

MINNESOTA CENTER FOR ARTS EDUCATION

Focus Group Needs Assessment Report:

Perceptions Related to Planning an Arts Resource Collection Services for Educators September 1991

Credits and Acknowledgements

This report is a product of the
Minnesota Center for Arts Education
which is solely responsible for its content.

The following people comprised a project planning team that worked on
the report:

Karon Sherarts, former Director, Resource Programs;
Nancy Engen-Wedin, Resource Programs Associate; and
Janet Parker, Special Project Assistant,
Minnesota Center for Arts Education

Margaret Hasse, Moderator, Consultant and
Principal Author of Report

Richard Krueger, Auditor and Consultant

Dr. Pamela Paulson, Director, Resource Programs, final editing
Minnesota Center for Arts Education

A number of individuals across the state of Minnesota contributed their
knowledge and ideas at focus group meetings held during the summer of
1990. They are listed in the appendix.

September 1991

For more information, contact:
Minnesota Center for Arts Education
6125 Olson Memorial Highway
Golden Valley, MN 55422
591-4700 or 800-657-3515

Resource Programs is the educational outreach branch of the Minnesota
Center for Arts Education. The Center is a statewide agency created by
the Minnesota Legislature in 1985 to improve arts education opportunities
for students and teachers throughout Minnesota.

INTRODUCTION

This report will be a useful planning tool for future Resource Program development. It represents the best thinking of Minnesota artist/educators on issues related to designing an Arts Resource Collection Service. The Board of Directors and administrative staff of the Minnesota Center for Arts Education congratulate all who participated in the focus groups and thank them for their creativity.

The primary mission of the Minnesota Center for Arts Education is to enhance arts education opportunities for all Minnesotans. Implicit in this mission is to develop programs based upon peoples' stated needs. This report provides information for a set of program options that can enrich arts education in our state.

Sincere thanks goes to the designers of the needs assessment and the staff who carefully did the documentation and reporting of the study. Collaborations such as these provide the foundation for good communication and strong arts programs.

Pamela N. Paulson, Ph. D.
Director, Resource Programs
Minnesota Center for Arts Education

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	III
BACKGROUND	1
RESEARCH AND REPORTING METHODS	3
SUMMARY OF RESULTS	7
CONCLUSIONS	10
APPENDICES	12
A. Mission of the Minnesota Center for Arts Education	
B. Information on Other Reports Cited	
C. Participants in Focus Group Meetings	
D. Questions Asked in Focus Group Meetings	
E. Audit of Focus Group Project	

BACKGROUND

The Minnesota Center for Arts Education (Center) was established by the Minnesota Legislature in 1985 to improve arts education opportunities for students and teachers statewide through a tuition-free residential arts high school and outreach programs. From the record of public hearings, Task Force meetings, and legislative testimony related to the creation of the Center emerges a clear need for the agency to include in its services a means to collect arts education information, including print and media items, and to act as a "conduit," providing ideas and materials to teachers in the field.

During the first four years, the Minnesota Center for Arts Education (formerly the Minnesota School and Resource Center for the Arts) concentrated on getting the agency off the ground, opening the doors of the arts high school, and offering resource programs. Examples of outreach activities of the Resource Programs include summer programs for students and teachers held throughout the state (called the Minnesota Arts eXperience or MAX); direct grants to educators (called the Professional Opportunities Program or POP); conferences, seminars and institutes; curriculum development projects; periodic publications; and focussed, multi-year endeavors, such as the Dance Education Initiative. For more information about the mission of the Center, refer to Appendix A.

In 1989, the Center was further stabilized by locating in its current residence on a former college campus in Golden Valley. The agency recommitted to a number of resource programs and added goals and objectives for the development of a new offering, the Arts Resource Collection Services, tentatively called Arcs.

For well over a year, the staff of the Minnesota Center for Arts Education, through professional consultants, conducted background research in order to plan a useful service for teachers that would complement other endeavors benefitting arts education in the state.

The national search yielded no examples of state-wide arts in education resource centers; however, many resource centers for general education or as regional or local services were found to exist. These centers were examined as to the types of services offered. With this background information in mind, the Center's staff created a format for possible services that might be provided by the Minnesota Arcs. A needs assessment in the form of a focus group project was conducted in order to gain insight related to the possible services from representatives of the intended audience for Arcs.

This report on the focus group needs assessment will be used as an in-house document and tool for planning the new Center Resource Programs.

