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ABSTRACT

Differences of Year-Round and Traditional Calendar Elementary Art Programs

by

Ashley Forgey

Dr. Lisa Bendixen, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Education Psychology
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The purpose of this study was to investigate the differences of year-round and traditional-calendar elementary art programs due to scheduling. By examining three elementary art specialists in two opposing schedules, the goal of the current study was to discover how the art specialists implemented their programs in different schedules. The research questions were: Did the art specialists have different professional experience or development training? How were the two programs different in time and scheduling? Were the class characteristics different? Did the instructional methods differ?

The findings concluded that implementing an art program in a year-round setting was more complex than a traditional calendar due to changing class schedules and difficult class combinations. The obstacles of year-round scheduling and the solutions to each are discussed using Shulman’s Pedagogical Reasoning and Action Model (1987).
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Personal Background

A university professor, who spent many years teaching elementary school, once told me the classroom teachers’ general opinion on being an art teacher. When things got hectic and discouraging, they would always say, “Well, it could be worse. I could be the art teacher.”

I questioned the meaning behind this phrase, and she explained it was because art was a “dumping ground” for students. The teachers dropped off the students and picked them up after the art period. This repeated several times during the day. I had to laugh from the relief of the idea, being an art teacher myself, that others felt my pain. It was reassuring that others noticed, although not comforting to think of my profession as a prep without substance.

Over the course of the semester, I spent many moments in class trying to explain to this professor how my schedule was not only a ‘dumping’ of classes every hour, but a rotating one with different groups of students coming and going on ‘track breaks’ because I taught at a year-round (YR) school. I had to embody every aspect of the effective teacher in wasting no class time and being prepared to finish a lesson before my
students left on break, coordinate materials with schedule changes, and planning ahead so I would not be caught storing unfinished work until the students returned. Since I have only taught as a year-round elementary art specialist (AS), I asked if this was a problem for nine-month ASs, or if they had conflicts unique to their schedule?

Current Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the differences of year-round and traditional-calendar elementary art programs. In a year-round schedule, the elementary art specialist works an extended contract and the students rotate through track breaks every three weeks during the twelve-month calendar. The constant shifting of classes and students during the year is unlike the traditional setting where the students and class schedule is stable. How the difference in scheduling impacts the art program has never been studied in year-round education or art education.

According to the California Department of Education (1999), year-round education, with multiple tracks, was adopted to decrease overcrowded school populations. The benefits of adopting this schedule are divided breaks, pacing of instruction, multiple vacations and salary enhancement. These breaks or vacations are experienced by the regular classroom teacher and student. Unlike them, the YR AS faces the disadvantage of planning a program around multiple beginnings and endings while working through those breaks as an extended contract employee. In reviewed studies, extended contract employees expressed feelings of possible burnout due to the less frequent breaks and higher demand on planning (Emmett, George, & Quinlan, 1987).
In managing an elementary art program, sequencing of instruction requires a deep understanding of what students learn and how they are connected with a hierarchy of complexity by which students come to understand those ideas (Hobbs & Rush, 1997). Given an understanding of these ideas in sequencing, three factors can challenge the ability of an art specialist to build a hierarchy of complexity: previous learning of the students, environmental conditions of learning, and school schedules (Callahan, Gibson, Harder, Kauchak, Keogh, Orlich, & Pendergrass, 1996). With an overcrowded school environment and changing schedule it is hypothesized in this study that implementing an art program in a year-round schedule is a more complex endeavor than the stable traditional-calendar.

To determine the differences of a year-round art program caused by the schedule, a case study approach was used to examine six elementary art specialists (ASs) in the Clark County School District. Among those six participants, three were year-round and three were traditional calendar, and all were required to teach the same curriculum based on national standards and the Discipline Based Art Education program (Greer, 1984). By examining three ASs in two opposing schedules, the goal of the current study was to discover how the ASs implemented their programs in different schedules. Did the ASs have different professional experience or development training? How were the two programs different in time and scheduling? Are class characteristics different? Do the instructional methods differ? These four questions were used to determine where the differences in schedules may affect the programs.

In this study, the literature review of chapter II introduces the aims and objectives of year-round and art education. None of the literature found combines the two subjects, but
the information from each group will highlight the characteristics of each. Shulman's Pedagogical Reasoning and Action model (1987) is reviewed to reinforce how teachers arrive at their pedagogical content knowledge that determines how they teach their content area within the contexts of their teaching situation.

The methods chapter describes the case study approach to selecting the six sites and participants. The qualitative methods of data collection and analysis are given.

Chapter IV, the findings, describes each case studied with a cross-case comparison of the participants' answers to the four research questions. How the programs differ in the four main areas is discussed and then validated in a member check.

A final discussion in Chapter V sorts through the findings' relevance to the larger issues of year-round education and art education. The pedagogical reasoning and action model is used to configure how year-round art specialists adapt their programs to the schedule.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study was to investigate the differences of year-round (YR) and traditional-calendar (TC) elementary art programs. The rationale for this study was derived in part through the lack of research on Year-Round Education (YRE) and art education (AE). The following literature review introduces the reasons, benefits, and disadvantages of YRE. A detailed description of what an elementary art program entails provides background information in art education. Pedagogical Reasoning and Action is described using the work of Shulman (1987) to illustrate how teachers arrive at their pedagogical content knowledge. His work is used in this study to understand at what stages YR ASs must consider the schedule in developing their art programs. A pilot study of three YR ASs in the Clark County School District describes how the schedule impacts the art program. Finally, a description of the purpose, research questions, and hypotheses of the study conclude this chapter.

Year-Round Education

This section of the paper is a collection of information about the reasons, benefits, and disadvantages of year-round education (YRE) in general. The main reason for YRE is overcrowding, meaning the student enrollment is greater than the capacity of the school building. By adopting a year-round schedule, the school is able to operate without the
entire population of students in school. This is to avoid the effects of overcrowded classrooms. The effects of overcrowding in the classroom are described next.

**Overcrowding**

One main impact of overcrowded schools is limited classroom space, resulting in ineffective education. In a commission’s report on overcrowding of New York City schools (Burnett, 1995), students and teachers recognized the negative conditions crowded classrooms created.

Crowded classroom conditions not only make it difficult for students to concentration their lessons, but inevitably limit the amount of time teachers can spend on innovative teaching methods, such as cooperative learning and group work, or indeed on teaching anything beyond the barest minimum of required materials. In addition, because teachers must constantly struggle simply to maintain order in an overcrowded classroom, the likelihood increases that they will suffer from burnout earlier than might otherwise be the case. It is unquestionable that overcrowding has a direct and often severe impact on the logistics of the school day, forcing changes in schedules and making disruptions and noise part of normal operating procedure. (pp. 35-37)

This description of the impact overcrowded schools has on teachers and students illustrates why schools need to correct the problem. YRE is viewed as a possible solution to this problem. While it may enable a school to house fewer students at one time, it does not mean class sizes are reduced to an appropriate level or that teachers experience less burnout or more ease in instruction. Whether class sizes are smaller due to the YR
schedule will be examined in each of the settings by comparing the class sizes of the YR and TC classes.

Definitions

In order to understand the language of this study, it is important to define the terminology relating to school scheduling. The following terms were gathered and listed by Linda Rogers in her master’s project, The Pros and Cons of Year-Round Education at the Elementary Public School Level (1993). Following the definitions, research studies on YRE offer a description of characteristics and beliefs of YRE by parents, teachers, and students.

Traditional School Calendar (TC) – is organized during a nine-month basis, usually beginning in August or September, lasting until late May or June. Students attend school during these months, except for excused or unexcused absences, followed by a summer vacation (Zykowski, 1991).

Track – “... a group of students who are assigned to attend school during the same instructional session. These students are on-track and off-track at the same time” (Fardig, 1992).

Single-Track Design – all students attend school and vacation at the same time, but unlike the traditional school calendar, these days of attendance and vacation are dispersed over the entire twelve-month calendar to reduce the amount of memory loss over a long summer break (Bradford, 1991; Fardig, 1992; Peltier, 1991).

Multi-Track Design – students attend school YR, but are assigned to different tracks. These tracks rotate in and out of school sequentially. Multi-Track designs are usually implemented to reduce overcrowded schools because a group of students are always off
campus. This enables the remaining teachers and classes to use the empty rooms and rotate through classrooms based on availability (Bradford, 1991; Fardig, 1992).

**Vacation or Track Break** – any period of time when students are not in school (Fardig, 1992).

**Regular Session** - any amount of time students are in school for the required number of days (Fardig, 1992).

**Burnout** – “a state of physical and/or psychological exhaustion brought about by unrelieved, excessive occupational distress which may be accompanied by feelings of decreased accomplishment and a sense of depersonalization toward students” (French, 1992).

**Elementary School** – for the purpose of this study, an elementary school is a school with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth grade.

**Extended Contract** – any personnel who works the traditional number of workdays, plus extra ‘add-on’ days to due to the YR schedule, and are compensated through daily or hourly rates in an extended contract.

**Time-Out Days** – YR employees who work extended contract are able to take ‘time-out days’ for vacation. In the case of an extended contract teacher, such as an AS, a substitute is called in to cover the day’s classes during the teacher’s vacation days.

**Pros and Cons of YRE**

With a staggered multi-track schedule, a school’s student population is increased by about 25% above building capacity (California Dept. of Education, 1999). Some considered benefits of this schedule include: division of the traditional summer break,
pacing of instruction, multiple vacation options for students and staff, and opportunities for salary enhancement. These benefits will be kept in mind while investigating the setting of the YR schools.

Nowhere in the research is smaller class sizes listed as a benefit. It can be easily misinterpreted that class size will decrease since students will be out on vacation at any given time during YR schedule changes. In a survey for the Riverside Unified School District, the respondents complained of large class sizes despite the change to a year-round schedule (Barrett et al., 1992).

Some known disadvantages of this scheduling include requiring three more “start-ups” and “endings”, additional storage space for teachers and students, additional demands placed upon cafeteria, custodial, maintenance, instructional support and administrative services, graduations, parent conference days, annual music, athletic and other events must be given specific accommodations, and no common vacation break longer than three weeks for all staff and students (California Department of Education, 1999, p. 5). These disadvantages could cause potential variances in the schedule, affecting the ASs in the YR schools, and could therefore create a difference in their programs.

Teacher Attitudes

In a comparison of teachers’ attitudes across different types of scheduling, those teachers who believe there are benefits from a YR schedule are those who have experienced working in a YR school (Shields, 1996). According to Weaver (1992), teachers in YRE do feel less burnout because of the frequent breaks and better student retention. Student absences were fewer and they were able to continue higher educational
learning by covering for one another during breaks. Teachers also believe the frequent breaks result in more quality instruction (Emmett, George, & Quinlan, 1987) and that the breaks allow them to plan and reflect (Oberg & Shields, 2000). In addition, teachers felt the break time allows for ample and productive instruction while in regular session (Kneese, 2000). It will be interesting to compare these attitudes with the YR ASs’ opinions of the breaks and opportunities presented by the schedule, since they do not have the frequent breaks for reflection and planning.

Advantages of Track Breaks

In the year-round schedule, continuity of learning is enabled by the frequent breaks, instead of the long summer vacations, and students have the option to attend intercessions during track breaks to work on areas they need help in (Serifs, 1990). Regular teaching staff may also sub at their own schools during their track breaks. This is believed to provide more quality substitute instruction since the teacher is more familiar with the curriculum and school (Brekke, 1992). Since YR ASs do not participate in track breaks, it will be relevant to consider these advantages for regular classroom teachers when compared to the time-out days of the YR ASs.

"Rainbow" Extended Contract Teachers

The research discussed previously, regarding teachers’ attitudes, included only regular classroom teachers who take track breaks with their students. A different type of teacher is called a “rainbow” teacher who is in school more days and paid accordingly. These “rainbows” are on extended contracts and work across the track breaks (Kneese, 2000). The YR ASs in this study are “rainbows.” For them, track breaks are aspects of teaching that require extra planning, not vacation time.
The track breaks do offer challenges in organization for those who stay through the breaks because of the frequent “start-ups” and “endings”. Teachers who report stress and burnout in YR schools are generally extended contract. The reoccurring stopping and starting of instruction sessions disrupt their programs (Emmett, George, & Quinlan, 1987). These ‘rainbow’ teachers must serve the current population of students while preparing for students returning from track break (Oberg & Shields, 2000). Since these teachers do not go off track with students, burnout can be a risk without the ‘personal renewal’ or reflection time offered to other regular track teachers (Worthen & Zsiray, 1994, p. 12). Since YR ASs are ‘rainbow’ teachers, they are at risk of burning out. How they maintain their art programs during the frequent “start-ups” and “endings” of the schedule is a consideration of the study, and how they avoid or maybe experience burnout while doing so is an additional consideration due to these previous studies.

Segregation

Some studies show that the parental preferences of track break schedules might initiate segregation within schools. When student performances are compared by track in multi-track schools, the middle tracks, or B-tracks in an A, B, C, tracking schedule, show a substantially lower performance (Cantrall, S. M. & White, J. A., 2001). Parents, who are perceived to be very active in the students’ lives, choose and fill tracks with vacation breaks most similar to the traditional calendar. This grouping of students with attentive and concerned parents creates segregation by track selection. The confirmation of parental concern with track selection and vacation planning was noted in many YRE studies survey parent attitudes (Fardig, 1992; Nygaard, 1974; Pelavin et al., 1979). In a
survey of parents in Cherry Creek, Colorado (Glass, 1992), half said track changes made vacations easier to plan, while one-third felt it was more difficult.

Further believed to segregate, based on achievement, was the selection of track preference by experienced teachers. The teachers with seniority bargain to seek these preferred tracks for the same reason. Over time, the difference in enrollment of these preferred tracks contrasts greatly to tracks with accumulated low-average students. Mitchell & Mitchell (1999) claim that, "educational opportunities afforded by higher achieving peers and better teachers may accelerate student achievement over time" (p. 37). Students whose parents are less involved may enroll their children later and have to settle for the least desirable track. The same track would frequently have the less experienced teachers assigned to it. The reverse situation develops where a large number of disadvantaged students with less experienced teachers are grouped together, further segregating the student achievement possibilities.

Since the YR ASs work with the entire population of the school over the course of many years, and work with the entire teaching staff by coordinating the art program around the schedule, it would be remarkable to find if the YR ASs see a parental and teaching segregation as described above. The segregation of experienced teachers with students from homes with higher parental involvement could impact art programs since the art specialist teaches all classes. The gap in segregated abilities due to parental and teacher choice of track assignment could designate some classes as higher ability than others, and planning would change based on the track of a class.
Conclusions of YRE

The research relating to YRE has focused on students, parents, and regular classroom teachers. Working a YR schedule as an extended contract employee had very little attention in the survey of teacher's attitudes. Most of the studies compared academic achievement across all tracks with those of TC schools. Several studies commented on "rainbow" track teacher and the burnout from lack of frequent breaks (Emmett, George, & Quinlan, 1987; Oberg & Shields, 2000; Worthen & Zsiray, 1994; Kneese, 2000). One study compared the different track test scores and found a difference in academic achievement that was attributed to parental and teacher choice of track assignment (Mitchell & Mitchell, 1999).

