. The literature defines quality and excellence in regards to arts programs. These articles strive to give examples of planning for arts programs and its connection to public value. Lastly, the literature review seeks to define public value for the state of Ohio. Currently, the literature lacks a clear understanding of specific assessment tools that are used to inform the public value.

This research will identify the necessary methods of evaluation in these troubling economic times to validate arts programs. Public value reflects how and why these arts programs are important. For instance, creativity is a characteristic that employers seek, yet arts programs that foster creativity are cut. Hopefully, evaluation tools can help validate the arts.

You were selected to participate in this study because of your experience and expertise in the area of <DEPARTMENT> at <ARTS ORGANIZATION>, which evaluates your arts programs. If you decide to participate in this research project, you will be asked to provide relevant organizational materials and participate in a semi-structured interview during the first months of 2012. Interviews will take place at your convenience, in person, via Skype internet phone or via email and will last approximately 15 to 20 minutes. If you wish, interview questions will be provided beforehand for your consideration. In addition to taking handwritten notes, with your permission, I will use an audio recorder for transcription and validation purposes. You may also be asked to provide follow-up information through phone calls or email.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (816)914-6776 or Tiffany.Lewis3@gmail.com, or Dr. Margaret J. Wyszomirski at wyszomirski.1@osu.edu. For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at (800) 678-6251.

Thank you in advance for your interest and consideration. I will contact you shortly to speak about your potential involvement in this study.
Sincerely,

Tiffany Lewis
Appendix B

Highland Elementary Pre-test

CATCO-Phoenix Theatre

Name: ___________________

Teacher: ___________________

Theatre and Writing Vocabulary

Read each question carefully. Choose the best answer to the questions below.

1. The ANTAGONIST saved the day. Antagonist means:

   A) hero  B) bad guy  C) wizard

2. The PROTAGONIST finally solved the problem. Protagonist means:

   A) hero  B) bad guy  C) wizard
3. A ___________ is when two characters have a problem.

A) conflict  B) agriculture  C) plot

4. There are four types of conflict in literature. The four types of conflict are:

A) person vs. person, person vs. unicorn, person vs. pig, person vs. society
B) person vs. person, person vs. self, person vs. nature, person vs. society
C) person vs. person, person vs. ninja, person vs. wolf, person vs. nature

5. A well written story includes an introduction, conflict, solution, and __________.

A) plot  B) narrative  C) resolution

6. A narrative is a story told based on true events or the imagination. Well written narratives have:

A) a clear beginning, middle, and end
B) front, center, and back
C) biography, autobiography, and fiction

7. What is a play?

A) a stage representation of an action or story
B) a game
C) a baseball game

8. What are the five tools of the actor?

A) Imagination, costumes, creativity, dance, singing
B) Imagination, captivity, collections, dance, opera
C) Imagination, concentration, cooperation, body, and voice

9. How do you think theatre can connect to science?

10. What do you want to learn from this program?

Science Vocabulary Section

Use the terms below to complete the sentences.

Inquiry  Experiment
Infer  Scientific Method

11. The steps of the ________________ are used to plan and conduct a scientific study.

12. When you ________________, you draw conclusions about something by using data you have gathered and things you already know.

13. When someone asks a question or closely studies something, he or she makes and
14. A test done to find out whether a hypothesis is correct is an

___________________.

___________________.

AAI TEACHER SURVEY

Teacher________________________

Participant________________________

*Please do not answer a question if you can not reach a decision

1. The aAi had a positive affect on the child’s behavior during class
   a.) Strongly Agree b.) Agree somewhat c.) Disagree somewhat d.) Strongly Disagree e.) No opinion

2. The aAi increased the child’s ability to analyze personal choices
   a.) Strongly Agree b.) Agree somewhat c.) Disagree somewhat d.) Strongly Disagree e.) No opinion

3. The aAi had a positive effect on the child’s ability to evaluate community based problem solving
   a.) Strongly Agree b.) Agree somewhat c.) Disagree somewhat d.) Strongly Disagree e.) No opinion