Other recent state and national reports, among many, that have contributed to public discussion, understanding of arts education and action, include: A Selection of Excellence (Minnesota Alliance for Arts in Education, 1988); A Vision of Arts Education in Minnesota (Minnesota State Arts Board, et al., 1988); Results of a Statewide Survey of School Districts (Minnesota DBAE Consortium, 1990); Toward Civilization (National Endowment for the Arts, 1988); Can We Rescue the Arts for America's Children? (American Council for the Arts, 1988); and Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools (Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1985.) Appendix B contains further information about obtaining copies of these documents.

RESEARCH AND REPORTING METHODS

Before beginning the needs assessment study, the Minnesota Center for Arts Education did some initial, thinking regarding the Arts Resource Collection Services. It was decided that overall, Arcs would need to be harmonious with the Center's mission and the Resource Programs' goal of "providing continuing education and support for professional development in arts education for educators and artists."

More specifically, a philosophy and five goals that might be included in Arcs were tentatively proposed. These were informed, in part, by background research related to educational resource collection models in the nation.

Philosophy of the Arts resource collection services

The Arcs would assist educators (K-12) throughout Minnesota to improve arts instruction by facilitating access to new concepts, educational materials, and opportunities to learn how to effectively apply them in the classroom. The Arcs must encompass all the arts -- dance, literary arts, media arts, music, theater, and visual arts -- and diverse approaches to arts education, including interdisciplinary. The Arcs' services would be phased in.

Proposed Goals of the Arts Resource Collection Services

The following five working goals of Arcs guided the investigation of the program definition and feasibility:

- 1) Development of a collection of arts education material would include:
 - a) those which provide a foundation as well as innovative materials,
 - b) print and non-print formats, including new technologies, and
 - c) materials that range from curricula to individual items;

- 2) Facilitation of the use of concepts, ideas and educational materials, and their application to arts instruction through seminars, workshops and promotion of networking and information sharing;
- 3) Provision of statewide access to Arcs through loaned materials, regional and on-site activities, and facilitating teachers' visits to the Minnesota Center for Arts Education;
- 4) Information about Arts resource collection services made available to potential users; and
- 5) Stimulation of dialogue about instructional issues and needs in arts education.

Purposes of the Study

Before proceeding with other steps in the planning, a study of the needs of people who represent the potential users of the Arts resource collection services -- its clientele -- was conducted. The results are reported in this document.

The purposes of the study were to gather:

- 1) Perceptions about needs in arts education;
- 2) Information about what motivates teachers to use more or different arts education instruction in their classrooms, including the use of new materials;
- 3) Evaluative feedback about the proposed purpose and goals of the Arts resource collection services;
- 4) Responses to specific components proposed for the Arcs, including services and delivery systems; and
- 5) Additional suggestions related to Arcs.

Focus Group Assessment Process

The focus group meeting process was decided upon as the method of conducting the needs assessment study. A focus group is a:

carefully planned discussion, designed to obtain perceptions about a defined area of interest in a permissive, non-threatening environment. It involves six to ten people with a skilled moderator. The discussion is relaxed, comfortable, and often enjoyable for participants as they share ideas and perceptions. If the focus group process is carefully conducted and appropriately analyzed, the user

is able to make generalizations to others who possess similar characteristics.

Between June 5 and September 19, 1990, ten focus groups were held to garner information from the arts education field related to the planning and development of the Arts resource collection services. One focus group was a trial run to evaluate the format. Seven focus groups comprised the core study. Two follow up groups were held to test and refine the conclusions.

Overall, seventy-two people participated in the discussions held at various urban and greater Minnesota sites. The participants: K-12 teachers, media specialists and people who influence teaching, such as college educators, administrators of district, regional and state-wide programs, and heads of professional organizations were selected by the staff of the Resource Programs to represent the audiences that the new program may serve.

The groups were composed to include people knowledgeable or able to represent each of the arts disciplines (dance, literary arts, media arts, music, theater, visual arts) and interdisciplinary approaches, various grade levels, and different racial or cultural perspectives. Most participants, experienced teachers and administrators, were well-known among their peers.

Factored in to the selection of participants was the desire to include a variety of perspectives from urban, suburban and greater Minnesota, from school districts in all regions of the state, and from districts of various sizes. The size of the represented districts ranges from among the smallest in the state, serving approximately two hundred students, to among the largest, serving over thirty-two thousand.