Whether the results of other YR studies will be found again in this study is uncertain since the study focuses on a specialty area of art and "rainbow" teaching, which had little prior research attention. Still, it is beneficial for this study to be familiar with past results of YR studies in order to find any similarities or differences in the experiences of YR ASs when compared to other YR teachers. It is important to understand the concepts guiding the YRE movement and to consider if these concepts oppose the ideas of art education program development.

The benefits and disadvantages of the YR schedule, as seen by the general educational community, can help clarify if they are similar for both general and art educational purposes. Since most of the benefits and disadvantages of YR scheduling did not take into account the extended contract, or "rainbow", educators like the ASs, it is important to take these descriptions and test them by comparing the regular TC ASs’
schedule. In the next section, the elements and curricular aims of an elementary art program are described.

Elementary Art

Art education in the elementary school includes more than simple production of art. In a recent National Art Educators Association (NAEA) book, *Art Education: Elementary*, Kay Alexander (1992) gives a description of how art education enhances the elementary school environment:

Art education can go a long way toward teaching young people how to ‘think through’ problems and make decisions about things that require deliberation and judgment… Furthermore, art education can provide satisfactions and enjoyment available through no other avenue, the joys of aesthetic experience. Teaching just the skills of art is not enough to satisfy new and pressing demands for excellence; the new vision of a substantive, rigorous, multifaceted sequential art curriculum is. Furthermore, integrating history, criticism, and aesthetics into a program does not mean sacrificing the considerable benefits of making original art. Such a balanced program offers students and their teachers the best of both worlds. (p. 3)

The inclusion of history, criticism, aesthetics and production characterizes Discipline Based Art Education (DBAE). In order to distinguish the programs of this study, description of the characteristics of DBAE follows.

*Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE)*

W. Dwaine Greer first created concept and coined the term Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) (Greer, 1984). His idea was to develop art education that followed
general education within the context of aesthetic education. “Four disciplines--aesthetics, studio art, art history, and art criticism--are taught by means of a formal, continuous, sequential, written curriculum across grade levels, in the same way as other subjects” (p. 5). His idea of DBAE caught on and was helped by the support of the J. Paul Getty Trust (Hobbs & Rush, 1997). The passing of Goals 2000: Educate America Act by congress in 1993 gave art a place in education as a core subject. The national recognition of art from this act began a movement for national standards in art. The National Art Education Association (NAEA) drafted national standards for art that reflected the ideas of DBAE (Hobbs and Rush, 1997). Later, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002, required all schools to include art as a core subject in order to receive federal funding (Arts Education Partnership, 2002-2003).

The four areas of DBAE - art history, aesthetics, art criticism, art production - have been described by previous researchers.

Art history is the “attempt to verify and interpret art objects made in the past” (Hobbs & Rush, 1997, p. 34). The study of art history allows students the chance to connect with social studies and literature, while valuing the contributions of others around the world through art. The focus is on the work’s meaning and function within the culture.

Aestheticians are “Philosophers who construct theories of the fine arts,” and are concerned with principles of art, like beauty, function, and design, than the art objects themselves (Hobbs & Rush, 1997, p. 34). Aesthetics, at the elementary level, is knowing what one likes and why. The use of sense, emotion, and intellect is aimed at discovering personal tastes, while trying to understand other preferences.
Art criticism emphasizes vocabulary; using it and understanding it. The art critic tries to establish “quality, meaning, and significance of individual works of contemporary art” (Hobbs & Rush, 1997, p. 33). By looking at art, one learns to “see, comprehend, and respond” (Alexander, 1992, p. 5). Students of even the youngest age can be encouraged to describe, analyze, and interpret what they see.

The production of art motivates children to use their abilities in original and inventive ways. It develops skill building and creativity. The creation of art and problem-solving processes that go with the activity of work is the domain of the “artist” (Hobbs & Rush, 1997, p. 33). Working with the elements and principles of design, the artist works within the constraints of the media chosen.

The curriculum of the ASs in this study utilizes the four categories of DBAE in their curriculum. Each of the four categories, which are favored and which are changed, will be a concentration when collecting data to see if the scheduling variances of YR and TC impact the decision by the AS of how much time to spend on each one or what methods to use when teaching them.

Strength of Art Specialists

What is the role of the art educator? ASs are responsible for content, scope and sequence of the curriculum (Hobbs & Rush, 1997). They can adapt and tailor, as Shulman suggested (1987), to the students’ needs. They extend learning from state or district curriculums and develop strong encounters with art (Hobbs & Rush, 1997).

Wiebe (1979-1980) analyzed the impact of art instruction by different staff during the change in Canadian policy of increasing the support of art in schools. She found that the children receiving art instruction from an AS, and not a general classroom teacher,
proved to be more effective. The classroom teachers used curriculum guides. Even with
the aid of an art consultant, they had difficulty understanding and teaching some of the
concepts selected. The ASs spent more time and effort in preparing for the lesson. The
children taught by the ASs excelled in many areas. They “acquired more skills, expressed
themselves more personally, and learned more art concepts and vocabulary” (p. 103). The
ASs, and their level of expertise in these specialized skills, was attributed to the in-depth
understanding of the content.

How much training and what kind of training each art specialist has will be taken into
consideration during the data collection because of the impact expertise may have on the
development of their programs.

*The Standard Art Program*

In comparing the programs of the TC and YR schedules, what constitutes as the
norm for an art program must be considered so any irregularities that may shape the
programs studied, besides scheduling, are known. The National Art Educators
Association printed a manual for administration that defines the customary art program.
Elementary Art Programs: A Guide for Administrators, NAEA (1992), has the most
precise and direct reference about what contextual situations should be expected in
regards to art instruction, equipment, curriculum, etc. It references areas of scheduling,
student progress reporting, facility standards, assessment, administration role,
qualifications of art instructors, and goals and objectives of the program. These
recommendations can be compared to the realities of the contextual situations of the YR
and TC ASs in this study.
The NAEA suggests that student-to-teacher ratios should be 350:1 or 450:1. The ASs should be instructing the four areas of DBAE. The NAEA suggests at least 50 min. a week in art instruction per student, but recommended 100 min. They ask if the class sizes are consistent with the other teachers in the building. Art resources and instructional materials are listed as necessities. They list in great detail what children should learn in art for grade levels K-2 and 3-5, aligned with the National Visual Arts Standards (NAEA, 1995).

The probability that the later criteria of class sizes and instructional time is being given in an elementary school are debated by McGoff (1988). He argues that the likelihood of any of these suggestions being met in the elementary school is improbable. He challenges that art is not a priority; it is often only a preparatory period for the classroom teacher. These preparatory periods are given preference when scheduling the art program. Changes are often made to the schedule with no consideration of the ASs, contends McGoff. What results, he says, is a ‘superficial’ art program due to lack of time to commit to the curricula (p. 45). Whether the programs in the study adopt a format of brief experiences with no depth will be scrutinized.

Time

When time is shorter than needed for an effective art program and the ratio of students to teacher is larger than those recommended by the NAEA, the effect on the program is less time for the art specialist to spend with the individual student. Time is necessary to go in-depth with the ideas of art (Hope, 1999). Just producing art, or talking about art without production, leads to “superficiality” (p. 4). With focus, a student can take the ideas of art and learn to apply them within a variety of media and context. In the
current study, the YR and TC schedules are compared to determine if both allow time for students to reach deep levels of art study and accommodate this effort of the ASs to accomplish those levels.

The idea of time being needed to execute a successful and meaningful elementary art program is proven in research studies of art education with regards to cognition, motivation, memory, and time. The longer time spent viewing artwork, the more young children are able to recognize detailed information in visual art examples (Marschalek, 1983). The more prior knowledge of art history, the duration of stimulus presentation, the nature of task demands, and the level of abstraction in artwork displayed, influences the amount and type of information subjects remember about visual art (Koroscik, 1982).

Through weekly discussions of ceramic pieces, four-year-olds showed greater motivation and participation in working with clay than the control group that had no discussions (Douglas & Schwartz, 1967). When compared, lecture-activity groups of students had higher test scores of Cubism knowledge than the lecture-only group, provided evidence that discussion alone is not enough (Day, 1969). Although the breadth approach of ‘superficial’, unrelated media is more appealing to students, the depth approach of emphasizing concepts through cumulating and sequential experiences results in greater aptitude and ability in spatial orientation (Hoepfner & Silverman, 1969).

Whether the class schedules of the ASs in this study allow for adequate time to implement all four areas of DBAE will be investigated using the research question of how the two programs differ in time and scheduling. Whether the time and schedules have an effect on the way the AS instructs will be probed by asking how the instructional methods differ because of the schedules. In planning for instructional methods,
sequencing the lessons over time is important. How sequencing instruction impacts learning, and the ways in which an art program can be sequenced, are described next. 

**Sequencing**

Sequencing makes learning more manageable and meaningful by building on previous instruction and learning so students can relate to prior knowledge (Callahan, Gibson, Harder, Kauchak, Keogh, Orlich, & Pendergrass, 1996). Sequencing orders the presentation of content over time, considering students' age, prior knowledge, and complexity of the task. "An effective art curriculum revisits the same concepts over and over, each time adding layers of meaning," (Hobbs and Rush, 1997, p. 98). Ahlgren and Kesidou described an unsequenced elementary art program as an "activity-to-activity incoherence" where "one activity follows another with no rhyme or reason" (1995, p. 45). With complex scheduling, an unsequenced art program would seem less hectic to manage, rather than a thoroughly sequenced program that accounts for all the changes during the year's schedule.

Sequenced instruction usually begins with teachers layering lower-levels of knowledge and then building them over time in complexity of task (Hobbs & Rush, 1997). To progress, students must spend time at the lower levels to achieve higher-level learning goals and objectives. While it takes less time to accomplish many lower level goals, it takes more time to finish one higher-level goal.

It is important to view this relationship of task complexity and time when viewing the differences of art programs due to the differences of scheduling class time. While it appears simple to specify and plan objectives in a linear fashion, there are contextual variables that alter or adjust sequencing, such as previous learning, environmental
conditions, and school schedules (Orlich et al., 1996). Given only one class a week with students, it takes longer to reach these higher-level goals than if you see them daily like a regular classroom teacher. When the YR track breaks disrupt the sequence, YR ASs must plan without losing levels of higher-level learning goals and objectives in a YR setting. This links the two research questions of time and scheduling with instructional methods.

Very often, teacher education focuses on subject matter but not sequencing the curriculum (Shulman, 1986). Zumwalt (1989) states that the reality of a first year teacher is that developing one's own curriculum is unrealistic and should plan on “implementing or adapting curricular material” instead (p. 180). Unfortunately, there are fewer curricular models for art than in other subjects (Hobbs & Rush, 1997), making it more difficult for an AS to align standards within context. By asking the participants about their professional experience or development training, the type of training received prior to teaching and the training received since teaching will be investigated to determine where each AS gained their knowledge about developing their program around the two schedules.

Conclusions of Elementary Art

The literature on elementary art details how a program is based on more than production of art (Alexander, 1992). Using Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE), an elementary art program incorporates aesthetics, art history, and art criticism with production (Greer, 1984). An art specialist was found to have a higher understanding of these content areas, resulting in greater acquisition of skills by students than regular classroom teachers instructing art (Wiebe, 1979-1980). The conditions of the class sizes and time should be adequate and similar to those of a regular classroom teacher (NAEA,
1995). The more time spent on activities such as discussion, viewing, and practicing art, the higher the level of depth in understanding and experiencing art (Marschalek, 1983; Koroscik, 1982; Douglas & Schwartz, 1967; Day, 1969; Hoepfner & Silverman, 1969).

Time is needed to spend on low-level thinking activities before complex higher-level thinking tasks are accomplished. An AS must sequence instruction to make it meaningful (Hobbs & Rush, 1997). Without proper sequencing, an art program risks meaningless activities (Ahlgren & Kesidou, 1995). There are few models for curricular planning, or scope and sequence of instruction, in art (Hobbs & Rush, 1997). Teacher training focuses more on subject matter than sequencing (Shulman, 1986). Contextual variables, such as scheduling, alter or adjust sequencing (Orlich et al., 1996). Based on the elementary art literature, it appears that planning a sequential DBAE curriculum around the track changes of a year-round schedule poses a challenge for the AS because it is unlikely any training in curricular planning, especially in a year-round setting, was given.

Pedagogical Reasoning and Action

How teachers adapt their programs to achieve learning involves Pedagogical Reasoning and Action (PRA). To begin to understand PRA, an introduction to the broader concept of Pedagogical Content Knowledge and its components is necessary.

Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK)

The term Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) was publicized by Lee Shulman at the American Educational Research Association’s presidential address in 1985 (Marks, 1990). PCK is unique in that it combines what is known in a subject area with ways to teach the subject. Shulman describes it as a “blending of content and pedagogy into an
understanding of how particular topics, problems, or issues are organized, represented, and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners, and presented for instruction” (Shulman, 1987, p. 8). PCK has two parts: the content and pedagogy (Gudmundsdottir, 1987). The content organizes the subject matter and the pedagogy is how the content is organized for instruction. Teachers reorganize content to take into consideration “students, classrooms, and curriculum” (Gudmundsdottir, 1990, p.47). This reorganization reflects the personal beliefs and values of the teachers’ orientation to their discipline, creating a ‘homemade’ model of teaching (Gudmundsdottir, 1990, p.47). This “homemade” model of YR art programs is precisely what this study expects to find in contrast to a TC art program.

PCK is an important focus for this study since it addresses both qualities of subject matter content and ways of teaching the content specific to the situation. The ASs, themselves, only know their PCK. It is not a body of knowledge that can be found among scholars in the field (Gudmundsdottir, 1987). Since PCK is critical in the analysis of YR and TC specialists, to understand how and why they organize their instruction, distinctions must be made within the knowledge base they are working with (or without).

Pedagogical Reasoning and Actions Model

PCK is what teachers know. ASs’ PCK develops through a process of choices and trials. Shulman (1987) refers to this process as Pedagogical Reasoning and Actions (PRA). He give details about this process from a teacher’s perspective; “Given a text, educational purposes, and /or a set of ideas, pedagogical reasoning and action involve a cycle through the activities of comprehension, transformation, instruction, evaluation, and reflection” (p. 14). To understand the adjustments ASs had to go through to arrive at
the YR art program, PRA will be used to highlight processes involved in establishing a program for a new schedule, or refining it. The process of PRA will assist in understanding how YR ASs develop their own program based on the schedule and their goals for their art programs.

