

ROUGH EDITED COPY

John F. Kennedy Center
The Arts and Special Education: A Map for Research
September 12, 2017
3:00 p.m. ET

CART CAPTIONING PROVIDED BY: ALTERNATIVE
COMMUNICATION SERVICES, LLC, www.CaptionFamily.com

* * * * *

This is being provided in a rough-draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

* * * * *

>> EMILY THIELL: Hello, everyone. Welcome to the September installment of our VSA Webinar Series, which comes to you from the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and addresses topics related to the arts and special education. I am Emily Thiell, the Program Coordinator for Special Education here at the Center, and I will be your webinar moderator. Today's webinar is called The Arts and Special Education: A Map for Research.

If you would like to view live-stream captioning of this webinar, you can follow the link you see in the slide, and on the chat box on the control panel located on the right side of your screen.

Before we get going, I would like to take a brief moment to introduce you to Cisco WebEx Event Center. Broadcast messages from the Kennedy Center Team, such as the live link for Web stream captioning, live-stream captioning, appear in the chat box which you can select from the control panel on the top right of your window.

If you need to leave the webinar early, you'll leave it by clicking the "X" in the upper left corner. A recording of the webinar will be available afterwards so you can catch up on any parts that you missed.

You can connect to the audio portion of the webinar through your telephone or through your computer's microphone and speakers. Select the option that works best for you. If you are using your telephone, please make sure you mute your computer speakers.

You can submit comments, questions, or answers to questions using the Q and A option, which you can select from the top panel. Please note that is different option than the chat box, and allows moderators to view your questions. Please make sure your question is directed to all panelists. I'll monitor the screen throughout the webinar. If you prefer to speak your input rather than typing it, please click on the "raise your hand" icon, which can be found in your view on

the participant's panel. I will touch base with you and unmute your microphone at the appropriate time.

Much of today's presentation will be conducted over a screen share. If you would like to adjust your view by zooming in or zooming out, you may click the magnifying glasses. You can also expand your view to full screen.

At the end of today's presentation, there will be an opportunity to ask questions about the material. During this open-ended question-and-answer time, please raise your hand if you wish to speak, or type your question into the Q & A box.

Within the week, we will send out a follow-up email with the link of the recording and today's presentation, and a copy of the PowerPoint, and a copy of the webinar transcript. This means that you can go back and watch the recording and review supplemental materials in addition to take any notes during the webinar.

Our October Lightning Series, Voices from the Field: Transition and the Arts, kicks off on October 3 at 12:30. The registration link can be found in your chat box.

If you're active on social media, I invite you to connect with us using #VSAWebinar. On Facebook, we are VSAInternational. And on Twitter, we are VSAINTL. We would love to engage with you.

And with that, I hand it over to today's presenters, Jenna and Don.

>> JENNA GABRIEL: Great. Thanks, Emily. Can you see the screen?

>> EMILY THIELL: Yep.

>> JENNA GABRIEL: Perfect.

All right. Well, thanks, everybody, for joining us. We are here today to talk about our recent publication that came out from the Office of VSA and Accessibility in collaboration with our colleagues in Research and Evaluation called The Arts and Special Education: A Map for Research. My name is Jenna Gabriel. I'm the Manager of Special Education here at the Kennedy Center. And I'm joined today by Don Glass.

>> DON GLASS: Hello, everyone. I'm also in the Education Division at the Kennedy Center, but in the Research and Evaluation Division. So we work with each of the different program areas, including Accessibility and VSA.

So today, I'll do a quick orientation of what we're going to be doing in the webinar session. We're going to begin with the goals of what we would like you to leave in terms of understanding and possibly some action points at the end after the webinar. We're going to begin by giving you some background and context to this exciting new publication, which is the Research Map. Then, we will focus on the content of it. We're going to basically walk through the different sections of it. It's divided into three priority areas. Each of these priority areas have a set of research

questions, some bullet points, and things to consider in terms of moving forward and doing this work either individually, collectively, or in collaboration with us. And we'll also highlight some of the Kennedy Center-related work that aligns with these milestones and suggestions.

Then, we'll move into some directions of action steps or milestones that we think would make a lot of sense in terms of developing and growing the field at the intersections of arts education and special education.

Then, finally, we'll take some questions and answers from folks.