4. The aAi increased the child’s ability to analyze global challenges and process solutions
   a.) Strongly Agree b.) Agree somewhat c.) Disagree somewhat d.) Strongly Disagree e.) No opinion

5. The aAi increased the child’s understanding of self, and developed artistic confidence
   a.) Strongly Agree b.) Agree somewhat c.) Disagree somewhat d.) Strongly Disagree e.) No opinion

6. The aAi increased the child’s understanding to verbalize thoughts and feelings to others
   a.) Strongly Agree b.) Agree somewhat c.) Disagree somewhat d.) Strongly Disagree e.) No opinion

7. The aAi increased the child’s ability to identify artists, art disciplines, and art styles
   a.) Strongly Agree b.) Agree somewhat c.) Disagree somewhat d.) Strongly Disagree e.) No opinion

8. The aAi increased the child’s technical ability for the chosen art discipline
   a.) Strongly Agree b.) Agree somewhat c.) Disagree somewhat d.) Strongly Disagree e.) No opinion

Please add additional comments
AAI Parent Survey

Parent Name__________________________

Participant Name_______________________

Please do not answer a question if you can not reach a decision

1. The aAi had a positive effect on your child’s behavior at home or at school.
   a.) Strongly Agree b.) Agree somewhat c.) Disagree somewhat d.) Strongly Disagree e.) No opinion

2. The aAi had a positive effect on your child’s self esteem.
   a.) Strongly Agree b.) Agree somewhat c.) Disagree somewhat d.) Strongly Disagree e.) No opinion

3. The aAi had a positive effect on your child’s communication skills.
   a.) Strongly Agree b.) Agree somewhat c.) Disagree somewhat d.) Strongly Disagree e.) No opinion

4. The aAi increased your child’s understanding of emotions and their physical expression.
   a.) Strongly Agree b.) Agree somewhat c.) Disagree somewhat d.) Strongly Disagree e.) No opinion

5. Your child increased their participation in sports.
   a.) Strongly Agree b.) Agree somewhat c.) Disagree somewhat d.) Strongly Disagree e.) No opinion

Please add additional comments below
[Program] Measure 1: Economic impact of area musicians measured by total money paid to musicians

What is this? This is an overall [Program] Measure and it assesses the economic impact [Program] creates by utilizing and paying local industry related professionals. This measure tracks the number of musicians [Program] directly impacts and the financial impact of these programs. This measure is used to demonstrate how this program is contributing to the economic development of Central Ohio.

What is the 2011 goal? A 2011 goal is to meet or exceed 2009-2010 levels, which was $19,000 and 26 unique musicians.

How will it be measured? This will use number of artists used and the total payments found in Peachtree.

Action Item: 2011-2012 data will be examined.
Artful Reading Evaluation Report

Prepared by

Victor S. Yocco/Institute for Learning Innovation

The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the degree to which participation in the “ARTful Reading” program provides students with opportunities to use critical thinking skills (CTS) necessary not only for reading art but for everyday tasks as highly functional citizens. The following report contains the results of the evaluation study on ARTful Reading. As part of the overall program evaluation strategy the Columbus Museum of Art (CMA) entered into an agreement with Victor S. Yocco to provide evaluation of ARTful Reading.

ARTful Reading: CCS 2008-2009 is a multi-faceted program that includes a docent-led tour at the Columbus Museum of Art, a studio experience at Fort Hayes High School, and docent visits to the classroom. Teachers and students apply critical thinking skills to “read” authentic works of art and explore creativity to produce works of art. “Symbolism”, a key concept in the 2008-2009 5th grade curriculum, will be integrated in all aspects of the ARTful Reading program. This mandatory program reaches all (approximately 5000) CCS 5th grade students.

Stated goals and outcomes for the program are:

Program goals:

1. To promote visual literacy through the ODIP strategy (observe, describe, interpret, and prove)
2. To facilitate a creative studio experience that incorporates key concepts explored at the Columbus Museum of Art.
3. To foster awareness of and conversation about symbolism in art.
4. To provide exposure to authentic art in a positive and engaging art museum experience.