In the trial run, five people participated. The location was in the Twin Cities with four participants from that region and one from greater Minnesota.

The core study included fifty-six people. Two types of groups were created. Administrators and others who hold leadership positions related to K-12 education made up two groups; practicing teachers, including media specialists, arts specialists and generalists, made up five groups.

Assessing Training Needs: The Use of Focus Group Interviewing
(Richard A. Krueger, Minnesota Extension Service, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, 1989, page 2)

Of the seven focus groups in the core study, four were held in the metropolitan area; three groups were held in greater Minnesota. At the metro meetings, people who reside in the Twin Cities' area were in the majority, with at least one greater Minnesota person in attendance at each meeting.

At the meetings in greater Minnesota, the majority of participants were from greater Minnesota. At each of these meetings, at least one metro area person was present, except in one case where all participants were from outside the Twin Cities' area. The breakdown of attendance was thirty-four from greater Minnesota and twenty-two from the metropolitan Twin Cities, for a total of fifty-six people comprising the core study.

A series of questions formulated in advance and the list of tentative Arts resource collection services provided the basis for each discussion. At the time of these discussions, the service was referred to as the Arts Resource Collection or ARC. This document has been up-dated to reflect recent thinking of the Center staff about the name of the service. Arts resource collection services or Arcs is the current working title.

The two follow up focus groups were held at a metropolitan location with a total of eleven participants, seven of whom were from greater Minnesota. Each of these groups included a mix of administrators and practicing teachers. Participants were asked to respond to the conclusions. In the main, they supported the conclusions, adding additional insights and evidence. The results and conclusions of the study, as reported here, have been refined to reflect input from the follow up focus groups. Whenever response from the follow up focus groups is used in the report, including quotations from participants, the report acknowledges its source.

To encourage candid response, participants in all the groups were assured that remarks would not be attributed to individuals by name. To provide a sense of the orientation of the people whose words are cited, this report gives general background information following each quotation. When the speaker is a teacher, the description includes the grade level taught, the subject area, and whether he or she is from the Twin Cities' metro area or greater Minnesota. When providing this much information would identify the speaker, a more generic description is provided. Media specialists or librarians are referred to as administrators.

The moderator of the trial run and core study groups was Margaret Hasse, a consultant. Assisting was Center staff member, Nancy Engen-Wedin, Resource Programs Associate. Karon Sherarts, former Director of the Resource Programs, attended many of the meetings. The consultant analyzed the results of all the meetings which were documented via audio tape recordings, over three hundred pages of transcripts, demographic and other information on participants, flip chart records, the notes of the assistant moderator, and the moderator's own field notes or impressions.

Dr. Richard Krueger acted in the capacity of advisor to the focus group project and provided an audit of the final report to assure that its findings were consistent with the discussions, and that the process permits conclusions about the field of arts education to be drawn. In addition, he was the moderator for one of the two follow up focus groups that reviewed and responded to the study's results, especially the conclusions.

The entire project team comprised of Karon Sherarts, Nancy Engen-Wedin, Dick Krueger and Margaret Hasse contributed to the content of this document. Dr. Pam Paulson was responsible for final editing and distribution of the report to focus group participants.

Refer to the appendices for additional background, including the listing of participants (Appendix C), the discussion questions asked during the meetings (Appendix D), and the audit of the assessment (Appendix E).

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

As a whole, the participants in the focus groups were extremely thoughtful and disciplined in their attention to the issue at hand. They appeared well-informed about arts education and education in general. The information provided was both of a general and of a specific, anecdotal nature. Most were very supportive of the Minnesota Center for Arts Education and all seemed in favor of the idea of additional assistance provided to the field of arts education through such a vehicle as the proposed Arts resource collection services.

This summary of the results gathered from the focus group participants is stated in terms of the five major purposes of the study:

Perceptions about needs in arts education:

According to participants, there appears to be a need for greater clarity in conceptual frameworks to provide a basis for school districts' arts education course offerings and programs. Frameworks permit the development of clear goals and outcomes for individual classes, making it possible to coordinate efforts between and among classes and grade levels and to evaluate overall arts education teaching and learning.

A sense in the focus groups was that the concepts governing arts education should ideally include the creation of artwork, as well as arts' history, appreciation, criticism and the inter-relatedness of the arts to other learning.

It was thought that such clear and broad-based conceptual frameworks are a requisite for addressing a second significant need in arts education, namely the need to gain more support for arts education from school administrators and the general public.