All right. So this slide kind of focuses on our session goals. There's two images here. One is of a compass with the north, south, east, west coordinates. We're using that as a metaphor helping orient yourselves to this new direction and possible pathways that we can go on together at this intersection of the second image on the slide, which is arts education and special education street signs at an intersection.

Our goals today is to help you understand the Research Map publication, which is available in print and digital forms, and its conception, our thinking behind it, and how it got developed. We want you to be oriented to the three priority areas and how you fit into any of those or all of them, and also for you to think about how your work may play into the different directions and next steps that we suggest.

>> JENNA GABRIEL: So to give you some background and context around this work, in 2012 the Office of VSA and Accessibility here at the Kennedy Center hosted 49 Thought Leaders who came from representative fields, like arts education, special education, and disability studies. Really, these folks represented two fields that we considered operating in parallel in our schools. Each of these teachers and these disciplines see all of the kids in any given school, but only very rarely do they intersect around the sharing of best practices. Our hope in this national forum was to get all these people in the room and say, "Talk to each other and share some expertise and tell us what your recommendations to us are. How can we better meet the needs of students with disabilities learning and, then, through the arts?"

They gave us a number of recommendations that fell into two overarching directions. The first was to create a dynamic information hub and technical assistance center, and the second was establishing a consortium of arts education and disability organizations to advance the shared national agenda.

And underneath that umbrella, this idea of the shared national agenda, came through some specific recommendations around research, telling us we needed more targeted research questions, telling us we needed to develop and test new methodologies that were compatible with this kind of inquiries, and we needed to shift our emphasis from

short-term program evaluation to long-term research. These really paired with recommendations we heard from across the field, that we needed to producing and disseminating more peer-reviewed articles and information, and that there needed to be some data bank where young graduate students or early career researchers could find literature in the field.

In response to these needs, of course we formed the Intersections conference and the other associated professional development that we offer through our VSA Webinar Series, and what's now three volumes of exemplary programs and approaches to series of academic papers.

But in 2016, we really said let's sit and take stock. We're five years almost after this national forum. How are we doing?

At the Intersections conference in 2016, we convened another group of people. These folks were researchers and academics at institutions in each of these fields, and we asked them to come together and help us consider how we might chart a course for the field and what the role of rigorous research might be. This publication has come out of those conversations and a year of refining and articulating and recognizing what we can and cannot do on our own. So what we want to introduce to you today is this tool and how you might use it.

>> DON GLASS: Right. So one of the things we did is we had several members of our thought leader community who have done certain literature reviews on different sets of literature. That's one of the things we're interested in doing, is doing a more comprehensive look at that. What we wanted to do is look at one measure of how well we're doing, what's going on in terms of research in the arts education field, but also special education. So one place to look is the U.S. Department of Education has an Institute of Educational Sciences, who host the What Works Clearinghouse, which is a place where researchers can submit their research and get it peer reviewed. Then, if it passes the really high rigorous standards, it will get accepted into the system. So one of the things we did is look at what's going on in relationship to what, at least, the U.S. Department of Education is considering high-quality research designs.

So if we look at this table that's on this page, we're looking at all the submissions, submissions from the children and youth with disabilities category, which would be special education research, and then from arts education.

The first thing I want you to take away from looking at this table is that it's really hard to meet, in education, to What Works Clearinghouse standards. A lot of studies have been submitted. Many don't fit the four sets of designs that they have currently -- which doesn't mean they're bad research; it just means they don't meet the designs -- and then certain others don't meet the standards.

What's promising taking away from this table is that the special education category has a good amount of research going on there. There's a lot of activity, expertise, a lot of foundational work to build on. There's a lot of experience in using random controlled trials. And also, if you notice in the single-case methodology, most of the single-case studies that met the standards were actually in the children and youth and disabilities category. So there's a specialty of using that kind of method, because of the context of that research being done. So there's a lot of things to learn from special education. You'll see a little bit later on how that's led us to some suggestions about piggybacking on others' research or making a stronger collaboration with the special education field.

If you look at the arts education column, not a lot of studies. But it's actually very promising that there's a higher rate of acceptance or approval for arts ed studies than everything. There's 11% approval rate for arts ed studies, compared to the overall 8%. So that's not bad considering the scale of our field and the limited amount of research funding that's available to do the kind of research we're interested in.

There's actually four studies in the database, if you want to check them out. They're a little bit hard to find. You have to look for arts disciplines, like drama, theater, visual arts, to narrow it down. I do know that just this summer one of the Innovation Grants from Young Audiences was accepted, and they are the study that had at least one statistically significant positive finding. So we have a presence there. We would like to make it stronger. We would also like to see crossover examples of things in the arts education category and the special education research category.

>> JENNA GABRIEL: That puts us into some of the goals that we laid out as a group for this Research Map. First was we wanted to support researchers in connecting their work to relevant research and to policy. We wanted to find allies to make sure this research wasn't happening in a vacuum.

The second was to increase access to allied research, practice, and policy communities. Again, it's this theme really is we're one of these unique and wonderful fields. We're working with real kids and real classrooms and real teachers with real needs. We wanted to make sure it was priority for us that the research we're putting out or asking for is really tied to real practice.

We wanted to support literature reviews that are focused on arts education and special education. That's not only so that we have a sense of what research has been done and what research is out there and what positive findings contribute to our understanding of best practice, but also to tell us where there were gaps and where, as a field, we needed to prioritize focus.

We hoped that this Research Map would link research in arts education and special education with other disciplines. This is a

theme I think you'll hear over and over again, from Don and I today, but also as you peruse the Map yourself, is we view this field as interdisciplinary and standing on some solid foundation that's been laid out about other established fields.

And finally, again, this theme of supporting evidence-based practice in arts education and special education.

>> DON GLASS: All right. So as we mentioned earlier, the Map for Research is divided into three priority areas, which kind of scaffolds in levels similar to the evidence levels and some of how the U.S. Department of Ed thinks about evidence.

Priority Area 1 is about access and equity research. So getting to the table to participate and how that works.

Priority Area 2 is about instructional design and innovation research. So what does teaching and learning actually look like for diverse learners?

And Priority Area 3 is what we want to work toward getting more of, which is the larger scale effectiveness, efficacy, and scale-up research.

>> JENNA GABRIEL: I would add to this slide before Don and I really dive into giving a more deep explanation of these priority areas is that we hope you notice as you're looking through this that there's kind of like a pipeline model here, that access and equity really looks at the field and foundation and where need is and where work is being done.

Priority Area 2 responds to what we know is going on in the field where there are these pockets of programming. So this is the theater program in Idaho that works with kids with autism, and this is the music program that's for nonverbal students in Florida. This is saying let's evaluate these innovative programs to instruction that are responding to the foundation we have in Priority Area 1.

Priority Area 3 is looking at when we know there's promising instruction happening somewhere, how do we really expand that out to a large number of communities and evaluate whether or not it's working?

With that, let's take a look at these priority areas.

Access and equity is referring to equitable and fair distribution of learning opportunities. It's talking about where kids have access to arts learning. We're talking in this about whether students with disabilities have the same level of access to arts learning that their typically-developing peers do. This is what kind of arts learning do students with disabilities have? What discipline? How many times a week? At what intensity? For what duration? This is asking those very, very broad questions. It's talking about what barriers exist to meaningful participation.

It's also addressing what correlations there might be between access to art learning and these kind of traditional measures of "success."

So when we talk broadly about do the arts work? This is saying, all right, we have some promising data that arts learning is tied to academic success for typically-developing students. Let's tease out some of the data for students on IEP's. Is participation in arts learning linked to, for example, high school graduation?

So when you think about how we move forward as a field in this priority area, some of the recommendations that our group laid out were to make sure that students with disabilities are included in the design of instruments, in item writing, sampling strategies, and analysis and use of data. We know some of our large departments of education or large districts have access to huge data sets for students and their participation in the arts. This is a messaging saying let's tease out the students with disabilities in that. Let's make sure that they're included in that. Again, this is that second point that we're calling on the field to advocate for the inclusion of data items about students with disabilities on the large surveys and assessments.

Third, we want to make sure that data is collected in ways that can be disaggregated by priority population types like students with disabilities. So when we have that large data set, can we pull out that priority populations? We'll get to this recommendation officially in a moment, but this is also saying that students with disabilities are not a homogeneous group. Right? Students with disabilities can also be students living in poverty, can also be students who are English language learners. Part of what we're calling on the field to do is make sure we can look at data in that myriad of ways.

We want to be developing high quality of instruments and assessments that are universally designed, flexible, and multi-model. These are students who have learning needs. We need to be sensitive to the way they receive and process information.

Again, here we are with this idea that students with disabilities are not in and of themselves a homogeneous population. Students who have autism are different than students who have intellectual disabilities, are different than students who are deaf or hard-of-hearing. And all of those students can co-occur with other priority populations.

>> DON GLASS: Okay. So building on Priority Area 1 is, then, Priority Area 2, which is about instructional design and innovation. Research in this area can run the gamut from teachers doing action research for practitioner inquiry all the way up to external program evaluation designs that are quasi-experimental.

So part of the focus here is looking at teaching and learning. Some sample research questions in this area would be how do the arts promote learning for diverse students? As Jenna pointed out in the earlier section, with specific focus on which art forms and for which

sets of students? So that we're making sure that learning is working for everyone and trying to understand how that works.

Then, what instructional strategies work for whom and under what conditions? We think that is a particularly important thing because an instructional method doesn't necessarily work for everyone. There may be -- you may need to do some adaptations or modifications or provide different options to be able to get students to the same learning goals.

So if you're -- you should take that into consideration that interventions, when put into different contexts, may look a little bit differently. So that has to be taken into consideration in your design.

So some of the things that are considerations or what we're calling moving-forward steps for this priority area, encouraging people to measure not just the outcomes, but processes, about how things work, that are valuable to the arts education field. So this would include arts knowledge, skills, and engagement. And not just measuring outcomes, like math, English language arts. Let's make sure we actually do measure things that are of value to the field, or where we have good evidence that there may be some contributions to, for example, social/emotional learning.

We also would love to have more of an understanding -- and this relates to literature reviews, but also designing the conceptual framework around study design, about how to understand and test the learning science mechanisms behind the teaching and learning, interactions with diverse learners. We want to know how teaching and learning actually works and how we can test different pieces of that. That will help us see how it works for different students under different conditions.

Another thing we learned partially looking through that big table of what was in the What Works Clearinghouse is that we should really think leveraging the single case and RCT design expertise through collaboration with the special education research field, and strongly consider and use the What Works Clearinghouse technical documentation. That stuff exists on the website. It's very well thought out. It's in complete alignment with the standards they use to review the studies. It's not just as a gatekeeper for getting into a database. It's there to help you do some really rigorous designs, if they match the type of research questions that you're exploring.

Then, I think, finally, in this Priority Area 2, in addition to doing these quasi-experimental studies, we want folks to also consider methodologies that are focused on more practical type of measurements. That's useful for practitioners, and data used for improvement. There's a lot of movement in the evaluation field and in developmental evaluation, and also in the educational field about improvement science, thinking of other ways to get at measuring and

improving instructional design, that's not necessarily an RCT or quasi-experimental, but it's just as rigorous in terms of its measurement methodology.

One thing we're particularly interested in in the Kennedy Center and encouraging out in the field is we want to coordinate and test instructional designs in multiple contexts or networks to increase both the numbers, so a bigger "N" to do more complex statistical analyses, and also because we want to be able to test the reliability of the implementation. It's a little bit different than testing fidelity. We understand things may work in different contexts for different learners. So recognizing that there may be some variance in how something is implemented in different places puts us more into looking at reliability rather than fidelity.

All right. Then, the Third Priority Area, which is effectiveness, efficacy, and scale-up, these are usually the larger-scale studies and probably need to have a good amount of funding to pull these off. The types of research questions in Priority Area 3 revolve around what is the impact of arts education for diverse learners in varied settings? And what are some of the core characteristics of effective arts programs for students with disabilities? These are kind of typical questions you'll get for external program evaluation. If you've gotten a U.S. Department of Education grant, they're always looking for impact and outcome measures, and also interested in understanding what some of these core characteristics or indicators are.

Part of that is developing reliable tools that can be used by others to measure. We also want to be able to use the tools to say, if we've created an intervention, we have some evidence it works at one site, but how do we design a study to test it at multiple places so that we know it works in different contexts?

So some of the moving-forward points for Priority Area 3, thinking about identifying and defining indicators of potential impact in research designs, as well as the program characteristics that are most likely to support effects of the arts on students with disabilities. So doing some of that work about what does it actually look like, either drawing from the literature or doing some research, and then using some of your findings doing factor analysis trying to figure out what kind of measures are actually working for us that can be used in multiple settings or across different projects.

Several of our authors in our Thought Leader Group reminded us to resist the constraint to narrowly evaluate only what works. That would be kind of what the What Works Clearinghouse is kind of pushing. And to be empowered to investigate basic questions on how the arts support development of people with disabilities. Part of that is perhaps thinking about mixed methods, but also realizing that we need some solid research around how things actually work for young people.

Not everything is about whether it actually has necessarily an impact or not.

Related to that is consideration or suggestion to use approaches in large-scale studies other than random controlled trials and quasi-experimental designs, especially considering mixed-methods designs. There are some other new designs out there gaining popularity. So RCT is not the only thing out there. So thanks to statistics and some really good statistical modeling methodologies, we can do things in some different kinds of ways.

But again, it really depends on what your research question is, and that should drive the decisions you make around what kind of research design.

So if you are interested in more of a qualitative view on something, I would design something that had more of a mixed-methods.

Then, one of the things we really want to push, and we would love to get involved with other groups who are also doing research and collaboration, is to develop research partnerships with special education researchers to piggy-back on or add value to existing larger scale studies.

One of the things we learned at the Kennedy Center was meeting with the NIH around neuroscience and music. One of the things the researchers were saying is, hey, we have these well-funded learning science labs. We have large-scale grants. We already have access to respondents through our IRB's. There are some places for, if you work with us, to add some questions onto an instrument. I mean you have to go through the proper channels and get IRB approval, but they seem to be open in general to the idea of taking advantage of the setup that's already there. That could be a strategy for the arts education field, since there's limited funding, specifically for arts eds grants, but there's much more funding in the special education research field.

>> JENNA GABRIEL: Great. So the priority areas that Don and I have outlined and our writing group outlined in this publication are broad opportunity. They're not meant to be prescriptive, but instead a call to action in education. We refer to this as a living document, because the idea isn't, hey, guys, we published the Kennedy Center's plan to advance this field; but, rather, we've had this collective response from the field around areas that we should be devoting attention.

Our Thought Leaders gave us some very specific recommendations, and together we put these out into what we're calling milestones and directions. The idea behind this is they're not specific actions; though, there are, of course, actions inherent in getting to this milestone. The idea is these are places that as we move the field forward we can look at and say, did we meet? What did that mean? What did that do for the field?

We grouped these milestones into three avenues. The first is a direction to contribute to the literature, both in research, practice, and in policy.

We kind of imagined that this is starting early with the literature reviews. Right? So drawing on the fields that form our foundation. Right? Looking to establish fields like special education, arts education, human development, disabilities studies, curriculum and instruction, these big -- some of the arts therapies, these big interventional and education science-y fields that inform our work. And from those literature reviews, being able to do some gap analyses and figure out where research should go next.

We also wanted to see these combined into an online database somewhere where researchers and practitioners in the field could find the literature.

And we wanted to push on the work that's being done that the rigor be upped. Right? So that these peer-reviewed articles could withstand some of the evaluation in the What Works Clearinghouse.

This might eventually lead us toward a series of publications that form the literature in the field. We recognize to get to a book series or to a journal, a medium step might be a themed issue. So looking at some of the established journals in special education, like in *Exceptional Children*, or *Teaching Exceptional Children*. Could one of those be about the arts and special education?

The second thing that we felt was an important direction was to generate professional organizations and interest groups.

Some of the things that we talked about were a Division of Visual and Performing Arts within the Council for Exceptional Children; to potentially having a special interest group at the VSA Intersections Conference that was specifically interested in research; to having a very large professional organization, AERA, having a special interest group that focused on the arts.

And then, finally, to develop higher education pathways for early-career researchers, so thinking about whether we start with workshops for graduate students at universities; whether eventually the field is funding fellowships for peer dissertation to contribute to this body of literature; to whether there are, then, interdisciplinary personnel prep grants.

I'm going to actually take us back a couple slides and just show these pathways one more time, because I think it's really important you think about the relationship between these three directions and each other. Right? They're not designed to stand alone.

So when we have an established journal in the field, we've now incentivized young researchers to contribute to this body of literature, because our field's journals will have the same prestige that the *Teaching Exceptional Children's* journal has. When we think about interest groups at our professional organizations, we're doing that with the idea that it's in these breeding grounds where young

researchers meet their mentors and figure out where they'll pursue their doctorate, and where they're seeing programs and innovative instructional approaches that they can be evaluating. All of this together is our hope for moving the field forward.

This is an ambitious agenda. Before we get into Q & A, I think it's really important that we speak briefly on that. No researcher or institution can do this on their own. The hope is that your organization is not simultaneously trying to fund interdisciplinary personnel prep grants and write the journal and support a special interest group in a new, professional organization. The idea is that hopefully you're looking at this and you're looking at the priority areas, and you're thinking about how your work might be contextualized within this, what specific milestones you or your institution or your funding body might be able to take on to help collectively move this field forward.

So with that, this is our contact information. The link you see at the bottom is the Research and Evaluation team page. This publication is available online there. It is also available online through the Office of VSA and Accessibility.

We would welcome some questions and the opportunity for discussion about this publication for the rest of the time we have today.

>> EMILY THIELL: We have now reached the question-and-answer portion of our webinar. If you haven't already, now is the time to enter a question into the Q & A box, or raise your hand. Now, to get started.

The first question is: How can I be sure that I'm measuring processes and outcomes valuable for the arts education field? Do you have any suggestions on how I can start tracking valuable data?

>> JENNA GABRIEL: I'm going to kick the "how" of this to Don. We're sort of both laughing, and I'm pointing at him. I would chime in simply to say that I think all data is valuable, especially in a young and emerging field. We put the "what works" on quotes on this. I would say resist the urge to evaluate only "what works," alluding to the What Works Clearinghouse.

But I think it's really important that researchers and practitioners resist the urge to only evaluate things they think they know will lead to a positive outcome. There's this reticence to be proven wrong in a field where we're very sensitive about the work that we do. I would simply say I think at this point all information is really valuable, what works, what doesn't. If it doesn't work for this kid, might it work for a kid whose learning profile is different?

>> DON GLASS: Yeah. I would say it's a big area and a big question. The idea is perhaps there's a tendency for many funding agencies to ask the arts education field, particularly, to not only pay attention to students with disabilities, but also to measure the impact of the program work on an instrumental outcome, like in another

subject area; which is okay if you're doing arts integration work, but I guess our reason why we put that discussion point into our document is we don't want people to forget that the arts have something valuable intrinsically to share, and you can learn from those.

So my suggestion is, at least if you're designing some kind of assessment tool to assess arts learning, I would look to the National Core Arts Standards at least as a conceptual framework around that. They're doing a lot of work around these cornerstone assessments that could potentially be useful for you to use, or at least have some guidance about how to design those things, so that you get actual student-level learning data related to the understandings, knowledge, and skills related to a particular art form, or the cross-cutting competencies or the connections between the art forms.

There's also a lot of work going on in the field right now looking at noncognitive outcomes, or social/emotional learning. People talk about growth mindset, grit. I mean there's a lot of scales available there.

I know there's a lot of people who -- there are several sites who have received the Arts in Education Model Development and Dissemination Grants from the U.S. Department of Ed who are very interested in developing and testing out some measures around social/emotional learning, so affect. The Kennedy Center, we're working on a couple different scales, one that is a general engagement scale where young people who come to our performances, and also another scale that we're using where teaching artists are going out in residency settings.

So we're looking at ways to measure arts thinking, engagement in the arts, behavioral, cognitive, and affective, and also looking at the arts learning outcomes.

One other point is if you are working on a project where you are doing arts integration, I think there are actually quite a few, particularly I'm thinking about English language arts, there are a lot of assessments that already exist in the English language arts, or assessments for language proficiency, that you could take advantage of if you are interested in also measuring those instrumental outcomes. You don't have to invent everything. There are things that already exist in other areas. There's a good amount of work going on in the arts education field. To develop it, we're refining some of these tools.

>> EMILY THIELL: Great.

We have another data-based question. It's we have a hard time keeping our data consistent across our programs. How can we ensure that our data that we received is used consistently across the board?

>> DON GLASS: Yeah. I mean that's a pretty common problem. We talk about that a lot here at the Kennedy Center because we have a lot of different programs and, also, work through networks of

programs who work in their own communities and contexts. The Kennedy Center has a relatively light touch in terms of program design, but it's more about convening people and sharing knowledge.

So in a lot of those instances, there are different kinds of final reporting tools or tools we've been experimenting to ask them to fill out. There is I would say -- I mean it's pretty tough. One of the things to look to in terms of some sort of guidance, particularly when you're asking questions about demographics, is to look at what some of the federal agencies have done in terms of how you ask questions about gender or ethnicity. Those items have been tested with thousands and thousands and thousands of respondents. It's good quality stuff.

I'd also say look at some other existing examples of large-scale things, like the National Endowment for the Arts has an arts participation study. Those items have been tested, and there may be descriptive material around the items that help people understand what the different -- what the words mean in the items, so that there's less of a chance of misinterpretation.

I know there are a bunch of groups working in these larger scale mapping, or online data-sharing things. For example, Ingenuity out of Chicago is working with the Chicago Public Schools and the arts community around there. The Geraldine Dodge Foundation is working with schools in New Jersey. They're all struggling with trying to figure out how to ask these consistent -- and the Kennedy Center, as well, figuring out how to ask some consistent types of questions and helping, in some sense, figuring out ways to proctor people so we get the most accurate information as possible.

Another thing, I would take a look at the Ingenuity artlook website. They have some interesting ways of representing data. But you can look at the types of fields, and I think you can probably backtrack and see what kind of questions they ask, as well.

Part of it is, I know what Ingenuity did there is they had a whole group of people, this big collective impact project. They actually had to go out and do some training with folks who were actually the data inputters, who were a liaison at a school, or a representative at an arts organization. So all these people had some sort of training. So they had some common knowledge about what the items were actually asking for and some advice about how to get access to that information, if you didn't know it already, or at least some guidance.

>> EMILY THIELL: We have a teaching-related question. It's what's your favorite evidence-based arts and special education teaching tool that you can encourage teachers to use in their classroom?

>> JENNA GABRIEL: That's a great question. So I would say -- I'll start this, I guess. I would start by saying that it's an interesting question in large part because there are not currently

any evidence-based arts and special education practices. So what I think our arts teachers do so expertly when they think about strategies for students with disabilities is they look to the evidence-based practices that special ed teachers use and think about how either to integrate the arts into that strategy -- right? So this idea of, like, an arts-based differentiated instruction. Or they think about how that strategy can be used to deliver arts content, instead of academic content.

So I think about some of the strategies that we know are particularly effective for students with autism. Right? So we know that it's particularly effective to design a structured classroom environment where routines are predictable for students, where transitions are supported and kids have advance notice. We know that it's helpful to have visual schedules up on the wall that support a child's journey through their instruction day-to-day.

An adept art teacher who is supporting students with autism in her classroom might take those strategies. Right? So she has visual representations on her wall that says, first, we start with a welcome song, and then we go into today's activity about "X", and then we go into this activity. So a student in her classroom can quite literally go to the visual schedule and say, all right, first, we did this. That's done now. Now it's time to do this. So she's drawing on the special education literature to make her art content more accessible for students with disabilities. So I'm a big proponent of stealing shamelessly for those established fields. And for the purposes of this webinar, I would also be a big proponent of evaluating shamelessly how effectively that is working in our classrooms.

From a more arts integrated standpoint, I talk a lot about arts-based differentiated instruction, so ways that we're thinking about how we design our lesson content, how we make decisions about the processes by which we will deliver that content, and how we think about creative products that our students can use to demonstrate their understanding back to us. And we think about ways the arts can support that.

>> DON GLASS: Yeah. Thank you for starting out, Jenna. You gave me some time to think of some good examples, one of which is -- I think Rob Horowitz is actually on this webinar; that the innovation grant that he was working on with District 65 in New York City, which is a self-contained special education school district, they were working with a lot of students on the autism spectrum. A lot of that was figuring out particular instructional strategies, or strategies and/or techniques, to work in different contexts under different conditions and different art forms. So there is some research with that. I think this is the area he's finishing up. I think a chapter is actually going to come out in the book in November around some of that.

>> JENNA GABRIEL: I think we actually have one of the program administrators for that project. This is the Everyday Arts for Special Education project in New York.

>> DON GLASS: Yeah. Jenna worked on that, as well.

>> JENNA GABRIEL: I actually taught with them when I was in New York.

>> DON GLASS: The other thing, going back a little in history, but it sticks in my mind, the VSA Start with the Arts site in El Paso, Texas. I think it was around 2009 or so. They had an Arts Education Model Development and Dissemination Grant. They were doing a lot of work with bilingual teaching through the arts. So they're teaching literacy in elementary school. They're using a lot of puppetry, picture study kind of strategies, in addition to supporting reading comprehension. What happened in that study was they saw for the district it didn't seem to have -- it had an effect, but it wasn't really a huge one. But when they disaggregated the data and looked at how the strategies worked for students with disabilities and English language learners, we actually saw much more of an effect there. It's a good example of, like, why we just get the data so we can tell what's working for whom, but also how sometimes summary data kind of hides the story inside.

If we want to pay attention to what diverse learners are doing, we need to design our studies around asking questions or collecting data around that, so we can see what's actually happening.

I actually can't remember the authors of the study, but it was actually pretty fantastic because it gave some background information about the strategies, but also showed how these arts, they can be used for everyone, but it was particularly useful for these two priority populations.

>> EMILY THIELL: And our last question: Thank you so much for publishing your research. To read more on this field, where do you suggest I first start?

>> JENNA GABRIEL: That's a great question, too. I would say take a look at the -- so in this guide, we have the names not only of the core authors who contributed to the writing of this publication, but also in the back you'll see the 20 or so Thought Leaders who contributed to the thinking and discussion that formed the foundation of this. So I would encourage you to look at their bodies of literature. Right? All of these people are active researchers. Don mentioned Rob Horowitz and the i3 grant that he's evaluating in New York City. I would look at the work of Alida Anderson at American University. She's doing a lot of arts integrated work around language and literacy development. She did some work with Kate Berry at UT Austin and Jean Crockett at the University of Florida.

I would also encourage you to look -- we spoke about some of those foundational fields. Right? So the places where they might not be looking specifically at educational outcomes, but where they're

looking at interventions related to the arts and related to students with specific disabilities, that you can start to make a tie between some of those social/emotional outcomes and learning readiness. So I would say there's some great work specifically with theater and social skills intervention, as Matt Lerner's work at SUNY Stony Brook, Blythe Corbett at Vanderbilt in Nashville. Those are very, very off the top of my head. Sharon Malley has published some work specifically around visual arts education that's really useful.

>> DON GLASS: I have a bit of a background in universal design for learning. So there's some publishing around that. It's not a lot of research. It's more scholarly work in trying to make the conceptual framework connections. That would be a great place to do some actual research about providing different -- if we recognize that all kids learn in different ways, what can we learn from perhaps that framework in terms of thinking about how do we design measures that capture different options or different pathways to learning. So it can become very complex when you're thinking about differentiation and providing options. How do you design a study that can kind of capture that kind of stuff? But I think reading in that kind of realm can give us some ideas about strategies to do that.

>> JENNA GABRIEL: I remembered as soon as I passed the mic over to done that Sharon Malley and Jean Crockett actually are editing a handbook in the arts and special education. It's a field first. It's coming out, I believe, later this fall. I think they're publishing it.

>> DON GLASS: The NAEA, National Arts Education Association, has some books on at least instructional strategies that Beverly Gerber published a while back. I think it's been revised. That's a really great place to look for instructional strategies.

So we're very interested in that. But also, like, how do we -- how do these things work for different kids? That's the research component of it. So that's the area that we want to grow. We know there is some practice going on, but we want to be able to understand how the learning mechanisms work and how teachers can take something and apply it into their own context reliably; and also, have some research study to show, you know, that this actually is, hopefully, a powerful, exciting way for kids to -- or at least one way for them to learn.

>> JENNA GABRIEL: If this Map does its job, then within a year or two, or couple of years, there will be more literature reviews and there will be a greater body of work to be referring people to.

>> EMILY THIELL: With that, that concludes today's webinar. I'd like to ask you, our webinar participants, to keep this window open following the webinar, where the survey will generate on the screen. Your feedback is always appreciated.

Thank you for joining us. For questions or comments, please contact me by email at ECTheill@Kennedy-Center.org or by phone at 202-416-8742.

Have a nice day.

(Webinar concluded at 4:01 PM ET.)

* * * * *

This is being provided in a rough-draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translations (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

* * * * *