

**Closing Equity Gaps in Arts Education:
Connecting Data-Informed Policy Making and Stakeholder Engagement**

Roundtable I

This discussion format is meant to be rapid—like ‘idea speed-dating’—and to begin to unearth participants’ perspectives in regard to the questions we’re exploring together.

Goals:

To get juices flowing. To raise questions, rather than answer them. To engage participants in the PDI Guiding Question, and gain skills in response to our outcomes through learning with peers, and engaging in small group discussion to clarify/build on thinking.

Supplies/Materials Needed:

- Copies of instructions
- Copies of questions / related statements

Format:

- Participants randomly select a table number from a basket (8 people / table) upon entering
- One main facilitator with visible timekeeper (projected) will help keep track of time
- AEWG members are assigned to each table to help keep time, as needed
- Each table is assigned two questions (from list of 6 panel questions)

1. Snowball! Table Talks (9:45-10:15am)

Round I – First (of two) questions (9:45am; ~15 minutes)

- 2 mins: Each participant reads, reflects and responds to the question / related statement, **individually**.
- 2 mins: **Pair share with neighbor** about individual reflections on the question / related statement.
- 4 mins: Table breaks into **two groups** (half the table per group) for conversation about pair share reflections on the question / related statement.
- 6 mins: Table comes back together for **whole-table conversation** about small group conversation on question / related statement

Round II – Second (of two) questions (10:00am; ~15 minutes)

- 2 mins: Each participant reads, reflects and responds to the question / related statement, **individually**.
- 2 mins: **Pair share with neighbor** about individual reflections on the question / related statement.
- 4 mins: Table breaks into **two groups** (half the table per group) for conversation about pair share reflections on the question / related statement.
- 6 mins: Table comes back together for **whole-table conversation** about small group conversation on question / related statement

2. Pop-Up! Share-out! (10:15-10:25am, ~10 mins)

- What were some of the ideas / reflections / questions unearthed during the snowball discussions?

**Closing Equity Gaps in Arts Education:
Connecting Data-Informed Policy Making and Stakeholder Engagement**

Questions & Related Statements

1. What does data-informed policy making look like in your agency and/or state?

What is data and where do I get it?

If you can observe it, it is data.

Data is factual information, especially information that is systematically organized and used to help someone make a decision. Most people associate the word “data” with numbers: dollars, demographics, percents or averages. Statistical or standardized information, usually called quantitative data, is part of most evaluations, but is by no means the only kind of information that is useful to arts organizations. While quantitative data can identify important trends or patterns, qualitative data is often needed to reveal the deeper meaning behind the numbers.

*--NASAA Evaluation Resource, *Getting Started with Program Evaluation: A Guide for Arts Organizations*, 2007*

2. Why are we gathering data on equity gaps in arts education, and what is it telling us?

Social research and program evaluation can be seen as efforts to understand the reality of social phenomenon as through a prism. Just as a prism bends the different frequencies of light into an ever-changing pattern of different colors, dependent upon the light source and the shape and motion of the prism, so we seek ways to understand social reality as it changes, dependent upon the diverse qualities and activities inherent in its creation and interpretation. Through the use of transformative, culturally appropriate, and multiple methods of research and evaluation, we can come to understand patterns of diverging results and their implications.

*--Donna M. Mertens, *Transformative Research and Evaluation*, “Chapter 1: Resilience, Resistance, and Complexities that Challenge”, Guildford Publications, 2009*

3. Regardless of where your ESSA state plan process is, how can data be collected and shared in order to influence policy makers so that arts education becomes more equitably accessible in the state?

State accountability systems serve the important purpose of setting the state goals for education and establishing the metrics by which the state will know if it has achieved the goals. As part of the requirements for receiving Title I funding, states must identify the components of their accountability systems with special attention given to the indicators required by ESSA: measures of student achievement and growth in mathematics and English language arts (ELA) at both the high school and elementary/middle school levels; high school graduation rates; measures of language proficiency for English language learners (ELLs); and at least one measure of school quality or student success. It is this final indicator — school quality or student success — that opens the door for opportunities within the arts.

Mapping Opportunities for the Arts According to ESSA, indicators of school quality or student success can include: “measures of student engagement, educator engagement, student access to and completion of advanced coursework, postsecondary readiness, school climate and safety, and any other indicator the state chooses...” (Title I, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 1005). These indicator options provide a number of opportunities for the arts, particularly in the areas of student and educator engagement and school climate.

--Education Commission of the States, Arts Education Partnership, *ESSA: Mapping opportunities for the arts*, 2017 https://www.ecs.org/ec-content/uploads/ESSA_Mapping_the_opportunities_for_the_arts-3.pdf

4. What specific approaches to stakeholder engagement might reduce equity gaps in arts education? (Stakeholder engagement can be specific to ESSA, but is also more generalizable to other initiatives useful for both SAAs and SDEs.)

Before states implement ESSA, they are required to create a comprehensive and collaborative state plan. ESSA requires that each state education agency (SEA) create the state plan with “timely and meaningful consultation with the governor, members of the state legislature... and state board of education, local educational agencies...representatives of Indian tribes located in the state, teachers, principals, other school leaders, charter school leaders...specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, administrators, other staff and parents.”

Stakeholder engagement and collaboration are essential to the development of an effective state plan. Yet engaging a diverse group of stakeholders tasked with working together to create education policies that will have a positive, lasting impact on students is not as easy as it sounds. Experts in the field argue that the traditional stakeholder engagement model alone will not produce the long-term outcomes states

--Education Commission of the States, Matt Jordan, David Chrislip and Emily Workman, *Special Report: Collaborative Stakeholder Engagement*, 2016, https://www.ecs.org/ec-content/uploads/Collaborative_Stakeholder_Engagement_June-2016.pdf

5. What does stakeholder engagement look like in your agency and/or state?

Evaluators must work hard in preparing to enter a community, neighborhood, or organization; they have a responsibility to educate themselves. CRE requires particular attention to the context in which an evaluation will be conducted. This includes the history of the location, the program, and the people. What are the stories of this community and its people, and who is telling them? CRE evaluators are observant regarding communication and relational styles. How does one respectfully enter this community? What dimensions of diversity are most salient within this community and how is power distributed, both formally and informally? What relationships are valued or privileged and what relationships are discouraged or forbidden?

- Stafford Hood, Rodney K. Hopson, Karen E. Kirkhart, *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation, Fourth Edition*, “Chapter Twelve: Culturally Responsive Evaluation, Theory, Practice and Future Implications, 2015

Thursday, September 14, 9:40-10:25am
Friends Room, Downtown Public Library

6. How are you / your state using data to make not only informed policy about arts education but policy that is responsive to constituents' who may experience inequities in arts education?

Evaluation is the social practice of valuing. *Evaluation is the social practice of gathering and using empirical information to make judgments about the merit and worth of a given social or educational intervention somewhere in the world. Both our empirical data and our judgments are grounded in particular values, which are too often unnamed and thereby under-used to advance our culturally responsive agenda of cultural respect and socio-political equity.*

-- Jennifer C. Greene Valuing Values in Evaluation, 10/12/2016, CREA: Center for Culturally Responsive Evaluation and Assessment <http://creablog.weebly.com/>