Another necessity that emerged is the provision of time in schools for teachers to engage in planning related to arts education. In general, the reduction of teacher isolation was considered to be a major need in the field.

Finally, assistance to non-arts teachers, in order that they might add the arts to their teaching, was seen to be of great importance.

Information about what motivates teachers to use more or different arts education instruction in their classrooms, including the use of new materials:

Most teachers are motivated to make changes in their instruction primarily for internal reasons; however, external factors, such as increased opportunities offered by new school facilities or requirements for continuing education credits, also influence changes. Once motivated to seek new information or use new materials, teachers overwhelmingly

prefer to acquire information directly from other people through familiar modes, such as conferences, workshops, seminars and over the telephone.

A variety of factors encourage teachers to take part in arts education learning opportunities or to use new arts education materials in their instruction. The type of incentive will vary, depending upon whether the teacher is an arts instructor, a strong arts proponent in another field, or is not particularly inclined towards the arts. Easy access to training and materials, paid release time and credits, and an understanding that the idea or items will permit accomplishment of several education goals are among important incentives for teachers.

Evaluative feedback about the proposed purpose and goals of the Arts resource collection services:

Participants strongly supported the concept of the Arts resource collection services. The proposed purpose and goals coincide with the perception of what is needed and desired by participants. Overall, the service is envisioned as a centralized source of information with significant educational outreach, primarily for elementary and secondary arts specialists and non-arts teachers. Within this "big picture," participants stressed that the Arcs will need to focus its services since its resources are not unlimited.

Responses to specific components proposed for the Arcs, including services and delivery systems:

People looked most favorably at the following types of services (not necessarily in priority order). These are harmonious with, but add additional focus to, what has been proposed as components of Arcs.

- 1) easy telephone and other contact with people for advice and referrals on a myriad of arts education concerns;
- 2) topic-specific listings of annotated human and other resources, whether in catalog or data base format, such as of arts education collections in the state, artists and arts education curriculum consultants, or materials for classroom use;
- 3) training and other avenues to give teachers direct access to other people who have information, including about useful materials and their applications;
- 4) mechanisms to get valuable audio visual materials directly to teachers, such as by a mailed delivery system; and

- 5) awareness or advocacy measures directed at administrative staff and the community to encourage them to value and support arts education.

Additional suggestions related to Arcs:

- 1) A creative public information and communications plan, aimed primarily at teachers and school administrators, is essential to the success of this project;
- 2) Making an inventory and providing information about currently available arts education resources should occur as part of planning for Arcs and also as a service to potential users of these resources; and
- 3) Arcs should be up-to-date; that is, alert to, and accommodating of, new trends in education and able to familiarize teachers with new technologies.

And, from the final focus groups,

- 4) Arcs has a role in articulating conceptual frameworks for arts education programs, modeling various districts' integrated or interdisciplinary arts curricula, and assisting arts educators with assessing the impact of their programs on students and building a case for support.

CONCLUSIONS:

Six conclusions were identified:

- 1) The conceptual frameworks which guide arts education are diverse. Among arts education professionals in Minnesota, traditional frameworks and classroom practices are wide-ranging, and some perceive these as undergoing change. Participants articulate a number of emerging issues in arts education: a) concern for curricula in each of the arts to provide a balance among performance, theory, creating and history; b) interdisciplinary arts education; c) the role of arts specialists and non-arts specialists and elementary and classroom teachers in providing arts education; d) the uses of the arts to meet other educational or socialization goals; and e) specific concerns were identified regarding each individual arts discipline.
- 2) The value individual communities, school districts, and schools place on arts education appears to vary greatly.
- 3) Elementary and secondary teachers experience isolation. Among arts teachers the experience of isolation is compounded by several factors, including: college or pre-service preparations generally do not require arts education courses; most districts do not have clear expectations for arts education and offer few opportunities for in-service; teachers, especially those at the elementary level, are overwhelmed by other curriculum demands and have little time to use the arts in their teaching; teachers are often uncomfortable teaching aspects of the arts which are unfamiliar, particularly those that involve creativity and imagination; and participants report that there are some teachers who resist change and do not want to do the additional work required to incorporate new ideas.
- 4) From the perspective of participants, non-arts teachers are unlikely to use the arts in their teaching.
- 5) Most teachers are motivated to make changes in their instruction, primarily for internal reasons; however, external factors also influence such changes. A variety of incentives encourage teachers to seek the information needed to make instructional changes; teachers prefer to acquire information through hands-on activities and familiar modes. However, participants report that these approaches to professional development may inhibit teachers' ability to connect activities to meaningful concepts, and perpetuate the view that the value of arts education lies in singular activities, rather than in an overarching approach which includes knowing, doing, valuing, and creating, as well as scope and sequence of the curriculum.