Program Assessment:

1. Students and teachers will demonstrate awareness and comprehension of the ODIP strategy through an individual writing response to an authentic work of art.
2. Students and teachers will participate in a studio experience where they create a metal quilt square that incorporates symbolism.
3. Students and teachers will be able to discuss symbols used in their artwork.
4. Students and teachers will rate the quality of their CMA experience by completing a feedback card.

Method

As part of ARTful Reading, while participating in a docent led tour, students are asked to use the ODIP process to read a work of art. The work of art is chosen by the docent, who asks the students to record their ODIP process on a note card they are given. Students are to be given ample time by the docents, who are available to answer questions, for completing this project.
Through conversations between the evaluator and CMA staff it was decided that a random sample of 100 note cards would be selected to be evaluated for the presence of CTS. The sample was selected from student responses that had been collected between November 2008 and April 2009, which is most of the period that the program took place. The note cards containing the student responses had been stored in groups of 5 to 10 based on the work of art read, date, and docent that had led the tour. No other information was collected from participants. One note card was pulled from every other group of cards until the desired sample size was obtained.

The note cards were analyzed using a rubric for assessing CTS (See Appendix A) created by Marianna Adams, Jessica Luke and others from the Institute for Learning Innovation as part of a research study at the Isabella Steward Gardner Museum (ISGM) and published in the Journal of Museum Education (Luke, Stein, Foutz, & Adams, 2007). After consultation with Jessica Luke, co-creator of the rubric, it was determined that this would be an appropriate use of the rubric.

In conversations between the evaluator and CMA staff it was decided it would be acceptable to use the rubric as a suitable tool to assess demonstrated CTS for the ARTful Reading program. The evaluator used the instructions from the scoring manual that was used for year two of the ISGM study. After coding the 100 note cards using the rubric, basic statistical analysis was conducted to determine the amount and type of CTS demonstrated by students participating in the program.

The rubric identifies two types of CTS; individual and synergistic. Individual CTS can be demonstrated by themselves and out of the context of surrounding sentences. Synergistic CTS must be accompanied by additional contextual information and occur in conjunction with other CTS. In accordance with the rubric, each note card was read four times. The note card was coded for individual CTS, synergistic CTS, depth of argument, and then once more to ensure accuracy. Only the evaluator was responsible for coding the note cards and therefore there was no need to check for inter-rater reliability. The check for accuracy was conducted by the evaluator to ensure the coding of the CTS was stable over time.

Results

Overall a total of 672 instances of CTS were identified and coded based on the standards of the rubric. This suggests an average of 6.72 CTS were demonstrated per student in this sample. The range of CTS identified in the sample was from 1 to 12. This suggests that some students used a number of CTS while reading art.

Results were also examined based on the types of CTS identified by the researchers in the Isabella Student Gardner Museum Study (See Table A).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTS Type</th>
<th>Total Occurrences</th>
<th>Mean per participant</th>
<th>% of total CTS (n=672)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observing 1.1</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing 1.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing 1.3</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing 1.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Labels 1.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreting 2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreting 2.2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreting 2.3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreting 2.4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating 3.1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating 3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associating 4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes or requests info 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparing 6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Thinking 7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A: Breakdown of CTS by type, total times the CTS occurred, the mean per participant, and the percent of total for each CTS.

Again, these results reflect a broad range and large use of CTS for student’s engaging in the Artful Reading program.

**Conclusions**

Overall, the data shows that students who participate in the ARTful Reading program at the Columbus Museum of Art have an opportunity to use critical thinking skills as they engage in the process of reading art. The data suggest that many students in the program are able to incorporate a wide variety of types and levels of critical thinking skills. As with other studies in which this CTS rubric has been used (Luke et al. 2007) the CTS that were most frequently coded were those of observation and interpretation.