Comprehension. The first stage, comprehension, means the teacher must understand the content or ideas that must be taught (Shulman, 1987). This would require the teacher to have curricular and content knowledge. The ASs must understand what to teach and how the ideas relate within art and other subjects as well. The purpose, such as state standards, district standards, and their relation to philosophical goals of the subject, must be addressed from multiple perspectives, not just the orientation of the AS. This marks the comprehension stage of PRA. Next, the content knowledge must be transformed through pedagogical knowledge.

Transformation. The ability "to reason one’s way through an act of teaching is to think one’s way from the subject matter as understood by the teacher into the minds and motivations of learners," explains Shulman (1987, p. 16). This is the essence of pedagogical reasoning during the transformation stage. Preparing information for the understanding by others is transforming the content so others are interested and able to comprehend it for themselves. Shulman listed the following steps as the process one goes through while transforming information (1987).

Preparation. During preparation of a lesson, the subject matter is dissected for understanding, purpose, and adaptation. This is where any curricular resources are utilized. For example, which cultures will be addressed in a pottery unit? What examples of the cultures life need to be addressed to understand the importance of the art in that
setting? How was symbolic representation used to communicate the values or beliefs of that culture? What were the values or beliefs of that culture?

**Representation.** A teacher decides how to represent a lesson by choosing what order materials and information will be presented to the students for better comprehension. There is more than one approach in presenting an idea. A teacher must decide what analogies, metaphors, and examples, to use for the best comprehension by the students. How would you explain the surrealist movement to a group of second graders? Should examples of portraiture be from the same artists or over a period of time by different art movements?

**Instructional Selection.** The methods and forms used for strategies of teaching are the instructional selections made. Lectures, demonstrations, recitation, or seatwork are some forms of instructional selection that a teacher makes in this process. Will there be slides used for examples of an art historical period? Will discussion of aesthetic value follow the production? How much demonstration of production technique will be given before the students get the chance to explore the material?

**Adaptation and Tailoring.** The lesson is changed to match the characteristics of the student, such as gender, language, culture, motivation, prior knowledge and skill, while using the appropriate version of the lesson for the group of students, or class, not only the individual students. Can the objectives of collage be met by a group of first graders using scissors, or would tearing be more appropriate? What modifications will be made for a class of 36 instead of a class of 18 in the same grade level? Should parts of the lesson be changed to shorten the lesson in time for the track break, and if so, which parts would best be modified without transferring the main concepts of the lesson? To further
understanding this stage, a detailed description of how an expert uses adaptive measures in instruction follows.

Related to Shulman’s adaptation and tailoring process is the idea of educators being flexible and having adaptive expertise. For PCK to be effective, expert teachers must have the creativity to adapt instruction in any situation. Hatano and Inagaki (1986) described adaptive expertise sushi chefs as preparing sushi correctly but with creativity, whereas a well skilled sushi chef would not think out of the norm. Different types of expertise were found when Miller (1978) examined information system designers. The artisan expert designers tend to accept problems and limits. They approach the problem as an opportunity to do “familiar tasks more efficiently” (p. 46). The virtuoso experts looked at client’s problems as “a point for departure and exploration” (p. 46). Following cognitive psychology, this concept of adaptive experts includes “metacognition” which is the “ability to monitor one’s current level of understanding and decide when it is not adequate” (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000, p. 47). An adaptive expert recognizes when the one is not sufficient in an area and therefore adopts a working hypothesis and learns more about the context until a better understanding of the structure is deepened.

Adaptive expertise will be used in examining the ASs’ ability to monitor their own PCK in a YR setting and decide if they have adapted their art program to successfully and sufficiently address the needs of their situation. The concept of adaptive expertise (Hatano & Inagaki, 1986) is important because it goes past the idea of skilled artisan to the concept of lifetime learner constantly trying to achieve better things.

Instruction. Instruction is the section of action in the PRA model. This is where the planning in transformation of the comprehended materials is executed in practice.
Managing, organizing, questioning, interacting, and discipline are a few of the components in instruction (Shulman, 1987). Examples of art are shown, demonstration of technique and qualities of materials are made known, and the production is followed by clean up. After execution of instruction, the process of retrospection emerges.

**Evaluation.** Described by Shulman, evaluation is a process that checks for understanding by student and teacher (1987). Perhaps the instructor overestimated the abilities of the students and needs to break the components of the lesson into smaller, more comprehensible parts. Maybe there were questions raised by the students that the teacher did not have the answer for and must go back to check for understanding of the concepts. Even the method of material distribution might be changed after the evaluation of time use was found to be wasteful. All of these evaluations lead to the act of reflection on teaching.

**Reflection.** Through reflection, a teacher is able to learn from experience. As Shulman explains, it is “what a teacher does when he or she looks back at the teaching and learning that has occurred, and reconstructs, reenacts, and/or recaptures the events, the emotions, and the accomplishments” (1987, p. 19). Through this act, teachers gain PCK that novices acquire over time. A more in-depth look at the act of reflection will bear the importance of this phase.

The work of Schon, *The Reflective Practitioner*, has been used in educational research to explain the knowledge of practice, PCK, that teachers acquire (Munby, 1989). According to Schon, a practitioner brings knowledge-in-practice (content knowledge) and uses it in daily routines. When the routines are not ordinary and challenge the “knowledge-in-practice”, it forces the practitioner to perform what Schon calls
Reflection-In-Action. (Schon, 1983, p. 62). Reflection-In-Action is “a process that enables us to see data differently” (Munby, 1989). If reflection occurs during instruction or evaluation, then the reflection is in-action. Reflection-on-Action, differs from reflection-in-action because it is deliberate, not surprising. Using propositional knowledge, new ideas are arrived at by reflecting after the fact, like Shulman’s reflection (Munby, 1989). Most aligned with PCK, Reflecting-in-Practice is where practitioners are able to ‘practice’ their practice (Schon, 1983). After many experiences with cases, a repertoire of expectations is built, and spontaneous, automatic, knowing-in-practice is increased. Central to reflection-in-action is reframing. Reframing is seeing the events of a confusing situation differently. This process allows the context of learning to be experienced. It alters the way data are seen (Munby, 1989).

New Comprehension. The final section of Shulman’s PRA is when a purpose, subject matter, students, teaching, and self are all viewed differently. Similar to Schon’s reframing, new comprehension allows the teacher to consolidate from new understandings and learn from experience (Shulman, 1987). This process does not happen right away.

Conclusions of Pedagogical Reasoning and Action

Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK), what teachers know about teaching their content area, takes into account the contextual situation of student, classroom, and curriculum. In attaining PCK, a teacher goes through the process of Pedagogical Reasoning and Action (PRA). This process involves a cycle of comprehending the content information, transforming it for the students to understand, executing the designed instruction, evaluating the effectiveness of the lesson, and reflecting on the
experience. With each stages' unique attributes, the PRA model will assist in determining the instances an AS must decide how to adapt the art program to the challenges of planning year-round. Some of the key challenges of planning an art program in a YR schedule were determined in a pilot study of three year-round art specialists in the same school district of this study. Parts of the pilot study assisted in the research questions developed for the current study.

Pilot Study

The idea for this study stemmed from a pilot study I conducted in a qualitative research class during the spring semester of 2001 at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Questions and categories from that study, Elementary Art Education in a Year-Round School Setting, were instrumental at the beginning of this current study.

The study, Elementary Art Education in a Year-Round School Setting, constructed a model for how art specialists managed, organized, and instructed in a year-round setting in the Clark County School District. Three YR ASs who taught TC prior to YR were interviewed, observed, and gathered data from to describe how the YR schedule and the art program was different from a TC schedule and program.

Patterns were found in the areas of schedule, time, art personnel, class size, and art instruction. The schedule for track changes and classes determined when students were in art and with which other classes, if combined. Student-Teacher ratios were larger than district guidelines because of combined classes. In the younger grades, these large class sizes were seen as obstacles by the YR ASs to teach all four areas of DBAE. Activities like discussing art were brief or not arranged. The majority of class time activity was
production. Some of the classes combined were from different tracks, changing the students within a class when their different tracks went on break. Lessons for those classes were shortened to amend the interruption. The students were characterized by their track, believed to reflect the parental preference of enrolling their students on certain tracks that coincided with major holidays, like Tracks I and V. These areas of scheduling, time, art personnel, class size, and art instruction were used to develop research questions for the new study.

The pilot study lacked any comparison with a traditional calendar art program to verify that the characteristics were unique to only a YR setting. For this reason, the current study here includes participants from traditional calendar art programs.

Summary of the Literature Review

In the literature review, the areas of year-round education (YRE), art education, and Pedagogical Reasoning and Action (PRA) were considered. None of these subjects had combined YRE with art education, prior to this study.

YRE is adopted by schools that have a larger student population than the building capacity. Some of the benefits of YRE are frequent breaks and retention of learning over briefer breaks for students (California Department of Education, 1999). For those who work extended contract, the start ups and endings of track changes were difficult and stressful to plan for (Emmett, George, & Quinlan, 1987), causing possible burnout risk (Worthen & Zsiray, 1994). The multi-track schedule created segregation unlike traditional-calendars due to parental and teacher selection of tracks (Mitchell & Mitchell,
1999). This was recognized in the pilot study as a rationale for the difference in artistic ability across tracks.

Within elementary art, Discipline Based Art Education (DBAE) encompassed four main areas of art history, art education, art criticism, and art production (Greer, 1984). Wiebe (1979-1980) found that art specialists (ASs) were able to develop a higher skill level with students than regular classroom teachers who taught art. The standards for an art program were outlined by the National Art Educators Association (1992). McGoff (1988) argues that the art program is not given the quality of instruction as a regular content area, but is treated as preparation period for regular classroom teachers only. The time allowed for art was found important for many cognitive skills, such as memory and motivation (Koroscik, 1982; Douglas & Schwartz, 1967). The sequencing of the lessons, and the time spent with each, was relevant to the ability of students to reach higher-levels of thinking and complexity of tasks (Hobbs & Rush, 1997).

The Pedagogical Reasoning and Action model (Shulman, 1987) outlines the stages teachers gone through while developing pedagogical content knowledge that organizes the subject matter for instruction. This model will be used to identify these stages when a YR AS adjusts the elements of an art program for the schedule.

Finally, the pilot study illustrated how the YR schedule creates an environment where large combined classes force elimination of aspects from the DBAE model. The areas of the pilot study that were impacted by the schedule (scheduling, time, art personnel, class size, and art instruction) will be used to develop the four main research questions for the new study.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate how year-round and traditional calendar art programs differ due to scheduling. Using six elementary art specialists (ASs), three year-round (YR) and three traditional-calendar (TC), a case study approach is used to compare how the ASs implement their programs in the different schedules.

Research Questions

Research questions from the four main areas of Professional Experiences and Development, Time and Scheduling, Instructional Methods, and Class Characteristics were used to investigate the phenomenon of how year-round and traditional calendar art programs differ. Four questions were used to determine where the differences in schedules may affect the programs.

1. Do art specialists have professional experiences or development training that helps them plan their programs around the schedules?
2. How are the two programs different in time and scheduling?
3. Are class characteristics different because of the tracking of students or overcrowded population?
4. Do the instructional methods differ between TC and YR settings?

Hypotheses

It is hypothesized that the year-round schedule poses a more complex challenge to plan and manage than a traditional-calendar program for the following reasons.
• Art specialists lack professional experiences or development in how to implement an art program to the year-round schedule.

• Year-round art specialists have less time to plan their program because they work extended contract without the summers off.

• The year-round schedule is changing constantly, whereas the traditional-calendar is stable.

• Segregation of students by track assignment distinguishes the classes of students and their abilities levels, in addition to the traditional assignments of grade level and teacher.

• Instructional methods are less in-depth in year-round than traditional-calendar because track changes interrupt lessons.

By collecting data in the four categories from the year-round and traditional-calendar art specialists, this study investigates the differences of the two programs and if the year-round art program is more complex to plan and manage than the traditional-calendar art program due to those differences.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD AND SETTING

Method

To investigate the differences of year-round (YR) and traditional-calendar (TC) elementary art programs, a case study approach was used to examine six elementary art specialists (ASs) in the Clark County School District. Using Merriam’s (1998) definition of a particularistic case study, this study focuses on “questions, situations, or puzzling occurrences arising from everyday practice” (p. 29). The question of how YR and TC elementary art programs differ comes from the assumption that changing classes every few weeks due to track rotation would change the art program. The changes and rotations were regular occurrences that might effect the everyday instruction. Descriptive in intent, the case study method for this study was useful in presenting basic information “where little research had been conducted” such as YR elementary art (Merriam, 1998, p. 38).

In order to present basic information about the differences of YR and TC elementary art programs, multiple sites were chosen and then cross-case analyzed (see Chapter IV for analysis). Merriam (1998) uses the term “comparative case studies” for the method of selecting several cases or sites based on relevant criteria, to be studied and compared (p. 65). A benefit of using “comparative case studies” was maximum variation sampling, identified by Glaser and Strauss (1967). By using a wide variety of sites sampled,
patterns or variations that emerge were more “conceptually dense and potentially more useful” to the study (Merriam, 1998, p. 63). In this study, six participants were sampled, three were year-round and three were traditional calendar. All six were required to teach the same curriculum based on national standards and the Discipline Based Art Education program (Greer, 1984), yet had a variety of experience levels in one or both types of scheduling. Site selection was used to identify the annual school schedule first, and then the art specialists at those sites were asked to participate.

By examining three ASs in two opposing schedules, the goal of the current study was to discover how ASs implement their programs in different schedules. Did the ASs have professional experience or development training relating to implementing a program in different schedules? How were the programs different in time and scheduling? Are class characteristics different? Do the instructional methods differ? These four research questions were used to determine where the differences in schedules may affect the programs. A description of the study’s general setting, methods for site and participant selection, materials used, and procedures follow.

General Setting

Before describing the method of this study, a general description of the school district, school calendars, and class schedules will be represented to understand the general setting of the study.

School District. The Clark County School District, located in Southern Nevada, was the fastest growing school district in the United States (Bach, 1998). Public school enrollment in Clark County expands at a rate of about 11,000 students a year (Bach, 1998). The nation’s sixth-largest public school system serves more than 254,000 students,
almost double the 136,188 students it had in 1992 (Bach, 2003). To counteract the sudden growth of the school district, several of the elementary schools in Clark County had adopted a multi-track, YR education schedule (CCSD, 2001).

School Calendars. At the time of this study, the majority of elementary schools in Clark County were traditional nine-month schedules (see Appendix G) (CCSD, 2002). Out of 172 elementary schools, a total of 76 elementary schools on the CCSD’s School Telephone Directory were listed as YR (CCSD, 2003). The Clark County School District implements a staggered, 60-15, five track schedule in its YR elementary schools (see Appendix H) (CCSD, 2002). For those that were YR, this means that one track was in regular session for 60 days a trimester, with 15 days of track break. There were five tracks, numbered I-V. The tracks were color-coded by the district: Track I/Red, Track II/Blue, Track III/Yellow, Track IV/Green, and Track V/Orange. Track I does not begin the school year with the other four tracks. After the initial three weeks of school, Track I comes ‘in’ for regular session and Track II goes ‘out’ on track break. The tracks rotate in and out on numerical order until Track V was the final track to go on break, signifying the end of the trimester (see Appendix H).

This sequence was repeated three times each year. During the 15-week trimester period, all students receive an average of 12 weeks instruction and three weeks vacation. Students were divided into these five tracks, but only four groups were in school at one time.

Year-Round and Traditional Class Schedules. For both schedules, elementary art classes were preparation periods for the classroom teacher. They bring their class at the designated time and students attend art for 50 min, while the classroom teacher attends to
other activities without his or her class. A “prep schedule” was a school-wide schedule assigning individual classes a place to go every day so the classroom teacher can receive 50 min of “prep” time. While the “prep schedule” may signify a break for teachers, it was in reality a “class schedule” for specialists, including music, physical education, library, humanities and art. The “class schedule” determines which classes come to the specialists’ room during a designated time of the week for fifty minutes. When track changes occur, the prep schedule determines where the classes returning fit into the schedule.

Participants

Participants were selected based on their schools’ site location. The selection of sites was described, followed by details of contacting and gaining permission for research on the site by site participants and their administrators.

Site Selection. The method of site selection was based on maximum variation sampling (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), where the more varying instances of a phenomenon are sampled. The criterion of site selection was school year calendar, proximity to a school with an opposite calendar, and designation within one of the three regions selected from the Clark County School District. A rationale for each criterion follows. The three regions were purposely selected to widen the variations of contextual factors, such as student demographics or regional practices; any shared patterns across the art programs could derive their significance out of diversity. If the selected schools had similar student demographics, then the instructional patterns may have common attributes due to the similar contextual variables of student demographics, school enrollment, and class schedules. To discourage such results, the different demographics were sought by
selecting three different regions. Region A, B, and C were selected because they had a variety of student demographics. According to the Student Population Report, compiled by the Diversity and Affirmative Action Office of the Clark County School District (2002), Region A had an overall rate of 55.7% minority student population, Region B had 72.5%, and Region C had 34%.

Within each region, two elementary schools were selected based on their calendar and proximity to one another. Any two elementary schools within a five mile radius of each other were highlighted if they had opposing school calendars, year-round and traditional. The reasons for seeking close proximity of the two schools after selecting different regions for student diversity was to ally any instructional patterns within student demographics but delineate those instructional patterns that differed because of the change in schedule. The logic behind the site selection was if the delineated instructional patterns found in the year-round school were similar to the other year-round schools’ delineated instructional patterns, even though the contextual variables of each year-round school were different, then the instructional patterns were assured to be unique to the year-round schedule and not the site or instructor. See Table 1 for a comparison of the site characteristics selected for this study.

On average, the year-round schools had an additional 236 students enrolled than their traditional counterparts. The greatest difference were the two schools in Region B where there were 373 more students in the year-round school, and the traditional school was considerably lower in enrollment than the other traditional schools in regions A and C.
The transiency rate for the district was 39%. Each of the year-round schools had a higher transiency rate than their traditional counterparts. Both schools in Region B had higher transiency rates than the other regions and the district.

Region B was higher in population of English Language Learners than the district average. All the other schools were either near the district average or much lower.

Region B had the highest population of students on Free or Reduced Meal programs. Eligibility for this program was based on family income. The other schools were below the district average, so the two schools in Region B had a higher population of students from lower economic homes than Regions A and C.

As can be seen in Table 1, the Expenditure per Student average of five schools was near the district average. The traditional school in Region B was almost $1,500.00 above the district average. Whether this greater difference was due to the large amount of Remedial Education funds or due to the lower enrollment when compared to the other schools can not be presumed from the accountability report.

The average percentile rankings of the Fourth Grade Iowa Tests of Basic Skills Results in Region A and C schools were comparable to the district average scores. Region B schools were drastically lower than the district average, almost by half.

Given these comparisons, it can be said that the year-round schools had a larger student enrollment than their traditional calendar counterparts. The schools in Region B serve a student population that was higher in transiency, English as a second language, and lower-economic backgrounds, than the other regions' schools.
Once these schools were selected, the art specialists at each location were contacted (with the approval of their administrator) to inform them of this study and ask for their participation. A description of each participant was now given.

*Participating Teachers.* The participating teachers’ names are pseudonyms. Two were male; the other four were female. The participants of this study had a variety of backgrounds in elementary art education, regular education, or no experience prior to the 2002-2003 school year. See Table 2 to view these traits.

In the first area, Region A, Teresa was a TC AS who was a regular classroom teacher for many years. This was her second year teaching art at the same school she was a regular classroom teacher at. At first, the criteria for selecting participants included at least three years experience in their setting, but when learning that Teresa had experience within the same school as a regular classroom teacher, this was seen as an advantage to the study. Using what Glaser and Strauss (1967) called maximum variation sampling, by seeking participants who represent the widest possible range of characteristics, the study would prove more “conceptually dense and potentially more useful” because the patterns found emerged out of a large variation of the population (Merriam, 1998, p. 63).

Karen, the YR AS near Teresa’s location, was a TC AS for seven years in the Clark County School District. This was Karen’s first year as a YR AS. She was viewed as a potential key participant since she had experience as a traditional nine-month art specialist, but was moving into the year-round schedule for the first time and could give key descriptions as to the differences of each.

The second area, Region B, included Chelsea and Tom. Both, Tom and Chelsea were required to travel to another school one day a week to help with the surplus numbers at
other schools. Chelsea was a TC AS. She had been teaching art at her school for three years. Tom, Chelsea's YR neighbor, was a first-year teacher. His school was Kindergarten through 2nd grade only. He had no prior experience in elementary during his student teaching experiences out of state, and no training in YR education. The administrator was reluctant of what benefit interviewing and observing Tom would be since he lacked experience. I assured him that Tom's lack of experience, but fresh perspective straight out of teacher training, might add a new dimension to the study. Perhaps Tom might bring in new techniques or training those other art specialists in the field had missed. This inexperience, too, would help maximize the variation of sampling discussed earlier about Teresa.

Finally, Region C had the most experienced teachers of all. Cindy had taught TC art for nine years at the same school. Kevin had taught YR art for seven years at two different schools, but never TC.

Materials

The materials used were a camera, 35 mm. film, tape recorder, audio tape, interview questions, and a questionnaire. The camera and film were used to take pictures of the classroom arrangements. The tape recorder and audio tape was used to help transcribe the interviews. The interview questions (see Appendix C) were derived from the four main research questions of Professional Experiences and Development, Time and Scheduling, Class Characteristics, and Instructional Methods. The questions were approved prior to the interviews by the Clark County School District and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Office of Human Research Subjects. Interviews were tape recorded and transcribed. The questionnaire was developed out of categories from the data analysis of
the initial interview questions in Phase I of the Procedures (see Appendix D). The list of 
interview questions for the member check (see Appendix F) had been compiled from the 
themes developed in data collection and analysis of Phase II in the Procedures.

Procedure

The selection criteria of participants in this study were site-based since the school 
calendar was the most important variable. From the six schools chosen in the site 
selection, each administrator was contacted by letter (see Appendix E) describing the 
study and intentions, stating that they would receive a call in a few days, asking their 
permission to conduct the study on their school grounds. After receiving permission from 
the administrator by phone, the AS was contacted by phone to describe the intent of the 
study, their participation requirements, and how their identity would remain anonymous. 
When the specialist agreed to participate, a Participation Agreement (see Appendix B) 
was sent by fax to their work locations to be signed, along with the date and time the first 
interview and observation visit.

The details of the Participation Agreement included the requirement of up to three 
half-day observations, two interviews (approximately one hour each before or after 
school), and collection of documents (seating charts, long-range plans, class sizes, and 
class schedules). The interviews and observations pertained to how ASs organize and 
deliver curriculum in relation to class size, time, and schedule changes (if any). These 
interviews would be conducted privately and tape recorded. No one would hear the tape 
recordings except the researcher.

Observing the privacy of participants, much of the data collected was reformatted to 
eliminate names of teachers, schools, and students. Photographs of the classrooms were
omitted because they revealed too much information about the school site and participant. Full transcripts of interviews were not in the appendix because they reveal too many personal details about the participant to remain anonymous. All other areas relating to ethical standards, as stated in the "Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct," were followed (American Psychological Association, 1992).

Access to the art specialists' classrooms was gained at the school sites by confirming appointments with the ASs by phone, fax, and/or email. Upon arriving at the school, I would show my school district identification badge at the office and sign in, receiving a visitor's badge. Anyone entering the school must check in at the office. This was a very familiar process, since being employed in the same district, traveling to other schools for training and checking in had been a frequent occurrence.

This study contains three main phases of procedures. Phase I was the initial data collection from the multiple sites. Phase II involved a questionnaire based on the analysis of Phase II. A member check in Phase III confirmed findings from Phase I and II. See Table 3 for an overview of the methods of data collection.

Phase I. The procedures used to collect data through interviews, observations, and document gathering were the same for each case to ensure that the information obtained was comparable. The exception to this procedural collection and sampling was Cindy's interview and observation which had to be cancelled at the last minute. The interview was conducted on the phone. No classroom observations were made at Cindy's site. Documents were collected on site when the visit was abruptly cancelled. More details of this event are explained in Chapter IV.
All interviews, except Cindy’s, were conducted on site in the art specialist’s classroom. The interviews were tape recorded and transcribed. Interviews were semi-structured (Merriam, 1998), where a specific list of information was needed but not arranged in a pre-determined order. The interview questions (see Appendix C) were based on the four main research questions: Did the ASs have different professional experience or development training? How are the two programs different in time and scheduling? Are class characteristics different? Do the instructional methods differ? Each of the four questions and their subcategories related to the art specialists’ programs. Any new categories that arose through conversation were marked in the transcripts and left open for analysis later. The study was not limited to these four categories. If something during observations was viewed as unique and pertaining to the study, questions were raised when class instruction was completed or the ASs had time to discuss relevant information while students worked on their art production.

Observations were held before, after, or concurrently with the interviews, depending on the specialists’ schedule. They were during a half day visit, either morning or afternoon. No observation of Cindy’s classroom was made. The observations were meant to gain a sense of what the ASs’ day was like, what routines were followed by the ASs’ and students, and if there were any differences between the routines of YR and TC AS on a daily basis. The participation agreement specified three half-day observations. The additional two observations were eliminated after the initial set of observations and interviews with five of the participants. Details of this decision will be discussed in Phase II and Chapter IV.
During observations, the art room, students, teacher, activities, procedures, commands, and conversations were noted by the observer. Tape recordings were not made because of the confusion in sound with so many students and materials being used.

As passive observer, the action of watching the classroom activities and noting the activities, script, and time was familiar since I had performed this role many times as a practicum art education student in my undergraduate program. Since the AS was aware of my presence and goals, my primary relationship with the activities was observer as participant (Merriam, 1998). I did not participate as an AS, my customary role in my occupation, except in one instance when Tom was teaching clay pinch pots to a large group of kindergarteners. It was his first day teaching clay in his career and I assisted students making the pinch pot, but allowed Tom to be the manager and instructor of the classroom. Details of this event are in Chapter IV.

Another incident affected my role as passive participant while I was observing Teresa’s class. A student recognized me as her former AS (she had transferred schools) and identified me to her other classmates as her past AS. I graciously acknowledged her with a smile and “How were you?” Then I gestured with my finger over my mouth that I was not there to socialize and she should continue her work, which she did with a knowing smile.

Documents requested from the ASs were class schedules with grade level, class size, and combination information. Grading criteria, recording, and reporting methods were Xeroxed or recorded in observation notes. Long-range plans, lesson units, and weekly lesson plans were gathered. How the specialist leaves lessons and information for a substitute were copied or photographed. Any printed information sent to other teachers,
parents, or students for communicating goals of the art program, class or student progress, were copied or gathered. Photographs of every wall and overall classroom arrangement were taken by the researcher to document the physical characteristics. If the AS brought out any other special document it was copied or photographed for later analysis. Other documents gathered were public record on-line through the school district website (www.ccsd.net) or the local newspaper site, the Las Vegas Review-Journal (www.reviewjournal.com), to collect statistics on general district or school information.

**Phase II.** The same participants from Phase I participated in Phase II. No new participants were selected. The questionnaire for Phase II was structured around the three categories of Planning Units, Holidays & Breaks, and Substitutes & Substitute Lesson Plans (see Appendix D). These categories developed during analysis of Phase I data because they revealed differences between the YR and TC art programs (see Chapter IV). The questions used in Phase II were sent via email or fax. The participants were allowed to fill in their answers and send them back via email or fax. Therefore, the setting was impersonal and very technological. This may have impacted the type of responses given if any of the participants were not comfortable with computers or fax machines, but none of the participants signaled that they were unable to manage the methods of transferring information and returned their questionnaires by one of the two methods. If any of the answers during analysis were not clear, a follow-up question for clarification was made to the individual participant by email or phone. All follow up questions were answered by the individual participants. The themes developed from the participant answers to this questionnaire were approved by another participant in Phase III through the use of a member check.
Phase III. To enhance internal validity, a member check (Flick, 2002) was used to verify data interpretations by sharing the results with a member of the field under study. The member check selection and procedure follows.

An expert in elementary art education with experience from both settings was selected to verify all themes found. The criterion for selecting a member check was extended experience in both settings of YR and TC elementary art education. There were several specialists in elementary art that met those criteria, but only one person in the district met those criteria with additional administrative experience overseeing all of the CCSD elementary art specialists and their programs. She was selected as the member check because of her first-hand experience as an elementary art specialist in YR and TC settings, and for her extensive knowledge of how other art specialists in the district adapted their programs to the YR schedule.

Margaret was a TC AS for three years, a YR AS for eight years, and then a Teacher On Special Assignment (TOSA) for almost five years. As TOSA, she oversaw the entire elementary art program of the CCSD, training ASs, developing curriculum, training new hires, and offering in-services to develop skills of new and experienced elementary ASs. After five years as TOSA her position was cancelled due to budget cuts and she currently works as a YR AS.

A restaurant location was agreed upon for us to meet for the interview. The site was selected for its convenience. The semi-structured interview was tape-recorded with questions (see Appendix F) relating to the themes found in Phase I and II.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the differences of year-round and traditional-calendar elementary art programs. To determine the differences of a year-round art program caused by the schedule, a case study approach was used to examine six elementary art specialists (ASs) in the Clark County School District. Among those six participants, three were year-round and three were traditional calendar, and all were required to teach the same curriculum based on national standards and the Discipline Based Art Education program (Greer, 1984). By examining three ASs in two opposing schedules, the goal of the current study was to discover how the ASs implemented their programs in different schedules.

Four research questions were used to determine if differences in schedules affected the art programs:

1. Do art specialists have professional experiences or development training that helps them plan their programs around the schedules?
2. How are the two programs different in time and scheduling?
3. Are class characteristics different because of the tracking of students or overcrowded population?
4. Do the instructional methods differ between TC and YR settings?

In this chapter, the general methods of analysis will be described. The results, blending the analyses used during each phase of research, are summarized using detailed accounts from each of the ASs and the member check to confirm the findings. The findings concluded that the year-round schedule posed a more complex challenge to plan and manage an art program than a traditional-calendar program.

Analyses

In Phase I of this study, the data from interviews, observations, and data collection were analyzed using the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). In a constant comparative method, sets of data are compared within and among categories, properties, and hypothesis. As Merriam (1998) suggests, data was analyzed while it was being collected. Notes were written after each interview, during observations, and on documents collected when pertinent questions, reflections, or ideas were noted about participants' program differences attributed to scheduling.

Using comparison matrices, the six ASs and their programs were cross-case analyzed (Merriam, 1998) to help conceptualize the data into “categories, themes, or typologies” (p. 195). A Venn diagram was used to display the scheduling characteristics found unique to each schedule and shared by both (see Figure 7). A new hypothesis about how the scheduling differences impacted the elementary art programs was illustrated in a diagram (see Figure 8). This hypothesis developed into an emerging theory of how the YR schedule challenges an AS to implement an elementary art program, more than the TC schedule. This process of theorizing beyond the analysis of categories is described by
Merriam as substantive theory (1998). The theory's validity was increased using a member check where the data and tentative interpretations were taken “to the people from whom they were derived and [asked] if the results are plausible” (Merriam, 1998, p. 204). The culminating evidence that explained and supported this theory was woven with the data analysis throughout the results section of this chapter. For more in-depth analysis, due to the immense amount of data from the six ASs and the member check, the process of data analysis, the findings, and the development of the substantive theory from those findings follow.

Results

The results section begins with a brief characterization of each participant, followed by the phases of procedures explained in the Methods chapter. Starting in order of the research visits, distinct characteristics of each participant and their settings were highlighted. The ASs were cross-case analyzed for each of the four main research questions in the Phase I section. Phase II detailed how the programs differed due to scheduling based on the findings from Phase I. Phase III confirms the findings and theory developed using the member check.

Research Participants
Teresa. Teresa was the regular classroom teacher who changed to elementary art two years ago. She took the art specialist position at her school after completing the required credits to get an art credential added to her elementary certificate to teach. She was at a traditional nine-month school in Region A. She had 733 students at her school.

The first impression of her room was BIG. I had never seen an art room so large before. The room was divided by an island of furniture, desks, carts, and drying racks. A large carpeted area was on one half, with a television, VCR, and computer stationed in the corner. Tables and chairs were arranged on the other half of the room. She had a large carpeted area so students could sit on the floor while viewing artwork on the computer or dry erase boards in that corner.

Storage units, teacher desks and boxes lined the walls. The walls were heavily decorated with art history time lines, cursive and print alphabets, art rules, elements and principles of design, maps, incentive programs, emergency evacuation plans and images of nature combined with words like “unique” and “change” with phrases of acceptance next to them.

The tables were labeled with shapes or forms, like “cubes” and “circles” (see Figure 1 for Teresa’s table arrangement). Tables were dismissed when she called out their assigned shape/form. Teresa numbered the seats in groups of four. On the white boards she had a number posted notifying who the week’s captain was. She changed it every week so everyone got their chance to help. The sergeant number she called out during the class I observed was a back-up captain in case the assigned captain was absent.

The rules or expectations were posted over the sinks. When a student broke a rule, they received a Behavior Form that had a place for the date and the student’s name.
Teresa checked the box listing what was wrong with the student’s behavior and the student wrote below what would be a better choice. This form was given to the classroom teacher who decided what consequences followed.

Teresa’s schedule had her planning, or ‘prep’ periods, spread out at different times during the day. Sometimes, she did not have one every day but two on another day. Teresa’s class schedule (see Table 4) on Monday combined her lunch and planning periods during her second period. She called this schedule an inconvenience because she wasn’t hungry at that time of the day but would be later on with no time to eat. On Wednesdays, she had difficulties because her lunch was the only break she had all day. On Tuesdays and Thursdays she had double the planning periods making up for the lack of one on Wednesday.

The lesson units usually began with a 10-20 minute discussion on an artist’s work or a type of art. She found her images from the Internet and posted them on the television that was connected to the computer, or she found bargain art calendars at the 99cent store that she cut and shared with the students. The discussions included art criticism and art history.

All areas of art production required by the curriculum were covered, except clay. When she began teaching art, Teresa was informed that the kiln did not work. She put in a work order to the district and had it fixed. She still had not used it because the kiln was in another room disconnected from the school and was being used to store recycling cans for student council. It was a fire hazard and safety violation to fire a kiln with flammables four feet away or within the enclosed kiln room. She had no oil clay for the students to work with because a teacher borrowed her supply last year and let the students take their
finished model home, thinking Teresa could just order more. She had, but it had not arrived.

Teresa grouped her lesson units to cover the same content for art history and art criticism, but there were different requirements for the art production based on age appropriateness. She gave me examples of her color unit (see Table 5 and 6). Teresa described her grouping of lessons across grade levels as more complicated for the fourth and fifth graders. For first and second, “I pretty much led them through it so that when we finished it was like, ‘Oh, look at that!’ instead of discovery on their own,” she explained. “Third [grade] gets it by themselves.” Assessment was achieved by circulating around the room and entering the grades while students cleaned up. Production was the final assessment criteria.

One of the classes I observed, a third grade class, reviewed a lesson about an illustrator who used collage techniques. The students created brightly colored papers during a prior lesson. Those papers were prepared for a collage based on a prior drawing. Teresa reminded them of a collage gluing technique using the finger to rub the glue over the entire bottom surface so the painted paper would not curl off the base paper. While she did this, several students were fidgeted and played with materials left on the tables in baskets (eg. scissors, glue, pencils). These materials were fixed on the tables in case they were needed during a lesson. When the students went to work, the group captains were supposed to gather and disperse the collage paper. Some captains showed poor leadership skills, forcing their table mates to leave the table and gather paper for themselves. Teresa had a difficult time monitoring whether the captains were the ones away from the table since she was always helping someone who was absent the week before or someone who
had a question. During clean up, the captains were supposed to pick up the supplies, organize them, and throw away the trash. They usually waited until Teresa visited their table for inspection to do so, while the other students waited for dismissal.

Karen. Karen was a first year YR AS at a school near Teresa in Region A. She taught TC for six years and then decided to move to YR as a challenge because she was bored with her program and morale was low at her other school. Her prior experience was substitute teaching in New York for two years after graduating from an art education program at Nazareth College, Rochester, NY. Her current YR school had 909 students.

In Karen’s room, decorations were limited to the bulletin boards, aside from a few small posters on the bare walls with border trim to dress them up. The floors were sparkling linoleum squares. Rectangular tables were spaced equally throughout the room (See Figure 2). The size was average of a regular classroom, enough to fit seven tables apart with storage equipment around the sides of the room.

Karen’s schedule was inconsistent with breaks, like Teresa’s. On Monday, she only taught two classes. She apologized for the lesson I observed because it was not what she considered a ‘regular’ art lesson. She collaborated with the music teacher for the holiday program. The third graders made snowflakes for program decorations. The students discussed the paper cuttings of Scandinavia during a prior lesson to tie in some art history with the project. I observed them finishing the production.

During the lesson, students were quiet and calm while Karen stood seriously behind the demonstration table. The materials were stacked and organized across her demonstration table. Karen began her demonstration of what they would be doing by reminding them of what they had talked about last class and waited for their nods,
recognizing they were paying attention. She demonstrated every step of the procedures, warning of what might happen with the snowflake if not cut or glued properly. A student raised her hand. Without stopping, Karen looked at her and said, "I will answer your question as soon as you have your materials," and continued to work.

Instead of table captains, Karen had a "helper team". The tables were arranged in order of the color wheel. The brown table was in the middle because all colors from the color wheel mixed made brown. The table diagram posted on the board behind the demonstration table had the designated colors on the rectangular table shapes. Above it, the colored paper flipbook was turned to the purple paper, designating the purple table for 'team leaders' of the week. The students at purple table helped Karen pass out materials, pick up materials, throw away trash and wash out brushes. The other students stayed in their seats except when it was time to slide their own snowflakes into the drying racks.

While students worked, if she wanted their attention, she would announce, "Third graders! Eyes up and hands empty!" Her hands would go up, as well as the students whose eyes were glued to her. Clean up involved baby wipes for the students to clean their hands and tables, freeing the sinks for brush washing, and limiting the movement around the room.

During the rest of the week, her classes were spaced two in the morning and three in the afternoon. The reason given for three classes in the afternoon was testing. "They [administration] wanted [students] to have more time in the morning to have testing time," Karen added, "because they’re at their optimum learning and performance time in the morning... The specialists kinda get dumped on in the afternoon." Karen’s opinion was two classes in the morning with many breaks in between "difficult" and the three
classes in a row afterwards "killer." "And I think all of the specialists feel the same way because we're just beat at the end of the day," she detailed.

Karen had an art club after school two days a week. She was paid $20 an hour but had not been paid at the time of the interview. "I'm told it's coming," she explained. The Parents and Teachers Association (PTA) hired her for the job. The students who attended also paid. They brought $36 for six sessions over a three week period. The money students brought helped supplement her program. She described the art room in bad condition when she arrived. It had few supplies salvageable to continue a program. In June and August, she was able to purchase supplies for the next year with a $1,000.00 budget, "Which doesn't go quite far, especially when I had to start with nothing," she conveyed. With 909 students, that budget amounts to $1.10 per student for the course of a year.

The following week was a track change. The classes on Track III rotated through the schedule at Karen's school. Some of her Track III classes on Thursday would be moving to Friday because the returning classes were originally in the Thursday slots, and the leaving classes were on Friday for Track III to fill (see Table 7 and 8). In deciding whether to repeat a lesson for students who were returning from track break, Karen said it depended on what they were doing. If clay was the missed experience, she would reteach it, whereas a drawing assignment might be skipped or altered to shorten the length of study.

Karen described planning around the YR schedule as the most difficult aspect of teaching YR art education. To manage the program, she said, required "always looking way ahead to find out how many classes do I have before [the class] was going out." She
elaborated on the difficulty of planning ahead with absences and holidays interrupting the schedule. "That tends to be difficult," said Karen, "Like this group that we just saw, I won’t see them Thanksgiving week because I’ll be taking some time-out days. So, that project goes a little further and further enough unfinished."

When asked if she ever felt pressure to finish a project, like she described, while working in a TC setting, Karen responded, "No." To extend a lesson in a TC setting was easier than in a YR setting. She explained, "The only thing you had to work around was a big break like a holiday break or Spring Break... But, this [YR] is a constant deadline to work around."

*Chelsea.* Chelsea was in her third year at her TC school, which was her only teaching experience since her art education training at a school in New York. Her school was in Region B and was the smallest in student population (415) yet high in per student expenditure ($1,500.00 above the district average). Of the schools chosen, her school had the highest population of English Language Learners, students on Free and Reduced Meals, and the lowest scores on the Iowa’s Tests of Basic Skills.

The entire room was lined with butcher paper on the walls from floor to ceiling and trimmed around any dry-erase boards or bulletin boards. The paper was painted in an Impressionist mural style like a Monet landscape. "I change it every year. Last year was a medieval castle," Chelsea explained, "I focus on one period of history every year." She has done Egyptian, cave art, medieval, renaissance, and now Impressionism. She debated whether next year would focus on modern art or if she would take a break and focus on multi-cultural art.
Her tables were arranged in a U-shape (see Figure 3), opening by the far wall with mounted dry-erase boards. This formation impeded her ability to get from one side of the room to the other during observations. Often Chelsea had to walk around the large U-shaped table arrangement to help one student or get a supply.

Each seat was labeled A through H with paper letters taped to the table, designating the captains. Chelsea put supplies on the table before students arrived to minimize the movement around the room. During class, one student used the materials to scratch off the taped letters on her table while Chelsea did her demonstration.

Chelsea kept seating charts for every class on a clipboard and wrote everything in pencil because she had to “erase all the time” due to transiency.

Looking at her schedule Chelsea’s schedule was the only one in this study that had single primary classes only (see Table 9). Her school was so small in enrollment, the schedule had open periods and team teaching classes were separated during specials, cutting the numbers of the class in half when compared to the team-teaching or combined primary classes. Because of this extra time in her schedule, she traveled on Wednesdays to another school as an itinerant. Chelsea said she would rather be at one school.

Her students needed instant gratification after finishing a project by taking their art home. They demanded their work back, even when she kept it briefly for grading. She knew the work was meaningful to them because she saw their work in the neighborhood. “Three years ago, we did papier-mâché Greek vases,” she told, “and I still see those in the windows [of their homes].”

Despite this need to take work home, she began collecting the best pieces of student work for academic night. Since her school was an outdoor school without safe hallways
to display on, she wanted to take advantage of the academic night opportunity to present her program to the parents by organizing a school-wide art exhibit showcasing the students’ achievements. She was gathering work as the year progressed and highlighted students’ names in her grade book to track who she had work from.

Chelsea was disappointed when her administrator questioned the relevance of art at the academic night. "I had to tell her art is academic," exclaimed Chelsea. She felt her administration did not appreciate what she did in her program. She enjoyed the small class sizes of her school but wondered if she would be happier at another school where she would not be treated as "babysitter prep" without educational relevance. She cited examples, such as having to sell food at open house instead of showing her classroom like the other teachers. When misbehavior occurred in her room, resulting in a student suspension meeting, the regular classroom teacher was called instead of Chelsea to decide the outcome.

One of the classes I observed was her largest in the school (27 students). They had a reputation of being rowdy, especially when they had a substitute, like the day I was there. She greeted them by saying, "Hey, Mr. Biggs’ class. You will not be crazy today! I warned you last week that we’re doing clay and if you misbehave, I’m throwing it away!"

She used a whistle to gain their attention during class. As the period went on, they paid less attention to it. Her captain system worked like Teresa’s; there were students wandering everywhere. When captains got rags to clean the clay mess at their tables, some of them cleaned their hands and tossed the rags in the air while other students asked the captains to pass the rags around.
The level of student concern about their work was scarce as Chelsea warned that the clay they rolled would crack or break if too thin. A few students mumble a sarcastic “Ooohhh…” under their breaths in response.

The class lost all of their five behavior points. This happened at a rapid rate during the course of the class time, sometimes skipping numbers with no visual record of what point they were currently on. Even though Chelsea had marked the points on her board with Impressionist flowers moving from healthy to droopy, she had a “hard time making it around the room to change them.”

“Do you think Mr. Biggs is going to let you come to art next week?” asked Chelsea.

“No,” answered the students.

“Me neither,” agreed Chelsea. “Maybe he can find some math for you to do!” she threatened as they left with the substitute.

Tom. Tom was in his first year teaching. His YR situation in Region B was unique because he taught at a kindergarten through second grade school. His school had 788 students with a higher transiency rate than any of the schools in this study (52%). The majority of students were on free or reduced lunch programs. The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills Results were not available because there were no fourth graders at Tom’s school. This was his first year teaching. He just graduated from Mazola, in Montana, where he received his K-12 art certification. He student taught at the middle and high school level only.

Tom’s room was small with carpeting and cafeteria tables that folded to roll away. The tables filled half of the room and a strip of tape divided them from an open area (See Figure 4). The tape on the floor marked where students sat after entering. He
demonstrated the production procedures there and then students went to the tables to begin. He found this easier for demonstrating because he could not “squeeze 35 kids around a table.”

The day I was there, clay streaks were across all of the table tops and some of the counter tops to the side. Clay saturated rags were scattered with other clay coated materials on the tables. This was Tom’s first day with clay instruction in an elementary school.

Tom’s schedule had many classes combined from different tracks (See Table 10). When the classes were together, it created a “behavior thing.” That morning he had a combined class, except one was gone on track break. It made a big difference with the morning’s clay project. He explained why (the grade level and track assignment has been used to replace the class’ teachers’ names):

This was the 2/IV and 2/V combination. 2/IV was gone. Her class was really rough. 2/V, her class was really good... I’m lucky I had 2/V today because this was the first day I did clay. With 2/V class I can do a little bit of a trial and I found that we’re not going to do coil pots. They were still able to work with me and I said, ‘Alright, just do pinch pots and if you want to try to do a coil pot, go ahead and try.’ [If the other class would have been there?] It would have been chaos! I mean, I try to introduce things with [those] guys first and it just goes nuts!

His average class size was 36 because most classes were two combined classes of 18 students. He said it felt “overwhelming” with the ratio of students to him because, “I wish
I had more time to spend with each of them but I don’t have the time.” He described the amount of time he had with the large classes:

If I had just 30 kids in here each period, I could deal with each student for like a minute and 40 seconds. That’s how much time I have with them. You know, you have things that happen in here and I can’t even address it. Like I had a kid punch another kid yesterday. Maybe? I don’t know. I didn’t see it. But, I had to go in to the classroom after the day was over and talk to the teacher and say, ‘I don’t know, but this was what I heard [from the students].’ You can’t even really address stuff sometimes.

The type of training he thought would best benefit him was just planning the lesson. He described his dilemma:

‘This is what you need to look out for when you’re handing out clay.’ ‘This is what you need to look out for when you’re handling paint.’

I’m apprehensive about things because I don’t want people to get hurt from anything. It’s like the idea of kindergarten using scissors. I did it, but do I show them how to use them first?

“So, you’re more concerned about how to manage the materials rather than how the schedule affects you?” I asked.

Well, it affects the schedule because I’m not sure how much time it’s going to take to teach and do something because I haven’t done it before with this age level. I can plan and plan and plan all I want, but just like this morning, it didn’t work. So, what are you going to do all day?

“You adapt?” I asked.
Yes, you work your way through it. It doesn’t really bother me except, like Track V I haven’t seen because of holidays. Now they’re going on track break. I won’t be able to get them their pots before track break.

To make things easier, he grouped lessons by media to avoid switching between different materials during the day. He planned one project at a time because he did not have “enough lessons in [his] head” to plan in advance. He skipped most lessons when a class returned from break or missed because of a holiday. He believed the kindergarten through second grade level was “developmentally pretty much the same” making planning less diverse of a challenge for him.

Using the same lesson seemed an advantage for coping with the large class sizes in the third grade and managing traveling to another school on Wednesdays. There, he had two doubled third grade classes. “Forty-three students” he informed me was the total number of students in each combined third grade. At that other school he had to use someone else’s classroom, which changed every track rotation. The music teacher from his school traveled to the other school, too, using the same rooms as Tom but on a different day of the week. She did not use chairs or tables, so she moved them out of the way. When Tom arrived, he had to reset all the tables and chairs. Sometimes he had to borrow chairs from other teachers because there were not enough for 43 students.

I observed the team-teaching class of 32 second graders. They were dropped off by their teachers who informed Tom, “They’ve been really bad today so watch out.” They barely fit in the carpeted demonstration space. Several picked at the floor tape dividing the areas. When they saw clay in Tom’s hands they perked up with attention. He
reviewed the coil pot lesson from last week but informed them the project had changed to pinch pots instead because the “clay was bad” for coil pots.

After demonstrating making a pinch pot, the students rustled to their seats. They were cramped on the cafeteria style tables. Tom appeared overwhelmed with passing out materials and trying to assist every student. It was then that I became a participant while observer by assisting the students making their pinch pots. I consciously did not interact with the students in my traditional way as an art specialist. If I had, I would have sent many in time-out for playing. One student was drinking the dirty clay water to get an alarming response out of his classmates. Some students were playing with other students’ clay. A few just pounded their clay into pancakes and then became frustrated with the resulting crumbled texture. Overall, they seemed happy to partake in the lesson.

Cindy. Cindy’s school had an enrollment of 766, almost the same as Tom and Teresa’s. There were very few students who were ELL or qualifying for Free and Reduced Meals. The test scores were slightly above district average. Cindy was in her ninth year of teaching at the same TC school.

Cindy’s case was the most difficult to obtain data from in my study. Checking in at the office, I was instructed how to get through the building to her room. When I found the room, the light was off and the door was locked. The office paged her twice. After fifteen minutes of waiting, she phoned the office and had them send me to the room. She had the light on and the door open. When I entered I was in awe of her room, but quickly dismayed when she asked, “Didn’t you get my message?”

“What message,” I asked.
She told me she sent a fax and an email to my school this week, informing me that she could not participate with the interview and observation because her schedule had changed. I had not because I had the week off to collect data. Her regional superintendent had ordered that parent-teacher conferences were to be held during regular school hours while students were there, so no instructional time would be lost. Traditionally, when the first report card period arrived, students were sent home at the midday point so parents can schedule a one-on-one meeting with the classroom teacher. Principals in Region C had to organize a way for the classroom teachers to be freed from students while students were still in the building learning. Cindy’s principal had decided that the entire school would be grouped three classes together, an average of 72 students, and rotated through the specialists while teachers had their conferences.

“Now, you tell me what kind of quality instruction I’m going to give those students when there are over seventy to me?” asked Cindy sarcastically.

I quickly took pictures of her room (See Figure 5) and tried to get the documents I had requested. She agreed to the photographs but apologized for the documents because she had not gathered them believing I would not be there. We planned to have the interview and observation on another day. She agreed to let me call her at home and conduct the interview over the phone the following week. I tried and did not reach her, nor did she return my calls. I sent emails asking her when we could conduct the interview. She responded finally, but the holidays did not coordinate well and it was almost two months later, following New Year’s Day when we were both at home and able to take the time to talk. By this point, I had gathered and transcribed the other five
interviews and observations, deciding that there was no evident reason to need an
observation of Cindy’s instruction.

Cindy received her Bachelors in Arts from Fort Hayes, Kansas. She substituted for
five years before acquiring her position at her school nine years ago. She deemed her
position as a “Christian mission to teach art to every child.”

According to Cindy, she saw herself as exceptional when compared to other art
specialists. They “need more meat” in their instruction she said. More meat to Cindy
entailed giving a child the need and desire to complete a project with “importance and
pride.” Other art specialists color and cut without teaching the works of “real artists”, she
claimed. She identified her role as “encompassing self-esteem and confidence” for
students.

In production, there was an activity every class. She admitted it took the most time to
cover in her program but she organized her room for efficiency, where upon arriving in
the room, students were “moving fast and engaged immediately.” Her room had four
rows of two rectangular tables (see Figure 5). There were supplies on the tables in cups
and shallow plastic boxes. Storage pieces of furniture were along the walls of the room.
Where the other art specialists had everything organized in cardboard boxes and brown
paper bags, Cindy had metal or plastic shelving containers that looked brand new.

There were art images everywhere with the artists’ names and the works’ titles
beneath. Her desk area between the room entrance and the kiln room door was covered
with files, books, and awards. Posted on the wall were awards and degrees in frames.
Hanging anywhere were guards, mobiles, and sculptures. Propped on top of file cabinets
and bookcases were natural objects for still life.
Every other week, the students took quizzes that were waiting on the table for them to begin when they arrived. She called them her ‘Art Smart Quiz Sheet.’ She used these quizzes to help assess, along with her art detective words on the Word Board, group assessment of discussion, and ‘spot check’ of art production while students were working.

Every year she held a special event she created called the ArtSmart-a-thon. Students and parents attended an evening event in the multi-purpose room at the school so students could compete, similar to a spelling bee, by naming the artist’s name of a work held in front of them. As long as the student named the correct artist, they could continue to the next session, eliminating those along the way who got the name wrong, until there was a final winner.

At the time of the interview, Cindy was painting the portables with body shapes filled with images of Van Gogh, Matisse, and other famous artists’ works.

To help with her school-wide project of Character Education Development, she had students collect clothing for the homeless and allowed students to group them by color into large shapes, creating a large ground mural that was photographed from above and framed in the school hallway to document the event. The students also spent time drawing and giving their artwork to nursing homes to lift the spirits of the residents.

Cindy’s school received an art itinerant one day a week to relieve her schedule (see Table 11). The itinerant, like Tom and Chelsea who traveled to other schools, traveled to Cindy’s school to take some of the extra classes. It puzzled me that Cindy and Tom had only a 22 student count difference in school population, with Cindy’s the lower, and yet Tom had to travel to another school one day a week as an itinerant and Cindy received an
itinerant one day a week. Cindy requested that the itinerant take the first and second
graders so she could prepare third through fifth grades for the ArtSmart-a-thon. She
viewed the itinerant as a positive because it lessened her class load and freed her
afternoons so she could get more work done, but counted it as a negative because those
grades do not receive her program.

Kevin. Kevin was in his seventh year of YR elementary art. He had never taught TC.
When Kevin started teaching, he referred to it as “sink or swim.” The assistance he
received was from the model of the YR AS there before him. Otherwise, he figured it out
on his own or asked questions when he was confused.

His professional training was from UNLV. He was from a small town and good at art.
Going into education was a “fluke” because his dad, a music teacher, convinced him to
change his Bachelors in Arts major to an Art Education major for job security as an artist.
He focused on teaching high school but was chosen to teach elementary and loves it. He
would never consider becoming a regular classroom teacher. He received his degree in
administration and considers the move as a career option, but low on his priority list.

The only reason I’m a teacher was because of art. If I had to make a change,
I’d go nine-month, middle school, or high school art; something different, but
still in art, unless, they eliminated it.

His school was the largest of the study with an enrollment of 925 students. His school
did not have an itinerant or humanities to help relieve the specialists. This was his first
year at this school. He needed a change after six years at his first YR school. He was
trying to get use to the differences in areas. He used to teach in another region close to
Chelsea and Tom. He said he did not mind his students at this school talking because they
were “good” whereas the students at his old school were “trash talking.” The parent involvement at this new school was an experience for him. He was not sure how to handle it because he was “use to doing things by himself.”

His responsibilities at the school included co-chairing the Student Intervention Team that recommended students for testing to receive special services, prep schedule, intramural program, and year-book committee. Any artistic related activity was brought to him for his assistance, like decorating the multipurpose room. He did not mind being asked because he was comfortable saying “No.”

When describing the YR schedule to someone who has never worked in one, Kevin said it created a “glazed look” because of its complexity. He tried to summarize the YR schedule and how he planned for it:

You explain the track systems. Then you need to figure out how every lesson will fit into that three week block because the tracks work on a three week schedule.

Kevin was angry that the district required him to take time-out days. During the prior years, YR ASs could work the full 45 add on days, which he confirmed, “I love working the whole time.” He explained why he would rather work his days and how the district’s decision was unfair to specialists:

I hate taking days off. I hate taking time away from the projects. I think it’s damaging… and I especially think it’s horrible because we’re expected to do sub plans. You’re not going to have a nine-month teacher make a summer’s worth of sub plans for their class.
His room was smaller than any of the others visited. Famous artists’ names and artwork hung from the ceiling over the tables marking their identity (see Figure 6). Names like Michelangelo, Matisse, Dali, Gauguin, Picasso, Monet, Van Gogh, and Seurat were featured.

There were supplies on the table: folders, glue bottles, and plastic trays with scissors and pencils. Kevin usually did not have materials on the tables because students “play with it” but that morning there was an assembly and he wanted to get started right away.

Kevin began by reviewing terms they discussed during another class, like arrangement, proportion, value, and oil pastels. He demonstrated techniques and gave hints of what to look out for, like black oil pastel smearing over colors.

All of Kevin’s commands were slow, loud, polite, and calm. He referred to the students as “Ladies and gentlemen.” Circulating around the room he encouraged them with “nice job” and “take your time.” When some finished before others he said, “For those who get done early, get a piece of colored paper and practice oil pastels.” He would warn ahead of time, “When I ring the bell, put your work in the drying rack. If you didn’t glue, put it in the folder on the table. I’m looking for the winner of the week. Put your heads down when you’re done.” He rang an old fashion teacher’s bell to signal clean-up.

When students were cleaning up, he selected students at random who were looking at him to collect certain materials and put them away. He gave the option of hanging their work or taking it home. The “winner of the week” was given to the table that cleaned up the best. Kevin placed a star sticker on a mannequin hand which he used to shake their hands. The students accepted the sticker from the hand and shook it, finding it silly but rewarding.
Summary

Maximum variation sampling (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) was resourceful in selecting six participants. They represented a wide range of experience and program development for both calendar settings. Because of this variety, the results provided more “conceptually dense and potentially more useful” data because the patterns found in YR versus TC could be attributed to the scheduling since it emerged out of a large variation of the ASs population (Merriam, 1998, p. 63).

In the next section, Phase I, an overall picture of the six settings and the ASs are cross-case analyzed to identify the differences of the YR and TC programs due to scheduling.

Phase I

The six ASs gave a brief description of the daily lives in YR and TC. In Phase I, the study took the ASs and grouped them into a larger overview of elementary art scheduling. In this section, the six YR and TC ASs were compared through cross-case analysis under each of the four main categories of investigation. Using the collected data from interview questions (see Appendix C), observation, and document collection, the cross-case analysis was aimed at identifying the categories that showed differences of the YR and TC schedules. This stage of analysis was to answer the main research question of what the differences were between traditional and year-round art schedules.

To begin, each of the four main research question areas are cross-case analyzed using a comparison matrix to illustrate those areas that were different in the schedules and those that were not.
Research Question #1: Do art specialists have professional experiences or development training that helps them plan their programs around the schedules?

This category was added to the investigation to understand the training and approach to pedagogy each AS had. It was hypothesized at the beginning of the study that ASs lack professional experiences or development in how to implement an art program to the year-round schedule.

Within Professional Experiences and Development, there were seven subcategories: Years of Teaching, Types of Training (Higher Education and In-services), Job Responsibilities, Ideal Teaching Situation, Communication with other Educators, Role as Specialist, and Philosophy of Education. In Table 12, each of the subcategories are listed in rows, with each specialist’s columns being cross-case analyzed in a comparison matrix. For comparison of schedules, the ASs had been listed in order of TC and YR schedules first, and then visitation order. The data contents of Table 4 were condensed.

The ASs in the study had a variety in number of years experience in their settings. Only Karen had experience working in both TC and YR. Karen and Tom were first year YR ASs. Teresa was the only AS with regular classroom teaching experience, although Chelsea, Karen, and Cindy had substitute experience in the regular classroom prior to acquiring their fulltime positions.

All of the ASs had undergraduate degrees. Teresa was the only AS who acquired an elementary education degree with a certification in art later. The others received their bachelors in art education. Tom and Kevin focused on high school art but were hired in elementary and now preferred teaching that level.
In-services were found useful if they were related to art education. None of the ASs found regular school-based in-services relevant to their position as an art specialist.

All of the ASs, except Cindy, used the elementary art chat room on Interact to get ideas or to communicate with other ASs they were close to. Cindy did not find time to communicate with other ASs because she was too busy with her projects. All of the ASs communicated with the other specialists at their schools, like PE and music. Each of the ASs mentioned one specialist that they socialized with daily for collaborating, discussing students or classes, and ‘venting steam’ as Karen referred to it, because the situations were similar.

Summary of Research Question #1. Overall, the Professional Experiences and Development question gained background information about the training and experience of the art specialists. None of the areas related to the differences in scheduling, except Karen’s experience of teaching both. The hypothesis that ASs lack professional experiences or development in how to implement an art program in a year-round schedule was supported by the three YR ASs. None of them had received any professional training from the school district or undergraduate program relating to YR scheduling and programs. This will be discussed further in Chapter V.

Research Question #2: How are the two programs different in time and scheduling?

The Time and Scheduling section of the Phase I analysis would prove crucial in finding what differences the traditional and year-round art schedules have. The hypotheses at the beginning of the study relating to time and scheduling were:

- Year-round specialists have less time to plan their program because they work extended contract without the summers off.
• The year-round schedule is changing constantly, whereas the traditional-calendar is stable.

The subcategories were: Schedule Description, Class Combinations, Student Activities (Outside of Regular Art Instruction), Substitute Preparation, Itinerant or Humanities, Flexibility of Scheduling, and Job Responsibilities. Some of these subcategories have related terms like Class Combinations could be team-teaching, single class combinations, or multi-track class combinations. Those related terms and subcategories were listed in a comparison matrix to compare each AS information in Table 15.

Many ASs had periods labeled Lunch or not labeled at all, that designated extra time with other students in their schedules. Totaling all the extra minutes without classes, duty, or lunch, gave the numbers of preparation minutes. The standard was 250 minutes for all licensed personnel in the elementary division from the district negotiations. All of the specialists had these minutes plus more. The TC schedules had consistent preparation time each week in excess of the standard district time. The YR ASs’ schedules had an excess of minutes, especially Tom’s 600 minutes, but they were inconsistent and fluctuating, depending on the track that was out. This difference in extra time was created when one track had more classes than another and when they left on break, no class replaced them in that class period. The extreme distance between Tom’s minutes was created by the lack of classes being replaced. Looking at his number of class combinations, eighteen, he had the most combined classes. Since all the classes were combined (only two of Tom’s were not combined), even those on different tracks, there was an abundance of open periods in his schedule.
Only Cindy had a single class combined during art in the TC setting. All of the YR ASs had combined single classes, which could pose a problem unique to a combination group that teaming combinations do not display. Classes arriving at different times stalled the beginning of instruction. Behavior problems increased because the students were from different management styles by two various teachers. The specialty classes serve as social time in the day with the other class' students.

Only YR ASs, Tom and Kevin, had combined classes from different tracks. This posed a problem because the students changed within the same time period over the course of a trimester. Planning was different from other classes because the projects may interrupt one group of students leaving on track break or one group returning to join in the middle of a project. This was an important difference of the traditional and year-round schedule. The TC would never separate students on a rotational basis for the AS. The multi-track combination class was a new aspect of scheduling differences.

All TC ASs said they would allow students to come in during non-class time to finish a project. The YR ASs said they most likely would not because it was too difficult with the schedule changing to arrange a time for students to visit and work. Given that they do have the extra time periods (except for Kevin when he had only the standard 250 minutes), it would appear they would have the time to allow the students to visit and finish their work. Contradicting this appearance was what all the YR ASs mentioned, which was planning around the changes. The TC ASs preparation times were constant, enabling them to establish a time where students could arrive and work on projects. The YR ASs' extra periods change every three weeks. There could be no established time for students to finish work outside of regular class. Also, the YR ASs planned frequently for
the changing of classes, which requires utilizing their extra time in comparison to the TC ASs.

*Summary of Research Question #2.* The hypothesis that the year-round schedule was changing constantly, whereas the traditional-calendar was stable, made planning more consuming and frequent because of class changes, more class combinations, and multi-track combinations was supported by the data. All of the ASs stated that lesson planning and preparation of materials occupied most of their time. Even though the YR AS had more prep time during certain track changes than the TC AS, this time was inconsistent and of no consequence when compared to the summer break TC AS had to utilize for reflection time. Even the vacation time-out days of YR ASs posed additional planning responsibility in time and scheduling.

*Research Question #3: Are class characteristics different because of the tracking of students or overcrowded population?*

Class Characteristics were selected as a research question since the students were assigned to classes on a track system in the YR setting and the YR schedule was adopted because of overcrowding in the schools. During the literature review, it was hypothesized:

- Classrooms were overcrowded in a YR setting and not a TC setting. Therefore, questions regarding the differences of large classes from different age groups were asked in this section.
- The segregation of students by track assignment distinguished the classes of students and their ability levels, in addition to the traditional assignments of grade level and teacher.
Questions of class characteristics being different among tracks were asked (see Appendix C for questions). The subcategories of Class Characteristics were: Work Pace (by Track, Primary, Intermediate, Single, Single Combination, Team-Teaching Combination), Class Sizes, Combinations (Single vs. Double and Primary vs. Intermediate). The answers were compared in Table 14.

The first subcategory, work pace between tracks was not applicable for the TC ASs. Only Kevin noticed a difference which he described as Track V being the most advanced and Track II the less fortunate. Given that Karen and Tom had only been in a YR setting for four months at the time of data collection, their responses of no difference was reasoned to be lack of experience over time with observing student characteristics on different tracks. The first recognition of track differences in student achievement was revealed in the pilot study. The three YR ASs, who had worked in the YR setting for at least three years, noticed the difference. Their descriptions matched with Kevin’s. The question of track differences would be directed to the member check, Margaret, as a final verification of whether track assignments group students by academic achievement due to parental preferences.

Overall, the class sizes were the same for the ASs despite school calendar. Only Chelsea had smaller numbers in the primary grades because the team teaching classes were separated for the specialists. The majority of ASs agreed that larger intermediate classes worked at a faster pace than the large primary classes who were deemed more dependent on supervision and assistance that was unavailable due to the high numbers. The only AS who chose primary over intermediate was Chelsea, which was
understandable since she had only single primary classes, no combinations, and her intermediate classes were her largest class sizes.

The single classes in primary (all intermediate classes were considered single) were chosen as the most productive, in-depth, classes when compared to the double primary. Most ASs chose third grade as their highest achieving classes because they were small in number compared to the double primaries and larger intermediates, but more advanced than the single primaries developmentally. The only exception to this was Tom who had double third grade totaling 43 students.

When faced with a double class, the team-teaching classes were considered the most stable when compared to the combined single classes that came from different teachers and classrooms. The settled group of students who were together under the same supervision for most of the year behaved uniformly, with exception. Tom and Kevin remarked that some team-teaching classes behaved worse than the combined singles because the team-teachers did not have a grasp on classroom management within their own room. The one class I observed with Tom that was a team-teaching second grade did not allow their student to use scissors in the classroom because the behavior was so poor.

**Summary of Research Question #3.** Overall, the class sizes were equal across the schools, except for Chelsea’s single primary classes and low intermediates. The similar class sizes provided information relating to art education and year-round education. The art specialists were not treated equal to regular education instructors because they were serving twice the established district class-size reduction rates for primary age. Also, the year-round schedule did not reduce overcrowded classes, just the population within the facility at any given time. The segregation of students by track assignment was only
detected by Kevin who had experience working with students in YR tracks over seven years. The hypothesis of segregation by track will be carried into the member check who has long-term experience in YR.

Research Question #4: Do the instructional methods differ between TC and YR settings?

The instructional methods category was aimed at gathering information about each ASs methods and how they differed due to their program schedules. It was hypothesized that instructional methods were expected to be less in-depth in YR than TC because the track changes interrupted the lessons.

To collect information, many subcategories were used. There were common themes across the settings of how ASs instruct, such as material distribution and collection, table identification, and attention devices like whistles, bells, and chimes. Overall, the patterns among instructional methods were either varied by individual or common among all. The only areas that emerged supporting a difference in instruction based on the schedule was substitute planning for time-out days and planning units around track changes. The following subcategories were used for investigating Instructional Methods: Classroom Rules, Motivation/Incentive Programs, Room Arrangement, Curriculum, Lesson Units, Assessment, Student Progress Reports, Writing, Repeating Lessons, Adapting Lessons, Field Trips, Substitute Planning, and Class Discussion. The results were cross-case analyzed in Table 17.

Lesson units were sequenced similarly, except for Cindy who said she started with a demonstration first and ended with the artist information. An observation would be necessary to verify if her sequencing was different, but the lesson sequences had no relevance to scheduling differences.
The only YR AS who used writing exercises within class time was Karen, but she admitted it was very minimal. All of the TC ASs used writing, two for assessment.

Every TC AS repeated a lesson missed by a class due to a holiday or assembly interrupting class time. Kevin and Karen said they would repeat a lesson, but it depended on what the lesson was. If a class was on track break and missed a drawing assignment, they might skip teaching it when the class returned, so that the class would “catch up” with the others. If it were a clay or painting project, they would reteach the lesson. This determination of teaching a lesson based on its media content by YR ASs was unique to the schedule because TC ASs do not face losing a class for three weeks at a time. All of the TC ASs, as well as the YR ASs, complained of Monday and Friday classes being behind schedule. The TC ASs advantage was the interruptions were occasional and the YR ASs was frequent. The decision to repeat was a dilemma every three weeks. Therefore, the problem of planning around track breaks, which lessons to repeat or skip, was a relevant category for inquiry in Phase II.

Adapting a lesson was different from repeating a lesson because it required a part of the lesson to be changed. When a holiday, track break, or assembly interrupted the progress of a lesson, each of the ASs said they changed part of the lesson to shorten it, except Cindy who said she would never do that. In adapting a lesson, the ASs never specified extending or adding a new component. Instead, the pieces of art history, criticism, or production stages were altered to minimize the unit’s time to completion. The adaptation of lessons for class time interruptions was the next category to progress into Phase II because it suggests an art program was altered due to the scheduling differences.
All ASs used one-day, easy substitute lesson plans for their absences. For the TC ASs, this was whether the absence was planned or scheduled. For the planned absences, the ASs mentioned not trusting substitutes to follow their lessons based on experience. Even with detailed lessons, the experienced ASs had substitutes who did not follow procedures and disorganized their room and supplies. To avoid this, they created simple lessons involving bingo, videos, or easy how-to-draw exercises and substitute could follow.

The difference in planning for a substitute showed when Karen and Kevin discussed their time-out days. Since these were extended absences or adequate when compared to the few planned absences of the TC ASs, the YR ASs had to take into consideration a substitute maintaining their program for an extended period of time. This impacted their program since they were absent for a length of time and they must schedule that absence at some point during the year. Tom did not mention planning for his time-out days because he had not taken any, yet. Planning around absences and the differences of a planned vs. an emergency, a known substitute and an unknown substitute, create the new area of investigation for Phase II.

Class discussion about art was used by each of the ASs except Tom. Kevin said he used little time to discuss art criticism and art history, but based on the evidence from observation that the students could define the type of project they were working on it was concluded that he does discuss some art with his students. Tom omitted the discussion time of art as he was just trying to make it through the year with managing behavior and production. The time he did discuss art was during his demonstrations when he defined terms, but it was not a conversation, it was more of a lecture-demonstration.
Summary of Research Question #4. In conclusion of Instructional Methods, less depth in a lesson because students were going on track break was expressed by all three YR ASs, but at different levels. For Tom, the depth was not apparent because he did not have the knowledge or experience to teach in-depth lessons to elementary students, yet. Kevin fit his lessons into three-week sessions to conform to the track changes, but sometimes skipped lessons because they were not media important enough to cover when students returned. Karen admitted shortening some aspect of production to save time, but tried to tie in the same art history and criticism that the other classes not returning for track break had. Therefore, the instructional methods were less in-depth because of track changes, depending on the skill level and preference of the AS to adapt the lesson. Adapting lessons to interruptions, such as track changes or holidays is further investigated in Phase II.

Conclusions of Phase I. The differences of traditional and year-round art schedules were featured in the Venn diagram of Figure 7. The differences of traditional scheduling were constant preparation periods and stable class schedule. The classes never move, leave, or switch times or days. Neither did the designated prep times. The differences of YR scheduling were rotating track changes, multi-track classes, time-out absences, and segregation. Although the time-out absences were not set into the schedule, they must be scheduled by the YR ASs. They were flexible for when they were arranged, but they were guaranteed differences in the schedule for at least 15-20 days. The rotating track changes caused the class and prep schedule of YR ASs to flux on an average three week cycle, sometimes combining classes that were not on the same track. The multi-track class combinations caused more lesson adjustments than the classes rotating in and out on
track breaks. Segregation by parental track choice was evident to the experienced YR ASs in the pilot study and this study.

The differences in implementing programs due to the schedules were based on the Venn diagram of Figure 7, the comments made by YR and TC ASs, and the literature on how time impacts learning in art. The features of the YR schedule were hypothesized to make the planning of an art program for a YR AS more difficult than a TC AS due to the higher frequency of interruptions, such as holidays, assemblies, or absences. The YR ASs either repeated, adapted, or skipped the lesson. Figure 8 illustrates the relationship of this hypothesis.