- 6) Arts education agencies in Minnesota share a responsibility to address a pervasive need in the field for articulating conceptual frameworks; defining and assessing the impact of arts education; and modeling integrated arts curricula. The proposed resource service can play a role in this endeavor.

Appendix A

Mission

The Minnesota Center for Arts Education, a statewide public high school and resource center, was created by the 1985 Minnesota State Legislature to enhance educational opportunities in the arts--dance, literary arts, media arts, music, theater, visual arts, and interdisciplinary studies for students and educators, from Kindergarten through 12th grade, throughout the state. The Center provides diverse services without financial barriers to educators and students through its statewide resource programs and its arts high school programs. The arts high school programs identify and provide programming for students who demonstrate potential or developed artistic talents.

Conceptual Framework

Recognizing that the arts are a basic form of human cultural expression and are an essential component of a democratic society, the Minnesota Center for Arts Education develops and offers programs reflecting that:

the arts significantly interrelate with other areas of human concern;

[this provides the basis for interdisciplinary studies, integrated programming, learning the arts within their own multi-faceted context as well as within a variety of broader ones]

creative/imaginative endeavor provides the basis for initiation of artistic and academic pursuit;

[this provides the basis for creativel/imaginative skills being taught in balance with technical skills and the basis for teaching complex thinking]

individuals interact within diverse cultural systems;

[this provides the basis for communications skills, partnerships, cooperative and networking activities, a multi-cultural/gender-fair focus, and a rationale for leadership development]

learning is a developmental process;

[this provides the basis for the organization of curriculum and instruction into developmental sequences according to the needs of the individual and knowledge base of a subject area].

The Board of Directors has affirmed its commitment to pursuing employment practices that create opportunities for all persons without regard to race, creed or religion, color, disability, gender, marital status, national origin or ancestry, or political affiliation. In addition, the Board is committed to fostering the health and professional education of its employees and to promoting a multi-cultural/gender-fair focus in all its programs.

The Center has established the following goals for its Resource Programs for fiscal years 1990 and 1991(July 1, 1989-June 30, 1991):

Provide continuing education and support for professional development in arts education for educators and artists;

Provide opportunities for students(K-12) to increase their awareness of and interest in the arts and develop their artistic abilities;

Develop and implement effective leadership strategies for arts educators;

Develop and implement innovative model program(s) in partnership with public and private arts and education institutions/organizations which improve approaches to arts education;

Increase awareness of the importance of arts education among educators, artists, and the general public, and disseminate art education information statewide;

Develop and implement, in cooperation with the Arts High School, a plan to share the Arts High School curriculum as a resource to enhance arts education in public schools;

Implement research, evaluation and assessment techniques to review and report on Resource Programs.

The Center has established the following goals for its Arts High School programs for fiscal years 1990 and 1991:

Identify high school students possessing potential or developed artistic talent through assessment of motivation, creativity and proficiency.

Educate artistically talented 11th and 12th graders in an innovative program which models the following characteristics:

- *A learner-outcome based curriculum organized around what students need to know, to do, to value and to create;
- *Emphasis on both the arts and the general studies;
- *Interdisciplinary studies that integrate the arts and general studies by emphasizing relationships, patterns and connections;
- *Assessment of student progress and achievement based on observational indicators as well as written work and conventional testing;
- *Innovative instructional strategies;
- *An individual learner focus;
- *A climate that promotes creativity, communication, cooperation, and self-discipline;
- *Expanded teachers' role as professional educators.

Serve as a resource to professional educators and artists and involve educators and artists in the the school programs as resources.

Educate artistically talented 9th-12th graders in part-time programs such as mentorships, intensive seminars, and summer programs that model and reflect the full-time program characteristics.

Approved: Board of Directors, September 14, 1990

Appendix B.

Contact Information on Other Reports Cited

A Selection of Excellence

Minnesota Alliance for Arts in Education
5701 Normandale Road, Suite 244
Minneapolis, MN 55424
612-920-9002`

A Vision of Arts Education in Minnesota

Minnesota State Arts Board
432 Summit
St. Paul, MN 55102
612-297-2603

Results of a Statewide Survey of School Districts

Minnesota DBAE Consortium
ISD #16
Community Services Offices
8000 Highway 65 N.E.
Spring Lake Park, MN 55432

Toward Civilization

National Endowment for the Arts
Arts in Education Program
1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20506

Can We Rescue the Arts for America's Children?

American Council for the Arts
1285 Avenue of the Americas, 3rd floor
New York, N.Y. 10019

A Framework for Multicultural Arts Education

National Arts Education Research Center
New York University
School of Education, Health, Nursing, and
Arts Professions
26 Washington Place, Room 21
New York, N.Y. 10013
212-998-5060

Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools

Getty Center for Education in the Arts

1875 Century Park East, Suite 2300

Los Angeles, CA 90067-2561

Perspectives: Educating America's Youth
in the Arts and Their Cultural Heritage

The Kennedy Center

Education, Alliance for Arts Education

Washington, D.C. 20566

202-416-8800

Appendix C: Focus Group Participants

ARC Focus Group Appendix

David Bengtson

English teacher, grades 10-12
Long Prairie Senior High School
Long Prairie

Brian Benson

Emotional behavioral disorders teacher,
grades 5-8
Dassel-Cokato Middle School
Dassel-Cokato

Marsha Besch

English Coordinator, grades 9-12
Apple Valley Senior High School
Apple Valley

Lynn Bollman

Visual arts teacher, grades 10-12
West Sibley Senior High School
West St. Paul

Judy Broekemeier

Visual arts teacher, grades K-6
Jordan Elementary School
Jordan

Sue Bruns

English teacher, grades 9-12
Bemidji Senior High School
Bemidji

Jim Busta

Superintendent
Spring Grove Public Schools
Spring Grove

Colleen Callahan

Dance Program Director, grades 9-12
North Senior High School
Minneapolis

Linda Capistrant

Theater, speech teacher, grades 7-9
Central Junior High School
Alexandria

Ellery Carr	General education teacher, grade 6 Galtier Elementary School St. Paul
Judy Christoffersen	Visual arts teacher, grades 1-6 Robert Asp Elementary Moorhead
Gretchen Collins	Chapter One Coordinator, grades 1-6 Hopkins School District Hopkins
Mary Dalbotten	Media Specialist Minnesota Department of Education St. Paul
Wendy DeGeest	General education teacher, preschool Fairview Elementary School Mora
Lou Ann Dressen	Visual arts teacher, grades K-6 Park Elementary School Hutchinson
Robert Durley	Music graduate assistant Mankato State University Mankato
Jean Endrizzi	English, speech teacher, grades 10-12 Denfeld Senior High School Duluth
Patrick Esser	English teacher, grades 7-8 Heron Lake, Okabena, Lakefield Middle School Okabena
Pat Feit	Vocal Director, grades 9-12 Princeton Senior High School Princeton

Julie Forderer

Independent dance instructor, grades K-12
Projects Coordinator
South Central Education District
Minnesota Lakes

Beth Fratzke

English teacher, grade 12
Minnesota Center for Arts Education
Golden Valley

Barb Geer

Music teacher, grades K-12
Badger Public Schools
Badger

Janet Grove

Program Coordinator
Minnesota Alliance for Arts in Education
Minneapolis

Shirley Hallberg

Technology resource teacher, grades 7-8
Franklin Junior High School
Minneapolis

Mark Hansen

Visual arts teacher, grades 10-12
Forest Lake Senior High School
Forest Lake

Jerry Hanson

Curriculum Specialist
Osakis Public Schools
Osakis

Betty Hatton

English teacher, grades 7-9
West Junior High School
Hopkins

Gretchen Heath

English, speech, theater teacher, grades 9-12
Armstrong Senior High School
Robbinsdale

Henry Hebert

English teacher, grades 11-12
Forest Lake Senior High School
Forest Lake

Annette Hustad	Music teacher, grades K-12 Osakis Public Schools Osakis
Annette Jenkins	General education teacher, grade 3 Blue Earth Elementary School Blue Earth
Beverly Jondahl	Visual arts teacher, grades 10-12 Brainerd Senior High School Brainerd
Kathleen Jorissen	President Minnesota Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Coon Rapids
Don Kain	Publisher, <u>The High School Writer</u> , for grades 6-12 Grand Rapids
Neva Kamrath	Media generalist, grades K-12 Canby Senior High School Canby
Deb Kopas	General education teacher, grade 1 Lino Lakes Elementary School Forest Lake
Ron Larson	Minnesota Music Education Association Waconia
Kate Lenzmeier	Visual arts teacher, grades K-6 Northfield Elementary Schools Northfield
Bruce Loschen	Visual arts teacher, grades 5-12 Southland Secondary Schools Southland

Le Lucht	English, Spanish teacher Worthington Senior High School Worthington
Marge Maddux	Assistant dance professor University of Minnesota Minneapolis
Roger McGaughey	Art Coordinator, grades 9-12 Apple Valley Senior High School Apple Valley
Karen Monson	Visual arts teacher, grades 10-12 Blue Earth Area Senior High School Blue Earth
John Nyberg	Music teacher, grades K-6 Brimhall Elementary School Roseville
Stephen O'Connor	Music teacher, grades K-12 Marshall Public Schools Marshall
Darlene Olson	English teacher, theater director, grades 9-12 Hastings Senior High School Hastings
Rodney Opprecht	Language Arts Chair, grades 11-12 Winona Senior High School Winona
Mary Ann Pakiz	General education teacher, grade 4 Chisholm Middle School Chisholm

Laurie Parnell	General education teacher, grade 5 Cherokee Heights Magnet School St. Paul
Bob Pattengale	Music professor Moorhead State University Moorhead
Mindy Peabody	Gifted and talented teacher, grades 1-3 Cooper Elementary School Minneapolis
Sonja Peterson	Program Coordinator Lake Region Arts Council Fergus Falls
Sue Pierson	Art education professor Concordia College Moorhead
Diane Remington	Assistant Principal Central Middle School Eden Prairie
Grace Rogers	English teacher, grades 7-8 Franklin Junior High School Minneapolis
Karen Rogers	Gifted and Talented Program Director St. Thomas University St. Paul
Karen Rossbach	Visual arts teacher, grades K-12 Mounds Park Academy Maplewood

Kay Sach	Technology Support Services Coordinator Minneapolis School District Minneapolis
Sheryl Saterstrom	Dance professor St. Olaf College Northfield
Jane Schuck	Principal West Junior High School Mankato
John See	Technology Specialist Minnesota Department of Education St. Paul
Don Sherman	Photographer, grades K-college Independent Ortonville
Ric Sorenson	Visual arts teacher, grades 7-12 Fosston Secondary Schools Fosston
Jean Steinbach	Music teacher, grades K-6 Maggelssen Elementary School Fosston
Ruth Suppas	General education teacher, grade 4 Probstfield Elementary School Moorhead
Michael Suzuki	Music professor Southeast State University Marshall

Dean Swanson

Director
Southeast ECSU
Rochester

Michael Tillmann

Theater Director,
grades K-12
Owatonna Public Schools
Owatonna

Chris Volz

Mentor teacher
Mankato State University
South Central Education District
Mankato

Elena White

Dance consultant, teacher,
grades K-college
Independent
St. Cloud

Laura Wills

English, speech and theater teacher,
grades 10-12
Osseo Senior High School
Osseo

Rick Wind

Music teacher,
grades 10-12
Faribault Senior High School
Faribault

Appendix D.

Questions Asked during Focus Groups

Welcomes and Overview

Ground Rules for the Discussion

Background on Center

Introductions of All Participants

Question 1.

As you think about your school district(s), what do you think is its (their) greatest strength in arts education?

Question 2.

What do you think of as the greatest constraint or limitation in providing arts education in your school district(s)?

Question 3.

How do teachers get ideas for arts instruction?

Question 4.

Think about a time in the last few years when you made a change in your instruction. Describe the change you made.

Follow-up:

What promoted you to make the change?

How well did the change work?

Can you recall something that you tried that just didn't work?

Question 5.

The Minnesota Center for Arts Education, through its Resource Programs, is committed to developing a new program for teachers which may contain three basic types of services. These services are currently categorized as Materials and Delivery, Linking and Networking People, Ideas and Information, and Teacher and Staff

Development with many examples listed. (Contained on a handout, see page 18 of this report for details.)
Which services are really important? Which are not high priorities?

Question 6.

What additional services would be useful to you?

Question 7.

Regarding access to these services by teachers across the state, we're looking at everything from toll-free telephone access and circulation through the mail to workshops and various mechanisms for transfer of materials and information.