Measurable results from this interpretation include:

- The CTS which fall under the “Observing” categories were the most frequent CTS observed (In line with the findings of Luke et al., 2007 of the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum school partnership program).
- There were occurrences of each type of CTS within the rubric found in this sample of students
- Most students demonstrated more than 1 CTS on their note card
- The average number of CTS observed was over 6 CTS per note card
- It is possible that there are large differences in how docents are conducting the program
• Artful Reading provides an opportunity for students to use CTS in relation to observing authentic works of art in an art museum
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# UW Performance Measurement Instruments

## 222 Youth Questionnaire

### CLIENT NAME____________________  CLIENT ID________  USE __ POST __

### WORKER____________________  GROUP CODE_______  DATE_____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very good at all</th>
<th>Only good on average</th>
<th>Not good at all</th>
<th>Useless or worse</th>
<th>Very bad at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I make friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I help other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I talk other stuff can be off.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I get along well with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Really</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. I usually have safe places to hang out.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have a number of friends that are interested in learning.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am able to get along with friends.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I usually try to stay out of trouble.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I know what to do that my friends think fun.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I choose to be around people who make good choices.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I can be successful in life.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I treat other people with respect.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I make progress in a positive manner.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I have many activities in my life that keep me busy.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am an active and healthy person.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I have good relationships with my peers.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I enjoy activities.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I am active.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. It is important for me to always do my best.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I work well as part of a team.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I try to control my anger.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I think I have done at least one activity.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I have a positive view of myself.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I understand that being kind leads to kindness.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I respect people in authority.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I understand that there are important lessons in life.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I respect people who have different beliefs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I respect parents who are not in authority.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I stand up for myself when I’m wrong.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I take part in activities that I enjoy.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recent score:**

- Positive: ___
- Negative: ___
- Neutral: ___
Columbus Museum of Art

Exhibition Planning Form

Exhibition Title:

Dates:

Organizing Institution:

Other venues/dates:

# of works :

Gallery Location:

Credit Line:

Sponsor Line:

Team Members:
Curator    Educator    Marketing    Registrar

Exhibition Catalogue:

☐ yes
☐ no
Unique audiences:

Partnerships:

Evaluation Needs:

Brief overview of exhibition:
Big Idea, Issues and Outcomes (BIO)

**Big Idea:** (What is a Big idea? It is one complete, noncompound active, clear sentence that identifies and limits the content of the exhibition.)

**Issues:** (Optional. What is an issue? Issues are contemporary political, cultural or social questions that are actively addressed in the exhibition. They are not didactic or historical)

**Outcomes:** (What will our visitors do, say, think, feel, wonder, or learn as a result of spending time in this exhibition)

- Visitors discuss, debate or talk about
- Visitors create
- Visitors work together to
- Visitors recognize different perspectives about
- Visitors are inspired/motivated to
- Visitors feel
- Visitors have a greater understanding of
- Visitors experiment or make
- Visitors have a positive attitude about
Visitors think critically about/question
Visitors are made aware of
Visitors observe/recognize

Visitors explore
Visitors connect/make connections
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Connectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Seating</td>
<td>□ Picture/photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Guide by Cell</td>
<td>□ Swing thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Print handout</td>
<td>□ Puzzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Label</td>
<td>□ Costume photo studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Join the Conversation Station</td>
<td>□ Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Guided Question</td>
<td>□ Books/reading materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 75 word text panel</td>
<td>□ Podcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Timeline</td>
<td>□ Guide by Cell scavenger hunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Map</td>
<td>□ Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Drawing activity</td>
<td>□ Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Building activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Connector ideas:

- Seating
- Guide by Cell
- Print handout
- Label
- Join the Conversation Station
- Guided Question
- 75 word text panel
- Timeline
- Map
- Drawing activity
- Building activity

- Picture/photo
- Swing thing
- Puzzle
- Costume photo studio
- Video
- Books/reading materials
- Podcast
- Guide by Cell scavenger hunt
- Music
- Programming
Exhibition Programs/Events: