This study describes the 1992-93 Chapter 1 Developer/Demonstration Program, Learning to Read through the Arts (LTRTA), and evaluates the effectiveness of its implementation. The program offers intensive holistic reading and reading-oriented arts instruction to Chapter 1-eligible students, using an interdisciplinary, thematic approach that integrates a total arts program with a total reading and writing program. The program employs the services of reading teachers and artist/teachers, who provide eligible students with 2.5 hour workshops 2 days every week. In 1992-93, each class of LTRTA students received 64 days of instruction, for a maximum of 150 hours of instruction. Four classes were serviced at each of the eight LTRTA school-based sites, resulting in a total of 32 classes receiving LTRTA instruction. Evaluators reviewed program documents, interviewed program staff, observed program sites and classes, and analyzed students' scores on standardized reading tests. The evaluation team identified nine factors crucial to program success: (1) a thematic curricula; (2) flexibility in developing curricula; (3) multi-modal instruction; (4) access to original art and art institutions; (5) ongoing student assessment; (6) a commitment to developing alternative assessment methods; (7) staff development; (8) parental involvement in the program; and (9) school administration support for the program. Staff members agreed that the program had a positive impact on students' development academically, artistically, personally, and socially. (Four tables and seven figures of data are included. Appendixes contain an overview of several 1992-93 sites; criteria for assessing reading, writing, and art; and a parent opinion questionnaire.) (RS)
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Learning to Read Through the Arts (L.T.R.T.A.) is an intensive holistic reading and reading-oriented arts instruction program for Chapter I-eligible students who have scored below the cut-off point on a standardized general education reading test or have performed poorly in the classroom, and for limited English proficient (LEP) students who have been recommended for participation on the basis of teacher ratings or classroom performance. Its overarching goal is to increase students' achievement in reading and writing through an interdisciplinary, thematic approach that integrates a total arts program (one that includes performing as well as visual arts) with a total reading and writing program. It provides remedial, developmental, and enrichment activities and skills, and has been recognized as exemplary at the national, state, and local level. L.T.R.T.A. has been in operation in New York City's public schools since 1971, and is currently under the auspices of the Office of Professional Development and Leadership Training under the Deputy Chancellor for Instruction and Development.

Structurally, the program employs the services of reading teachers and artist/teachers, who provide eligible students with two-and-one-half hour workshops two days every week. During the 1992-93 program year, each class of L.T.R.T.A. students received 64 days of instruction, for a maximum of 150 hours of instruction. Four classes were serviced at each of the eight L.T.R.T.A. school-based sites, resulting in a grand total of 32 classes receiving L.T.R.T.A. instruction.

With each class, the reading teacher uses creative, arts-oriented materials related to a particular L.T.R.T.A. site's theme in the reading/writing workshop, and the artist/teacher provides arts-related thematic activities that are reading- and language-oriented. The classroom teacher assists with either workshop as one or the other needs emphasis, and then reinforces the skills acquired when students return to their regular classes.

This report presents the evaluation findings of the 1992-93 L.T.R.T.A. program by the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA). During this year, the program took place at eight school-based sites, including six SURR schools, and served 890 students. The total number of staff members supported by the program was twenty.

Evaluators made visits to program sites to observe program activities and interview a sample of school and program staff members. As a result of these efforts, the evaluation team identified a number of factors that were crucial to program success in this year's program, as in past years. Those factors were: a thematic curricula, flexibility in developing curricula, multi-modal instruction, access to original art and art
institutions, on-going student assessment, a commitment to developing alternative assessment methods, staff development, parental involvement in the program, and school administration support for the program.

Staff members agreed that the program had a very positive impact on students' development in academic and artistic areas, as well as on their personal and social growth, and most felt strongly that arts education is an excellent vehicle for developing such skills.

Except for grades three and six in 1992-93, students met all program objectives. In reading, grades four and five made N.C.E. gains of 1.9 and 5.7 respectively. Grades three and six had N.C.E. changes of -4.7 and +.1. In writing, all grades showed a mean raw score gain of greater than one (1) on the New York State Holistic Rating Scale—a scale with a total range of one (1) to five (5). A few students had portfolio assessment criteria applied to their work, and guidelines for the alternative assessment project were established. This year was, in effect, devoted to staff development and orienting L.T.R.T.A. to this pilot project. LEP student achievement data as measured by the Wisconsin Design Skills Development Test, a criterion-referenced reading test used to evaluate reading skills development, shows that a high percentage of all the LEP students in L.T.R.T.A. mastered each tested skill. Based on its highly successful record at demonstration sites, OREA recommends that program administrators:

- expand L.T.R.T.A. to serve greater numbers of students throughout the New York City Schools;

implement the portfolio assessment project with three children from each class serviced during the 1993-94 program year, as outlined by program administrators;

- give added emphasis to staff development for classroom and reading teachers in the use of different art media and related arts activities.
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I. INTRODUCTION

PROGRAM BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

Learning to Read Through the Arts (L.T.R.T.A.) is an intensive holistic reading and reading-oriented arts instruction program for Chapter I-eligible students.* Its overarching goal is to increase student achievement in reading and writing through an interdisciplinary, thematic approach that integrates the arts (including performing as well as visual arts) with reading and writing. While remedial help is provided, enhanced skills development and enrichment activities are fundamental to the program as well. L.T.R.T.A.'s success has been recognized as exemplary at both the national and state levels, as well as the local level.

Structurally, the program employs the services of reading teachers and artist/teachers who each provide their respective workshops to eligible students for slightly less than two-and-one-half hours twice every week. The reading teacher uses creative, arts-oriented materials related to a particular L.T.R.T.A. site's theme in the reading/writing workshop, and the

*Chapter I of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act provides federal funding to school districts that offer remedial programs designed to address student needs in basic reading, writing, mathematics, and English-language proficiency. A school is eligible for Chapter I funds if its percentage of low-income students is equal to or greater than the citywide average based on a formula which calculates students' eligibility for free lunches and Aid to Families with Dependent Children (A.F.D.C.). In order to be eligible for Chapter I services, a student must reside within a targeted neighbor and either score below a designated cut-off point on state-mandated standardized reading tests or—as specified by the Chapter I Evaluation Reporting System—be selected on the basis of classroom performance.
artist/teacher working in the arts workshop with the same theme provides arts-related activities that are reading- and language-oriented. The classroom teacher assists with either workshop as one or the other needs emphasis, and then reinforces the skills gained when students return to their regular class. In the 1992-93 program, students were offered 63 days of instruction, for a maximum of 150 hours of such instruction.

L.T.R.T.A. has been in operation in New York City's public schools since 1971, and is currently under the auspices of the Division of Instruction and Professional Development.

PROGRAM FUNDING AND SITES FOR 1992-93

At the beginning of the 1991-92 program year, a restructuring of program sites was recommended as part of a three-year effort to improve Chapter I programming in selected schools. The Division of Funded Programs asked that the program no longer require students to come to L.T.R.T.A. locations and instead have sites located at each of the eight schools L.T.R.T.A. served. 1992-93 was the second year of the transition to the school-based model, and program managers reported that the transition had been made smoothly. Six of these sites were Schools Under Registration Review (SURRE) schools,* including PS 27/CSD 7 and CES 126/CSD 9 in the Bronx, PS 181/CSD 29 in Queens, and PS 92/CSD 17, PS 304/CSD 16, and PS 314/CSD 20 in

---

*In 1989-90, under the State's Excellence and Accountability Program (EAP), a number of schools were designated Schools Under Registration Review (SURRE) on the basis of substandard and declining performance over three years on any one state standard. SURRE schools are required to form school-based planning teams to prepare school plans designed to bring them up to standard.
Brooklyn. The program also served two non-SURR sites in Manhattan—PS 11/CSD 2 and PS 20/CSD 1. Total program funding for 1992-93 was $1,099,350.

**STUDENT ELIGIBILITY AND STUDENTS SERVED**

Student eligibility for program participation remained the same as last year. Chapter 1-eligible students who scored below the cut-off point on a standardized reading test or performed poorly in the classroom were eligible to take part in the program. This also included limited English proficient (LEP) students (who are exempted from standardized testing) on the basis of teacher ratings or classroom performance. Ultimately, the decision as to which eligible students would be served was left to each principal at the specific school housing the program. A total of 890 students were served in 1992-93, with about one-third of the students in the fourth grade. Table 1 gives the distribution of the student population by grade.

**PROGRAM OBJECTIVES**

L.T.R.T.A. program objectives for the 1992-1993 school year were as follows:

- Each grade served will achieve a gain of one (1) N.C.E. as indicated by pre- and posttest scores on the Degrees of Reading Power (D.R.P.) Test.

- Program participants will demonstrate improvement in writing skills as measured by the New York State holistic rating scale.

- A selected group of students will have portfolio assessment criteria applied to their work.
TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT POPULATION BY GRADE
L.T.R.T.A. 1992-93

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>STUDENTS/GRADE</th>
<th>PERCENT/GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest percentage of L.T.R.T.A. students were in the fourth grade.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) is responsible for evaluating the Learning to Read Through the Arts program and has done so for a number of years. OREA's purposes in conducting the 1992-1993 program evaluation were to describe program implementation, and assess program impact on student achievement in reading and writing. To achieve these aims, evaluators:

- reviewed program documents and materials;
- interviewed program staff and classroom teachers to gather information about program organization and funding, the curriculum, and parent and staff development activities;
- made classroom and site observations of instruction, teacher/student interaction, and overall program implementation; and
- analyzed students' scores on standardized reading tests as well as students' responses to a questionnaire pertaining to the students' attitudes and feelings towards the L.T.R.T.A. program.
SCOPE OF THE REPORT

Chapter II presents evaluators' findings regarding L.T.R.T.A. implementation for the 1992-93 program year. Chapter III discusses student outcomes, and Chapter IV presents OREA's conclusions and recommendations for the program.
II. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

PROGRAM STRUCTURE

Sites

O.R.E.A. evaluators visited four of the L.T.R.T.A. program sites during the 1992-93 school year. Program sites were clean and well-maintained, and classrooms were well-illuminated, adequately heated and ventilated, and equipped with shelves, storage lockers, and moveable furniture. All site classrooms displayed vocabulary lists, art terms, synonym-antonym charts, student tests and compositions, and teacher-made materials. Student art work was exhibited in classrooms and throughout much of the schools. Art work included self-portraits, paintings, murals, printing blocks, blueprints, photographs, models, and pottery.

Staffing

In 1992-93, project funds supported a project director, two teacher trainers (one of whom acted as an on-site program coordinator), and one hourly office aide based at the program's central office located at P.S. 156 in the Bronx. The teacher trainers traveled to the various school sites at a minimum of once every two weeks, and administrative/staff development meetings were held once a month. School-based staff included eight reading teachers and eight arts teacher/professionals.

The reading teachers and artist/teachers each provided their respective workshop to eligible students for slightly less than two-and-one-half hours twice every week. Students came to the
program as a whole class, along with their classroom teacher, and the class was then broken into halves, with one half attending a reading workshop and the other half attending an art workshop. After approximately one hour and ten minutes, students switched to the other workshop. In the afternoon, the process was repeated with another class. Each class was selected for participation by the principal within eligibility guidelines.

While in the reading workshop, the reading teacher used creative, arts-oriented materials related to a particular L.T.R.T.A. site's theme and connected words and concepts to the material and/or arts objects. As a follow-up to this activity, the reading teacher read aloud to the students, and had the students read aloud as well, using material that incorporated the words and concepts they had been introduced to earlier. During the arts workshop, the artist teacher worked with the same theme, and guided the students as they did a particular arts activity. Throughout the activity, the artist teacher linked the students' actions to words and concepts. The classroom teacher assisted with either workshop as one or the other needed emphasis, and then reinforced the skills gained when students returned to their regular class.

**Factors Critical to Program Success**

Observations and interviews conducted by OREA evaluators resulted in the identification of a number of factors that manifested the program's philosophy and were crucial to its success. These critical factors are described below.
Thematic curricula. During the 1992-93 program year, the theme of multiculturalism linked all program activities. This concentration provided both depth and focus for program activities, and was also utilized by classroom teachers in other subjects, thus enhancing the interdisciplinary nature of the program. However, while specific themes used during the 1992-93 school year at the various sites were related to the focus on multiculturalism, they were also varied. For example, P.S.27 in the Bronx used the themes "Our Changing World" for their third grade students and "Folk Art and Folktales" for their sixth grade students to help them consider alternative patterns of relationships between individuals, and between individuals and their communities. The theme "A Sense of Place" utilized at P.S. 314 in Brooklyn was meant to help students gain a greater appreciation for connections among and between their "world" and the world of others.

This approach permitted schools utilizing L.T.R.T.A. to focus on many different subject areas within a single theme. Classroom teachers applied this method to subjects such as social studies, math, and science. For example, a classroom discussion of animals in science at P.S.27 was integrated with a social studies discussion on Nigeria, while in the L.T.R.T.A. reading workshop, the students were reading about African folktales, and in the L.T.R.T.A. art workshop the students were classifying and painting animals. Appendix A provides an overview of various site themes that the schools emphasized during the 1992-93 school year.
Flexibility in developing curricula. Because L.T.R.T.A.'s holistic instructional approach is unique, teaching materials are often generated by the collaborating team at each site, making good use of the creative energies of each team member and highlighting the importance of a team approach to instruction. This encourages the teachers to integrate curriculum and to be creative in developing lessons students will enjoy, since they know they have considerable control and flexibility in making their lessons.

Structurally, the reading teachers met weekly with either the project director, program coordinator, or teacher trainer to develop curricula in reading, language, and writing for each site. Although L.T.R.T.A. curriculum guides were not developed this year, practical courses of study in ceramics, crafts, dance, filmmaking, graphics, music, painting, photography, printmaking, puppetry, sculpture, theater, works on paper, jewelry, and reading/arts units related to particular media were.

The staff-generated materials developed for the specific needs of students resulted in instruction that was accessible and easily handled. Many L.T.R.T.A. students, accustomed to failure, doubted their ability to complete various projects. However, because lessons were designed with particular cases in mind, success became a greater reality for these students. This experience with successful learning transferred readily to reading and writing instruction, since children came to gain confidence in themselves. Learning was now seen as interesting and exciting, and not something to be feared.
Multi-modal instruction. L.T.R.T.A. taps students' various strengths through its multi-modal instruction, which incorporates all of the learning modalities: visual, aural, tactile, and kinesthetic. Teachers have noted that using a multi-sensory approach has meant that children who are not successful in one modality have a chance for success in another and that mastering simple, concrete skills motivates and enables lower-achieving students to generalize from these experiences.

For example, as students went through the process of creating particular artifacts, they also developed and verbally expressed feelings and meanings which were in turn translated into written words and ultimately into complex, abstract ideas. This progression from concrete, experiential art-based tasks to more abstract reading/writing skills was linked through reading and writing activities which were all centered around a theme. This process was described by an artist teacher in the following manner:

Broad themes are chosen so that we can incorporate many things. Painting, for example, requires working with such concepts as planning, measurement, space, form and (as)ymmetry. We work with all of these concepts in both our reading exercises and our art exercises. This gives us the opportunity to relate these concepts to the different ways these issues are handled by different people.

Consequently, L.T.R.T.A. staff overwhelmingly felt that working with specific mediums was helping students to strengthen their reading and writing capacities. For example, interviews indicated that staff felt that when students worked with their hands, they underwent a sensory experience that stimulated thought, verbal and written expression, and feelings of self-
worth, as well as an appreciation for detail.

**Access to original art and art institutions.** In addition to the workshops, students participated in field trips and special events at least once a month. These trips reinforced classroom and workshop lessons, and showed the students that learning can go on outside of the traditional classroom environment. Groups ranging in size from 25 to 65 students, accompanied by one or more of the L.T.R.T.A. teachers and the classroom teacher(s), visited various cultural institutions throughout the city, including the American Museum of Natural History, The International Center of Photography, The Brooklyn Academy of Music, and The Alvin Ailey Studio.

These outings were designed to be an extension of the curriculum and thus to coincide with teacher-prepared materials and classroom lessons. After the trips, students went on to create their own work and shows, and through displaying their creations self-esteem was boosted. As one reading teacher noted, students respond well to field trips:

African dance was one of many topics covered this year by the L.T.R.T.A. program, so the whole class went on a field trip to a dance studio. The dancers answered the children's questions and even came to visit them at our school. This was a wonderful experience for the children.

**Ongoing student assessment.** At the beginning of each school year, L.T.R.T.A. reading teachers obtained the previous end-of-the-year Degrees of Reading Power test results for each L.T.R.T.A. student. In addition, the Wisconsin Reading Skills Development tests were administered to all students for purposes of diagnoses and prescription. A holistic writing test was also
administered to all students, and classroom teachers "flagged" particular student problems that the tests may have missed.

These assessment activities enabled the teachers to begin developing a complete student-skills profile. Staff also monitored student cognitive and writing development through individual student folder-portfolios. In this way, a record of personal gains was maintained for each student's use.

Program commitment to alternative assessment. During the 1992-1993 school year, the L.T.R.T.A. program began a pilot project aimed at incorporating alternative forms of assessment. One particular form, portfolio assessment, was chosen for implementation by the program, and program administration, staff, and classroom teachers held discussions throughout the year regarding execution of the portfolio system. The discussants felt that certain educational issues would be addressed through this new assessment technique, such as: (1) having children use self-reflection as a form of critical thinking through such activities as having them help in the selection process of the pieces to be included in the portfolio, and write pieces that reflect on work already included in the portfolio, (2) having children understand the criteria by which they are being judged, (3) having assessment tailored to outcomes so that assessment more accurately reflects children's performance, (4) and having "guidance" be the primary teacher-student mode of interaction rather than "directing".

Regarding overall administration of the system, it was decided that (1) three program sites would each pilot alternative
assessment with three children, (2) the portfolio system would be expanded to all sites by the end of the program's third year of implementing the project, (3) the classroom teacher would be responsible for the writing aspect of the portfolio, and (4) the reading and artist teachers would handle their respective areas within the portfolio. In addition, the entry categories (the fundamental categories by which the materials to be placed in the portfolio would be organized) and the criteria for assessing the examples of reading, writing, and art in the students' portfolios were established (see appendix B). The entry categories established were standardized test results, performance samples, and teacher observations. Finally, it was decided that performance samples would be entered into the portfolio on a "beginning, middle, and end" of term basis for the purpose of evaluating progress over time.

Although guidelines for the alternative assessment project were established, portfolios were not fully implemented with the children in 1992-93. This year was, in effect, devoted to staff development and orienting L.T.R.T.A. to this pilot project.

**Staff continuity and stability.** Of the eight L.T.R.T.A. staff members who were interviewed (four reading and four art teachers), four had thirteen or more years' experience teaching with the program and the other four had six or more years teaching in the program. Of the four classroom teachers who completed the OREA survey, three were first-year participants in the L.T.R.T.A. program, while the other teacher had three years' experience in the program.
This continuity of teaching and L.T.R.T.A. staff has facilitated extensive interaction and coordination among staff members, and has resulted in an integrated curriculum that benefits the students. This continuity has also extended to collaboration with other arts organizations working in the L.T.R.T.A. site schools, resulting in shared resources and expanded opportunities for students to attend performances and visit art institutions.

**Staff development.** Throughout the 1992-93 program year, the L.T.R.T.A. central program office provided ongoing professional development to all staff members. Every month, the project director and/or the Program Coordinator conducted a workshop in L.T.R.T.A. methodology at one of the eight program sites. For example, seminars were offered in such subjects as authentic assessment, the role of participating classroom teachers in the bi-weekly meetings, the writing process, team building, cooperative learning, whole language, oral reading, thematic teaching, using literature, comprehension skills, and sharing and developing reading and writing activities in the reading/language-oriented arts workshops. In addition, a pre-service training orientation dealing with class schedules, the role of participating classroom teachers, program articulation with classroom instruction, program themes, administrative procedures, workshop management, and evaluation procedures was offered at the beginning of the year. This training process was described by an L.T.R.T.A. reading teacher in the following way:
We all meet at the beginning of the year to coordinate our activities. The state's, the district's and the school's curricula goals and objectives are reviewed and an appropriate thematic planning frame is drawn. There are also weekly meetings throughout the year that are used to articulate and coordinate activities.

The success of L.T.R.T.A. staff development has been confirmed by the attitudes expressed by program staff and classroom teachers to evaluators. For example, all L.T.R.T.A. staff members interviewed for this report indicated that they had attended orientation and training workshops and had found them useful. Training topics considered most useful by the staff included: (1) how to coordinate and integrate activities (i.e. the curricula with the theme and the workshops with the classroom), (2) different teaching styles, (3) getting kids to work in groups, and (4) the reading and writing processes.

In addition, three out of four of the classroom teachers interviewed stated that they attended L.T.R.T.A. orientation/training, as did one principal. The aspect of training considered most valuable by the classroom teachers was the instruction on integrating art with the regular curricula; the topic considered most important for future training programs was art [medium] training. All of the teachers felt that they were more than adequately trained to participate in the program, and rated the cooperation between classroom teachers and L.T.R.T.A. staff as good to excellent.

Finally, L.T.R.T.A. held a conference/exhibition as a culminating professional development activity. The annual conference/exhibition was held on May 26, 1993 at Bank Street.
College of Education, and was attended by over 280 participants.

**Parental involvement in the program.** As in past years, parental involvement was an integral part of the L.T.R.T.A. program in 1992-93. Parents were invited to attend and/or assist with class trips, student performances, parent-teacher conferences, workshops, and open houses. Since parent involvement was generally greatest during student performances, L.T.R.T.A. staff used this opportunity to confer informally with parents.

In addition, the local Parent Advisory Councils (PACs) held workshops, including both staff/parent discussions and lectures, approximately every other month for a total of five meetings during the year. As evidenced by staff comments regarding PAC meetings, parents were enthusiastic about the program and its impact on their children. The PACs gave parents the opportunity to learn more about the L.T.R.T.A. program, share personal artistic materials with the program, and learn techniques useful at home to further their childrens' education.

In May of 1993, the L.T.R.T.A. program coordinator sent questionnaires to the parents of participants to elicit their opinions about the program. (An example of the questionnaire is attached to this report as Appendix C.) Parents reported that L.T.R.T.A. had helped their children improve their attitudes toward, and skills in, reading.

**Administrative support for the program.** Staff agreed that there was much enthusiasm within the school for the program. School administrators provided space, worked out schedules, and
targeted classes for the program, and were seen as very supportive overall. Furthermore, the degree of flexibility provided by these administrators allowed efficient handling of problems which were unique to the program. For example, administrators at the L.T.R.T.A. school sites helped to assure that the program's numerous trips went smoothly, and found the hall space that was needed to display an extraordinary amount of student artwork.

TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' RESPONSES ON PROGRAM IMPACT

Teachers

The teachers (N=12) at each school site were asked to use a 5-point scale to indicate how strongly art education had affected their students' development in academic and artistic areas, and in personal and social growth. As shown on Table 2, overall ratings were high, indicating that these staff members felt that the program was having a positive effect on student performance.

Students

In addition, students (N=99) were asked to indicate the level of agreement/disagreement they had with a series of statements using a four-point scale, with a rating of one (1) indicating a high level of disagreement and a rating of four (4) indicating a high level of agreement. Student responses, as shown in Table 3, indicated a high degree of positive feelings towards the program. For example, the statement that "I am reading more at home now" received the lowest level of agreement, (a mean of 3.3), yet was still on the strongly positive end of
TABLE 2
Learning To Read Through The Arts
1992-93
Indication of Ways Arts Education Affects Student Performance
Ratings According to Staff Experiences and Observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC AND ARTISTIC AREAS</th>
<th>Artist Teacher</th>
<th>Reading Teacher</th>
<th>Classrm Teacher</th>
<th>Overall Rating by Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=4)</td>
<td>(N=4)</td>
<td>(N=4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Developing students' artistic expertise</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Improving students' reading</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Improving students' overall academic performance</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Developing students' 'higher thinking' skills</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Analyzing and interpreting</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Developing students' aesthetic appreciation</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC AND ARTISTIC AREAS RATING BY TEACHERS</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL AND SOCIAL GROWTH AREAS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Developing self-discipline</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Developing self-confidence and self-esteem</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Increasing their ability to cooperate with others</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Increasing their ability to express themselves verbally</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Developing leadership skills</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Developing a personal point of view</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Developing higher standards for themselves</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL AND SOCIAL GROWTH RATING BY TEACHERS</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall Rating by Teachers | 4.98 | 4.95 | 4.80 |

* Rating by classroom teachers and arts resource persons: 1 = low, 5 = high
* Overall ratings of the two categories "Academic and Artistic" and "Personal and Social Growth" were tied at 4.90.
* "Developing students' aesthetic appreciation" and "Developing self-confidence and self-esteem" were rated highest as ways student performance was affected.
# TABLE 3

Learning to Read Through the Arts Program
1992-93
Student Attitudes and Feelings Towards the LTRTA Program* by School and Program-Wide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS AND STUDENT RESPONSES REGARDING LTRTA</th>
<th>PS11 N=27</th>
<th>PS20 N=27</th>
<th>PS27 N=21</th>
<th>PS314 N=24</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I always look forward to going to this program.</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think this program makes me smarter.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learn how to do new things in reading class.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have learned to read much better.</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am reading more at home now.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to study again with the reading teacher.</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a lot of fun in the reading class.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel good about my work in the art program.</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned a new interest in the art class</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned how to do new things in the art class.</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to study again with the artists.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a lot of fun in the art class.</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rating by students: 1 = high disagreement, 4 = high agreement

- "I learn how to do new things in reading class" was most highly rated by students.
- "I am reading more at home now" was rated lowest by students. Yet, this statement received an overall agreement rating equal to 83% of the highest agreement rating possible.
the scale. Numerous statements received the highest rating possible (e.g., a mean of 4).

Students were also asked two open-ended questions regarding what they considered to be the best thing about their reading and arts classes. In the case of reading class, students offered different types of responses, but a few dominated. Forty-eight percent of the students indicated that the best thing about their reading class was "reading," and "learning to read better." Adding the second most-often-given response, "my teacher," accounts for 61 percent of the responses, and adding the third most-often-cited response to the question, "learning new things," accounts for 75 percent of the student responses. As for the "best thing about their arts class," eighty-four percent of the students said that it was learning an artistic skill and creating with that skill.
III. STUDENT OUTCOMES

NUMBER OF HOURS OF INSTRUCTION

Students received nearly five hours of workshop instruction per week in the L.T.R.T.A. program, for a maximum of 150 instructional hours throughout the year. Figure 1 shows the number of hours of instruction students received in 1992-1993, as reported on the LEAP forms prepared for all Chapter I-funded programs. As indicated in this figure, 80 percent of the students received the maximum or close to the maximum number of hours of instruction (130-150 hours). Students who received fewer hours of instruction may have had poor attendance or may have entered the program late in the academic year.

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN READING

Degrees of Reading Power Scores

Program impact on general education students' reading level was determined by comparing their performance on the Degrees of Reading Power (D.R.P.) test in the spring of 1992-93 (the "posttest") with their score on the D.R.P. test from the previous spring (the "pretest"). Analysts converted these pre- and posttest D.R.P. scores for full-year students to normal curve equivalents (N.C.E.s), * and then sorted these results by grade.

*By converting the citywide reading scores to N.C.E.s, it is possible to determine students' progress in relation to that of the national norm group. Students who show N.C.E. gains have improved their standing in relation to the norming group. Those who show no gain have remained in the same relative position, although they may have improved their absolute reading ability.
FIGURE 1
STUDENTS SERVED BY HOURS OF INSTRUCTION
L.T.R.T.A. 1992-93

An additional 50 students had less than 60 hours of instruction.
1992-93 gains. L.T.R.T.A. students' average N.C.E. scores by grade changed from 1992 to 1993, as shown in Figure 2. Figure 3 shows that every grade made gains in these average scores in relation to the national norm except the third. Although L.T.R.T.A. classes by grade ranged from the 13th to the 19th national percentile in N.C.E. scores*, and thus continued to be behind when compared to the national average, improvement in this range did occur during the 1992-93 program year in all but the third grade. The overall N.C.E. gain for the entire population was 1.34.

As in past years, a number of factors may have contributed to the negative N.C.E. gain experienced in the third grade, and the minimal gain in the sixth grade. One is that the D.R.P. given in grades three and six is the state-mandated PEP test, which has slightly different test items than those used in other grades. N.C.E. gains were negative in both of these grades last year as well. Another associated factor is that citywide N.C.E. scores for these grades for 1992-93 similarly declined, as shown in Figure 4. Finally, the fact that the program is located at predominately SURR schools undoubtedly affected the program's results. Students in these schools are, by definition, less able readers than those in non-SURR schools. The fact that a substantial number of students made gains as a result of the L.T.R.T.A. program redounds to the credit of this innovative

---

*The national percentile ranking of a specific N.C.E. score can be found in Degrees of reading Power: D.R.P. Norms published by Touchstone Applied Science Associates, Inc.
FIGURE 3
MEAN NCE CHANGE BY GRADE
L.T.R.T.A. 1992-93

GRADE: ALL GRADES
STUDENTS: 835

GRADE 3: 144
GRADE 4: 227
GRADE 5: 195
GRADE 6: 65
FIGURE 4
MEAN NCE SCORE CHANGES BY GRADE
COMPARING L.T.R.T.A. TO CITYWIDE*
L.T.R.T.A. 1992-93

*1992-93 PRELIMINARY CITYWIDE RESULTS
MEAN DRP UNITS CONVERTED TO NCE SCORES

5.7
5.5
5.0
4.5
4.0
3.5
3.0
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
-0.5
-1.0
-1.5
-2.0
-2.5
-3.0
-3.5
-4.0
-4.5
-5.0
-5.5
-6.0
-6.5
-7.0
-7.5
-8.0
-8.5
-9.0
-9.5
-10.0

1992-93 PRELIMINARY CITYWIDE RESULTS
MEAN DRP UNITS CONVERTED TO NCE SCORES

---

38
program. Figure 5 provides the mean N.C.E. gains by school.

Mid-instructional units. The mid-instructional unit score is used to estimate the readability level of books and other materials and to predict the kinds of reading materials students will be able to understand with a moderate degree of instructional support. The children's ability to read books at particular readability level thus reflects their actual ability to read as compared to their ability to read and understand passages in isolation as presented in standardized reading tests.

The mean mid-instructional scores for L.T.R.T.A. students in grades three through six in 1992-1993 are graphically represented in Figure 6. The height of the pre- and posttest bars provides a measure of the average level of materials L.T.R.T.A. students can read, and shows the average student growth in reading ability during the academic year. These scores demonstrate that the average reading ability of L.T.R.T.A. students improved over last year's in all grades. The entire population's average reading ability (grades 3-6) improved 7.87 D.R.P.s from 1992 to 1993.

Limited English Proficient Students (LEP)

LEP student achievement in the L.T.R.T.A. Program was measured by the Wisconsin Design Skills Development Test, a criterion-referenced reading test used to evaluate reading skill development. All students identified as having a limited proficiency in English were given a battery of five or six pre-

*As shown in Figure 6, A Duck Is A Duck has a D.R.P. mid-instructional score of 32, and is considered a beginner's text. This book is, thus, among the lowest D.R.P.-rated children's book that has ever been scored.
FIGURE 5
MEAN PRE- AND POST NCE SCORE BY SCHOOL
L.T.R.T.A. 1992-93
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FIGURE 6
MEAN PRE- AND POSTTEST DRP MID-INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT SCORES
L.T.R.T.A. 1992-93

GRADE: STUDENTS:
GRADE 3 148
GRADE 4 227
GRADE 5 195
GRADE 6 65

ANIMAL FARM
TREASURE ISLAND
CHARLOTTE'S WEB
SUPER-FUDGE
NATE THE GREAT
A DUCK IS A DUCK

and post-reading skills tests related to the general level of English proficiency each student was estimated to have achieved to date. Each test analyzed a particular reading skill in one of the following areas: word attack, comprehension, study skills, self-directed reading, interpretive reading, and creative reading. Students attaining a grade of 80 percent or higher were considered to have mastered that skill for the level being tested. Each test had ten to fifteen questions and was graded on a pass/fail basis. Skills acquired by L.T.R.T.A. LEP students during the school year as manifested by the results of the pre- and posttests are shown in Table 4.

**Table 4**

**Skills Acquired by LEP Students as Indicated by Results from the Wisconsin Design Pre-Tests/Post-Tests L.T.R.T.A. 1992-93**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>P.S. 304</th>
<th>P.S. 20</th>
<th>P.S. 314</th>
<th>P.S. 92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># OF LEP STUDENTS</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from the data reported, a high percentage of all the LEP students in L.T.R.T.A. mastered each skill. Out of 66 LEP students, 59 (89 percent) mastered all five skills, and each student mastered at least one of the skills for their level. P.S.314 and P.S.92 were particularly successful as all LEP students at both schools mastered all five skills.

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN WRITING

Writing Test Holistically Scored

1992-93 L.T.R.T.A. students were given a writing test in the fall of 1992 (pre-test) and a similar test in the spring of 1993 (posttest), which were holistically scored by L.T.R.T.A. program readers. A five-point scale that measured how well the students communicated in written form was used. The results from these pre- and posttests were compared so as to determine overall changes in the students’ writing ability. Readers were asked to pay special attention to each writing sample’s coherence, sentence structure, and sequence, and the writer’s awareness of the audience. Each writing test was independently scored by two readers. A one-point discrepancy between readers was acceptable. However, discrepancies of more than one point required a third reader. The program reported that very few of the cases required a third reader, indicating a high degree of inter-rater reliability.

Figure 7 presents, by grade, the holistic writing test changes (gains) between the pretest and the posttest given L.T.R.T.A. students during the 1992-93 program year. The writing achievement data shown cover a total of 812 general education and
LEP students in grades two through six. Students in all grades demonstrated improvement in writing skills as measured by the New York State Holistic Rating Scale; thus, the program met its objective in this achievement area. The mean gain for all students was a raw score of 1.55.
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

The Learning to Read Through the Arts program is an established, well-defined program which integrates reading/writing and arts instruction into a theme-based holistic educational experience. By using this sophisticated educational approach, the program provides children with a creative environment that allows them to express themselves through a variety of modalities. By encouraging the verbal, physical, and written forms of expression, reading becomes a new and exciting aspect of the learning process. Reading, for the children, is no longer a chore to be avoided, but another way to expand on their immediate activities. This method has also had positive effects on the creative energies of the program personnel and has been a pedagogical model for the school environment as a whole.

A good example of the inventive and progressive character of the L.T.R.T.A. program is provided by the efforts of program management to incorporate alternative means of student assessment. It was felt that having the participants consider the very criteria by which they were being assessed, and become more involved in directing their own education (all goals of an alternative assessment project), would enhance the program’s efforts to meet the educational needs of the children. The particular form of assessment chosen as a pilot project was portfolio assessment, and while implementation of the project with the children was incomplete, expansion of the project is planned for 1993-94.
OREA's review of program documents, observation of program activities, and interviews with program and participating school staff indicated that L.T.R.T.A. was implemented as proposed during the 1992-93 program year, and was well organized and effective at all sites. Program staff were observed to be professional and collegial, and students were engaged and enthusiastic. Staff development was well thought-out and thorough, parents were enthusiastic about the program, and staff as well as classroom teachers supported the program fully. Survey respondents agreed that the program was having a positive effect on students' academic abilities and self-esteem, and that arts education should definitely be a part of each child's academic program.

All program objectives for student improvement in reading and writing were met or surpassed, with the exception of third and sixth grade student N.C.E. gains in reading. As noted in the text of this report, these particular outcomes were probably influenced by a number of elements, including the overall decline in scores citywide, and the fact that most of the program sites were in SURR schools where students are, by definition, less able readers than students in non-SURR schools. The fact that a substantial number of these students made gains as a result of the L.T.R.T.A. program is convincing evidence of the program's effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Since its inception, the Learning to Read Through the Arts Program has produced positive student outcomes and received very
positive program evaluations. Based upon its highly successful record at demonstration sites, OREA therefore recommends that program administrators:

- expand L.T.R.T.A. to serve greater numbers of students throughout the New York City Schools;

- implement the portfolio assessment project with three children from each class serviced during the 1993-94 program year, as outlined by program administrators;

- give added emphasis to staff development for classroom and reading teachers in the use of different art media and related arts activities.
Overview

Site Theme - Grade 3: Our Changing World:

- How communities change
- How our world changes
- How people and families change

The third grade site theme begins with the concept of change. The children explore different kinds of communities and how people live in them. A detailed class mural depicting the neighborhood of the children will be drawn.

A class quilt based on changing seasons will be created to show the effect climate has on communities.

Self-portraits and masks will show the relationship of people and families to the community. Customs and traditions of different cultures will be explored.

The corresponding literature can be found in folktales around the world. The Twelve Months is a Russian folktale. Ah See and the Spooky House takes place in Hawaii. Who am I and The Patchwork Quilt represent people and families. The Big Orange Splot depicts changing neighborhoods.

Site Theme Grade 6: Folk Art and Folktales

Folk Art and Folktales around the world begins with the continent of Africa. African Andinkira patterns will be examined and created as paintings. African folktales and “dilemma” tales will be read. Egyptian-like self-portraits will be another project that will explore life in ancient Egypt. Aesop tales and tales from the Arabian nights will be read concurrently. Masks and collages will deal with the continent of South America. Folktales from that region will also be examined.

Before exploring the continent of Africa a review of where each of us lives now will be given. Developmentally, in art the concept of pattern is taught. The story of The Last Leaf will be read concurrently to introduce the relationship of the arts community in N.Y. to that of another continent. It will also be used as a guide to teach specific patterns in stories.
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Overview

Site Theme - Grade 3: Social Studies Through the Grades

This year the Manhattan II site of Learning to Read Through the Arts, located in the Chelsea section of N.Y.C. at P.S. 11, will have as its theme "Social Studies Through the Grades." The grades we are servicing are 3-6. The 3rd and 4th grades will be studying the Native Americans and the 5th and 6th grades will be focusing first on Ancient Greece.

In Mixed Media the students began the year by creating self-portraits. In the reading workshop, the students are learning "Mapping" techniques and writing their autobiographies.

In November, the 3rd and 4th graders read the story the "Legend of the Indian Paintbrush." Transformation is discussed and critical questions are asked. Mixed Media will be designing Indian skins.

The 5th and 6th graders are reading Greek Myths and creating ancient Greek pottery.

The student in Mixed Media in the 5th and 6th grades created their own designs on Greek Urns. They used paint and textures to do this. In reading they are creating greek myths. (Illustrating and writing).

The 3rd and 4th grade students are designing Native American mats on bamboo. In reading, details are being reviewed and main idea is being taught. The students are writing about their Native American puppets.

Manhattan Site
P.S. 11, District 2
Judith Lorenzo
Debra Jacoby
Overview

Site Theme: One Nation ...Many Flags

This year at Learning to Read Through the Arts in P.S. 92 the children will be exploring festivals, celebrations, folktales, folk songs and cultural events of the different areas from which their families are from. Through music, we will explore the many parts of music in the lives of our ancestors’ birthplaces. Different ways to use music in celebrations also will be explored.

In the music workshop, we will also focus on Native American and Black American music styles.

The students will learn that music for Native Americans served a specific purpose. They sang to certain Gods in order for specific events to take place, e.g. Rain God for rain, Sun God for sun. Spirituals were sung by the slaves to help pass the time and they are based upon Biblical stories.

The different cultures will include Native Americans, West Indians, European and African peoples. Children will read about the different cultures through folklore and create their own stories.

The students will create “Big Books” based upon animal stories. The children will re-tell the stories and illustrate them. The music workshop will be studying “Carnival of the Animals” written by Saint Saens, and the students will create animal pop-up books.
Overview

Theme - A Sense of Place -- Grades 4 and 5

Grade 4

The sub-themes for the fourth grade are "The Nations of New York" and "New York in History." The students will explore their ancestry and learn about the many ethnic groups that have immigrated to New York City. They will explore folk culture of many groups, including their own. This will include architecture, folk art and folktales.

The fourth grade students will learn about the history of New York including Colonial Dutch and the Algonquin Nation and the boroughs of New York City, particularly Brooklyn. They will go on field trips to Brooklyn Borough Hall, the Whitney Museum, the International Center of Photography and the Museum of American Folk Art.

In the visual arts workshop, they will paint signs and symbols of stores and buildings in 'olde' New York and compare them to modern day symbols. They will create self-portraits, Native American weavings and a map project as well as murals of New York scenes. In the reading-photography workshop, the students will photograph portraits of each other, architecture in their neighborhood, in Brooklyn Heights and also in Manhattan. They will learn about American photographers, especially those who photographed New York City.

Grade 5

The sub-theme for the fifth grade is "the Americas, Its People and Their Environment." The students will learn about immigrants in New York and the United States as well as the Caribbean, Mexico and South America. The students will explore the folk culture of the Americas, focusing on the architecture, folk art and folktales. Maps and symbols will also be explored.

Field trips will be taken to the Cooper Hewitt Museum ("The Power of Maps"), the Museum of American Folk Art ("Visiones del Pueblo"), the Whitney Museum, and the International Center of Photography.

Some of the projects in the visual arts workshop will include a Pueblo mural, creating "Tarjetas de Loteria," self-portraits, Latin American shop symbols and a map project. Some of the projects in the reading-photography workshop will include students taking portraits of each other, using the Pueblo mural as background, shooting photographs of neighborhood stores and signs, a pinhole camera project and a blueprint project.

In both grades 4 and 5, visual literacy will be stressed and encouraged.

Brooklyn Site
P.S. 314, District 20
Susan Ledwith
Christine Sinnott
Overview

The Queens site's current theme is "East, West and Beyond," where children examine the relationship in art and literature between eastern and western cultures. Mutual respect flourishes in a peaceful and positive environment as the children learn how different societies influence and improve each other.

In our reading oriented arts workshop the students are creating Asian scrolls and fans as well as designing their own chop (seal). In our reading workshop students read "The Five, Six and Seven Chinese Brothers" and create situation comedies and pop-up books inspired by these stories. They compare eastern and western version of such tales as "The Stonecutter" and "The Fisherman and His Wife", and read Asian stories like "The Crane Wife" and "White Wave", and Western ones like "The Elves and The Shoemaker".

One highlight was our visit to the Isamu Noguchi Garden Museum where the artist visually explored the influence and balance of his Japanese and American backgrounds. The result is a perfect example of the harmony of ideas from East and West.

This month, for the Chinese New Year, we will visit The China Institute, view an exhibit and video and participate in a Chinese calligraphy workshop.

Queens Site
P.S. 181, District 29
Lois Hellman
Frank DiNardo
APPENDIX B: CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING READING, WRITING AND ART IN THE ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT PORTFOLIOS
Manhattan II - Alternative Assessment Criteria

1. Reading:
   Comprehension: Student can summarize the content in his own words.
   Student can make inferences from given information.

2. Dance:
   Creating a dance
   Rehearsing a dance
   Repeating a dance

3. Writing:
   Sentence Structure: Complete/Incomplete/Run on
   Capitalization
   Punctuation
Alternate Assessment Criteria

Reading
Comprehension: Student can summarize the content in his own words.
- Students can make inferences from given information
- Miscue Analysis
- Picks up books readily and reads

Writing
- Sentence structure
  Complete/Incomplete/Run-on
- Use of capital letters, punctuation
- Paragraph writing
  Students can write a well-organized paragraph with a beginning and an ending.

Art
- Children will create an original artwork that expresses a theme.
children will learn a new art technique to be used in the creation of his/her artwork.

- children will learn and use art-related vocabulary, and show evidence of this in related reading/writing to their projects.
APPENDIX C: PARENT OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE
Dear Parents:

We have had the pleasure of having your daughter/son as a participant in the Learning to Read Through the Arts program during the 1992-93 school year.

In preparation for next year, we would like your opinions about the program.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Susan Ledwith
Site Coordinator

[Child's Name]

School

Parent/Guardian's Name

1. Do you think Learning to Read Through the Arts has helped your child improve in reading?
   - Very Much ✓
   - Some __
   - Not at all __

2. Has the Learning to Read Through the Arts program helped your child's attitude toward reading?
   - Very Much __
   - Some __
   - Not at all ✓

3. Do you think other children would benefit from the program?
   - Very Much ✓
   - Some __
   - Not at all __

4. What did you like most about the program?
   - [Handwritten answer: They teach to read better]

5. What are your recommendations to improve our program for next year?
   - [Handwritten answer: To keep doing it]
Queridos Padres:

Hemos tenido el placer de haber tenido a su hija/hijo como participante en el programa Aprendiendo a Leer a Través de las Artes durante el año escolar 1992-93.

Preparandonos para el próximo año, nos agradaría tener su opinión respecto al programa.

Gracias por su cooperación.

Sinceramente,

Susan Ledwith
Site Coordinator

Nombre del Niño

Escuela
Firma del Padre/Encargado

1. Usted cree que Aprendiendo a leer a Través de las Artes ha ayudado a su niño/a mejorar en la lectura?

Bastante _______  Algo _______  Nada _______

2. De qué manera ha sido ayudada la actitud de su niño/a para la lectura a través de Aprendiendo a leer a Través de las Artes?

Bastante _______  Algo _______  Nada _______

3. Usted cree que otros niños(as) podrán beneficiarse de este programa?

Bastante _______  Algo _______  Nada _______

4. ¿Qué le gustó más de este programa?

En el caso de que la ayuda a mejorar, Bastante

5. Cuáles serían sus recomendaciones para mejorar nuestro programa el próximo año?

En el caso de que los ayuden mucho en la lectura
Dear Parents:

We have had the pleasure of having your daughter/son as a participant in the Learning to Read Through the Arts program during the 1992-93 school year.

In preparation for next year, we would like your opinions about the program.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Susan Ledwith
Site Coordinator

1. Do you think Learning to Read Through the Arts has helped your child improve in reading?
   - Very Much □
   - Some □
   - Not at all □

2. Has the Learning to Read Through the Arts program helped your child's attitude toward reading?
   - Very Much □
   - Some □
   - Not at all □

3. Do you think other children would benefit from the program?
   - Very Much □
   - Some □
   - Not at all □

4. What did you like most about the program?

5. What are your recommendations to improve our program for next year?
May, 1993

Dear Parents:

We have had the pleasure of having your daughter/son as a participant in the Learning to Read Through the Arts program during the 1992-93 school year.

In preparation for next year, we would like your opinions about the program.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Susan Ledwith
Site Coordinator

[Signature]

Daniel Perez 3/4 [Signature]
Child's Name          School          Parent/Guardian's Name

1. Do you think Learning to Read Through the Arts has helped your child improve in reading?
   Very Much [ ]            Some [ ]           Not at all [ ]

2. Has the Learning to Read Through the Arts program helped your child's Attitude toward reading?
   Very Much [ ]            Some [ ]           Not at all [ ]

3. Do you think other children would benefit from the program?
   Very Much [ ]            Some [ ]           Not at all [ ]

4. What did you like most about the program?
   [ ] Help my child read very much.

5. What are your recommendations to improve our program for next year?
   [ ] Keep the program going year after year. It helps a lot of children improve reading.