What word or phrase describes the kind of access that you (or teachers) would like to have to all the potential services?

Question 8.

Do you have any advice to those in charge of setting up the new services?

Question 9.

Our purpose is to obtain ideas that help in planning the new services. Have we missed anything that should be discussed?

Question 10.

A Summary of the Discussion Is Presented

Do you think this is an accurate summary of our discussion?

Closing Remarks

RICHARD A. KRUEGER AND ASSOCIATES

Research Consulting and Focus Group Interviewing
4544 Quail Ave North
Minneapolis, Minn. 55422

February 6, 1991

Karon Sherarts, Director of Resource Programs
Minnesota Center for Arts Education
6125 Olson Memorial Highway
Golden Valley, MN 55422

Statement of Audit

To Whom it May Concern:

I was invited to serve in a consultative capacity for the research team investigating perceptions of Minnesota educators toward the Minnesota Center for Arts Education Arts Resource Center. This included providing advice to the research team on accepted focus group protocol for logistics, documentation and data analysis. At the conclusion of the study I conducted an audit of the procedures used. I have reviewed the final report as well as supporting documents: field notes, transcripts, and summaries which were prepared immediately after the group interviews. I have also consulted with the moderator and assistant moderator of the seven focus group interviews.

Choice of Methodology

The data in this study were obtained through the use of focus group interviews. Given the purpose of the study and the complexity of the topic this was a wise methodological choice. The focus group interview allows individuals to listen and interact with others as they develop their own opinions. As a result the participants have the opportunity to profit from the feedback from others as opinions are shared and exchanged. The permissive environment of the focus group enhances candor and taps into opinions and values in a more naturalistic manner than would other choices of research methodology thereby increasing this study's credibility. The focus group interview is an ideal methodology to use in this type of study.

Scope and Nature of the Study:

Respondents were selected from two categories of people who are important to the Arts Resource Center: influentials and arts practitioners.

This grouping is sensible given the purpose of the study. Influentials have certain characteristics: they occupy positions of responsibility where they leverage resources, open doors, sanction activities, and exert influence on the future direction of the arts. Of equal importance are teachers of arts from throughout Minnesota. These practitioners are front-line professionals who deliver arts education to Minnesota youth. Seven focus groups (with 56 participants) were conducted at four locations: Golden Valley, Rochester, Montevideo or Grand Rapids. Two additional focus groups were conducted at the conclusion of the study as a validity check of the findings.

Documentation Trail:

The study was conducted in a systematic and verifiable process that minimized the potential for error. The documentation trail is exceptional. The researchers used accepted practices in handling data. Each focus group discussion was captured in two ways: by tape recording and by field notes taken by the assistant moderator. Immediately following each focus group interview the moderator and assistant moderator prepared a brief summary of the discussion. Following the focus group the cassette tapes were transcribed and resulted in approximately 50 pages of single spaced text for each focus group. The data collection process reflected the research team's conscientious effort and appropriate attention to details.

Analysis:

The research team identified six conclusions based on themes surfacing in the focus group interviews. These conclusions highlighted (1) the diversity of conceptual frameworks in arts education, (2) the values placed on the arts, (3) the isolation, and (4) insulation of arts educators, (5) who are internally motivated, yet responsive to external motivation, and (6) who strongly support a state level arts resource collection. A major purpose of a focus group audit is to determine if the conclusions and themes found by the researchers are supported by the data. In my opinion, this test has been met. Each of these themes is readily traceable back to the interviews.

The researchers have followed a systematic process that is appropriate for the nature of the study. The process reflected careful planning, attention to details, well designed questions, exceptional documentation, and appropriate analysis procedures. Each step in the methodology was sound, well documented and overall this study is exemplary.

page 3.

The study results are transferable to other units where similar conditions and circumstances exist. The comprehensive data base developed from this study provides the thick description necessary for transferability judgments. In addition, the study exhibits both dependability and confirmability. The dependability and confirmability criteria were ensured by team efforts of the moderator and assistant moderator followed by discussion and interaction with the analysis team. The resulting analysis can be considered trustworthy.

In summary, this study is credible, trustworthy, uses appropriate methodology, is carefully executed and skillfully analyzed. I commend the research team of Margaret Hasse and Nancy Engin-Wedin for their capable execution of the focus group interview process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Richard A. Krueger". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "R" and "K".

Richard A. Krueger, Ph.D.
Evaluation Consultant