There were instructional interruptions within each of the schedules: holidays, assemblies, and teacher absences. The areas that were different for YR were track changes and time-out days. When these interruptions occurred, there were three choices an AS could make: to adapt the lesson, repeat the lesson, or cancel (skip) the lesson. Only the YR ASs mentioned canceling a lesson if they deemed it unimportant, such as a drawing exercise. With teacher absences, the ASs concurred that they did not require the substitute to teach their regular art lessons. This would be considered adaptation. The ASs had one-day ‘filler’ or ‘fluff’ lessons for the sick, personal, or flex days. Only the YR ASs, Karen and Kevin, mentioned planning lessons ahead and coordinating plans with a substitute to cover their time-out days. These lesson plans were still considered adaptations because the lessons were not regular lessons. Track changes were planned interruptions.

To further develop the hypothesis of how the YR schedule makes the planning of an art program for a YR AS more difficult than a TC AS due to the higher frequency of
interruptions, such as holidays, assemblies, or absences, a questionnaire was developed and analyzed in Phase II.

**Phase II**

Phase II's goal was to investigate the hypothesis that the differences of YR scheduling made implementing an art program more challenging for an AS than the TC setting. In Phase II, three main categories of Planning Units, Holidays and Breaks, and Substitutes and Substitute Lessons were chosen to represent the groups of questions being asked in the questionnaire (see Appendix D). The questions were for clarification of how these areas were planned for, or how they changed planning in an art program.

Questions about Planning Units asked what factors were involved in deciding how long a lesson would last, when to extend or shorten a lesson, and if quizzes were factorable into the schedule of a unit. It was hypothesized that lessons for YR were planned around the track changes and writing exercises were less likely since they took extra time from production.

The Holidays and Breaks section asked details about the disruption of assemblies, holidays and long breaks. Factors such as shortening a lesson, inserting a filler lesson, repeating instruction, staggering lessons or memory of students after a break were solicited. The hypothesis was that YR ASs would have to shorten, repeat, and stagger lessons more than TC ASs because of the frequent track changes.

Questions relating to Substitutes and Substitute Lessons aimed at clarifying the difference between substitutes, substitute plans, types of absences, and how they were all related. The hypotheses were:
• There are more varieties of substitute lessons planned by YR ASs due to the additional days for time-out they must take.

• The impact time-out days have on the YR ASs and the YR program was less quality instruction during time-out absences and more work in planning for the time-out days required of YR ASs than TC ASs.

There were added sections for nine-month (TC) only and YR only. The TC section asked hypothetical questions of how they imagine their program or planning in a YR setting. The YR section asked if the YR AS believes their art program would benefit from a TC schedule, time-out day preferences, and what projects they would never skip and why. The hypotheses were:

• TC ASs would not imagine their art program successful in a YR schedule.

• The YR ASs would see their program benefiting from a TC schedule due to fewer interruptions.

• The YR ASs would prefer to take all time-out days off.

• YR ASs do not consider which tracks are out when they arrange the time they take their days off.

• The most popular time to take time-out days is during the summer.

Planning Units. The answers were given in separate comparison matrices (see Table 18). Three class periods were the average number planned for a unit of study. The students usually stayed within the estimated time, although Tom's examples during the interview were not consistent with that reflection. If the students were taking longer to finish, the ASs said they extended the time. By extending the project, the results were
better artwork but could cause other projects to be shortened in the future. The planned length was based on the medium, the steps involved, and the concepts. Two of the TC ASs said they quizzed because they want to verify content understanding. The remainder of the ASs claimed quizzes took too much time with review, grading, and quiz taking. The length of a unit could be shortened because of an assembly, school holiday, or teacher absence in either setting.

The hypothesis of Planning Units proved relevant. The experienced ASs in YR mentioned track breaks as a factor in planning lessons. Tom said track breaks did not factor into his planning. From the data collection of Phase I, Tom’s difficulty in planning lessons and predicting their length could account for his inability to recognize track breaks as an aspect of long range planning. The two experienced ASs included track breaks in their planning of units, and therefore were deemed relevant. Also, the YR ASs believed quizzes were feasible in their programs if the experiences with different types of media were accomplishable over the school year, yet none of them used quizzes.

*Holidays and Breaks.* Everyone except Cindy had shortened or condensed their lessons because an assembly or holiday interruption caused a class to be behind schedule (see Table 19). The areas condensed included size of the piece, art history, discussion time, learning objectives, or less time to finish. The opposite solution was to use a one-day lesson with every class during a week when there was a one day holiday. The ASs, except for Cindy, felt pressure to complete lessons before a holiday or track break arrived. They condensed the lesson, or in Chelsea’s case she had them come in another time, to finish the lesson. Karen said she would repeat the lesson unless there was another break after the holiday, like track break, and then she would condense the lesson.
The majority considered Monday and Friday classes behind the other days because of one-day holidays usually scheduled on those days. After a major break, like spring break or winter break, the ASs agreed students need reminding of rules and procedures; except for Cindy (this could be attributed to her ninth year at the same school and all the students knowing her procedures well). Karen and Kevin mentioned track breaks as events that forced reminders of procedures and rules.

Overall, the ASs in both settings had similar procedures and feelings about the holidays and breaks in instruction. Given the frequency of the breaks in the rotation of classes during track changes, YR ASs have a chronic task of condensing, repeating, and staggering their lessons with the frequent track changes, assemblies, and holiday breaks.

*Substitutes and Substitute Lessons.* Substitutes and Substitute Lessons’ questions ask for clarification about the differences in each area of absences (see Table 21), substitutes (see Table 20), and substitute plans (see Table 22).

There were two types of absences: emergency for sick days and planned for personal, flex, and time-out days. The difference in an emergency or planned absence was the type of lesson left. For an emergency lesson, an easy, one-day lesson was left. The ASs referred to this lesson as a “fluff” lesson because it did not require the substitute to understand art skills or content. For a planned absence, the ASs could leave a “fluff” one-day lesson or very detailed, specific lesson since the absence was known ahead of time. The planned absence was almost an agreed delay on a program. Only Teresa and Tom thought otherwise. Teresa believed if the lessons were planned well the program would continue. Tom was not certain because he had not taken a time-out day or personal day, yet.
A preferred substitute was described as one who was familiar, comfortable in the art room, able to follow directions, teach the lesson left, organized, manages discipline, understands art, and was sometimes a teacher or parent from the school. The preferred substitute was found by school lists, 'word of mouth' with other teachers or ASs, or because they were a colleague. The availability of a preferred substitute was difficult to nearly impossible and required giving notification weeks ahead. Only Kevin said he had preferred substitutes available because he used the teachers on track break.

Every type of substitute plan requires documents like seating charts, schedules, emergency plans, and incentive programs. Emergency absences arrive without warning. The lesson plan was made ahead of time and stored in a location, like a drawer or desk, with a label on it. The ASs only have to plan for them once a year with updated details of the schedule. Karen and Tom mentioned changing the information every track change, but they were planning new methods for the following year that would carry through any track change without their supervision. An emergency lesson was considered easy, one-day, and not challenging. Anything with easy clean up could be used as an emergency lesson.

The planned absence lesson plan was specific and detailed. Some ASs, like Chelsea, Tom, and Kevin, used one-day filler lessons for their planned absences. Others used lessons that were more challenging, messy and in-depth. Most agreed that the planned lesson, if detailed, required more planning than an emergency.

The largest difference in the Substitutes and Substitute Lessons category was the frequency of planning. For the TC ASs they planned any type of absence only a few times a year or seldom. The YR ASs planned frequently because of their time-out days.
Contrary to the hypothesis, the YR ASs did not have a variety of lessons planned for time-out days, except Karen. Tom and Kevin used the same one-day fluff lesson for their absences. Karen planned detailed lessons to continue her program as much as possible. This reflects the day I visited her and she was discussing all the work she was doing to plan a one day lesson around her regular activities. She was organizing all the materials, procedures, and meeting with the substitute ahead of time. For the other days, she was using a filler lesson because she did not know the substitute. Even though she planned to continue her program as much as possible during her time out days, she still believed her program was different when she was gone. “It’s a negative effect,” she said in her questionnaire. “Students seem to perform best within a routine. When that routine was broken, students are affected.”

Given that Tom and Kevin did not plan any in-depth lessons for their time-out days, and even Karen believed her preparation did not include everything needed, then the hypothesis that time-out days leave a YR program with less quality instruction time was supported. Whether the YR ASs plan a 'fluff' lesson or a detailed lesson for their time-out days, it still requires planning, which was more frequent and troublesome than in the TC setting.

Traditional-Calendar Art Specialists. The nine-month (TC) section asked TC ASs their considerations of YR education (see Table 23). The contrast of Teresa’s answers to the questions about YR and the program with Chelsea’s and Cindy’s proves that she was unaware of what YR was. When I contacted her and asked her what she thought YR was, she thought students and teachers attended school for longer periods of time, and that enabled the lessons to be extended. She was unaware of the changing tracks and said she
"wouldn’t like that." Chelsea and Cindy were similar in their answers, except for Chelsea’s consideration of working YR. They both considered the YR schedule hectic or chaotic, challenging the function of their programs with the track changes.

*Year-Round Art Specialists.* The section directed towards the YR ASs only asked how different their program would be with a TC schedule, what their preferences with time-out days were, and how they arrange their time out days (see Table 24). Karen was the only YR AS who had taught a program in a TC schedule. She found from experience that the lessons in TC were more in-depth than YR because there were no track breaks that interrupt the lesson. Tom could not predict because he was unaware of the schedule in TC. Kevin did not think the schedule made a difference because all of his lessons were based on a three-week rotation anyway.

Karen mentioned retreats from particular students gone on track break as an advantage to working year-round. This advantage was not encountered in TC unless the student was absent or transferred to a different school. She added the chance to take vacation at different times of the year, not summer only, was enjoyable.

Tom and Kevin expressed the desire to work more days instead of taking time off. Tom pointed out that the substitute planning takes away from the vacation because he worries what was happening while he was gone. Compared to track breaks for teachers who do not agonize over their classes remaining in session without them, this was a consideration for those who have no absolute escape from work during time-out days.

Karen believed the 20 days of time-out were needed to recuperate, even though she only took 15 and found them adequate. Tom was conflicted between more money and
relief from teaching. Kevin knew from experience he would prefer to work than plan for a substitute.

When planning time-out days the strategies varied. Days were scheduled with other holidays so the vacation was extended past the number of time-out days used, during the summers, or when one specific track was on track break over the school year.

In summary, the TC ASs did not picture their art program as successful in a YR schedule due to the constant rotation and interruption of track changes. The hypothesis that YR ASs would see their program benefiting from the TC schedule was only found in the case of Karen who was considered an expert since she worked TC. This would be verified later during the member check process.

The YR ASs preference to take all time-out days was individually based and inconsistent; so were the times that they planned to take the days off. What effects the times and ways they take their days off will be examined later in Phase III.

**Conclusions in Phase II.** In answering the sub-research question, how year-round and traditional programs differ due to the differences in scheduling, three categories of instructional interruptions were examined through a questionnaire with a focus on how the ASs adapted their program accordingly. The results of Planning Units, Holidays and Breaks, and Substitutes and Substitute Lessons follow:

- Experienced ASs plan units around the track schedule, sometimes condensing the lessons to end before a track break, or to 'catch up' a returning class.

- The difficulty of fitting all media experiences into the YR schedule for all students leads to the exclusion of lesson components such as quizzes, medium, or discussion time.
• YR ASs confront a chronic task of condensing, repeating, and staggering their lessons due to track breaks and the higher occurrence of holidays and assemblies than TC scheduling.

• Time-out vacation days impede the YR art programs’ progression given that substitute lesson plans were fractional when compared to a regular art lesson taught by the AS.

• Time-out vacation days require more program planning time for YR AS than TC AS.

• TC art programs were allowed greater flexibility and in-depth opportunities in planning than the YR schedule.

The culminating affect of these challenges in the YR schedule and program leads to the question of how a YR AS could adapt the art program to the year-round schedule. Given the evidence of differences in the YR and TC schedule, a validation procedure incorporating a member check was used in Phase III. The findings from Phase II (listed above) were compiled into a list of questions. The questions were developed with the intent of not revealing the findings, but to investigate whether the member concurs with the findings of this study through her own experiences (see Appendix F). The process involved, its development, and results are reported in Phase III section.

**Phase III**

The member check was incorporated into the study to validate the findings of Phase I and II, while adding information about the way YR ASs adapt their programs to the YR schedule. Meeting the criteria for member check, Margaret had three years experience as
a TC AS, eight years as YR AS, and five years as a Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA) where she oversaw the entire elementary art program for the Clark County School District (CCSD). As TOSA, she oversaw curriculum development, new hires, and elementary art in-services. She held several workshops on how to manage classroom behavior in the art room, long-range planning in the YR schedule and DBAE methods. When her TOSA position was cancelled, she went back into the field of teaching art as a YR AS. During the data collection of Phase I in this study, two of the ASs mentioned Margaret as a leader who they considered a mentor. Chelsea was in the same region as Margaret and benefited from Margaret’s regular presentations at regional in-services. Kevin took Margaret’s position at a YR school when Margaret left to fill the TOSA position. He mentioned following many of her plans to help adjust to the YR schedule.

Margaret and I met at a restaurant to conduct the interview. Questions developed earlier were relative to the findings of Phase I and II about the differences of YR and TC scheduling and programs (see Appendix #). The questions for the member check related to the areas asked of the ASs in Phases I and II: planning units, holidays, breaks, substitutes, absences, and planning substitute lessons. The results of the interview proved the findings of Phase II.

The interview segments and information relating to the findings in Phase II were grouped by finding with an explanation of the experiences and adaptations Margaret had managed with her program.

Finding: TC art programs were allowed greater flexibility and in-depth opportunities in planning than the YR schedule.
Margaret agreed that TC have more flexibility to extend and add components to a unit if desired, whereas YR have to take into account an “arbitrary cut off date,” the track break. The two reasons she gave for extending lessons while she was a TC AS were more production time or presenting the lesson in a new way because the first approach was unsuccessful. As a YR AS, she had found this task more difficult, but possible. The mentioning of extending a lesson to try a new approach in instruction seemed beneficial to someone new to elementary art, like Tom’s case.

Margaret agreed that the results of extending a lesson were better artwork, more complexity of task, and increased understanding. The idea that students may get bored with an extended lesson or become a management problem was rebuked. Margaret explained how an AS arranges the components of a lesson to maintain the interest of the student while increasing the complexity of the task. She guides through the steps of contemplating the length and components of a lesson:

Could my second graders do this activity, and could they do it in two class periods, or do they need three? And then how much art history were they going to be able to sit still for? If I’ve got fifteen minutes of attention span to talk about art, how much would I do the first day, the second day, and the third day? Generally I find, and other teachers corroborate this, if there’s some new skill or technique or objective introduced each time, a lesson could go on and on and on with interest maintained; where you could have a series of new activities that renew and refresh concepts for several days in a row even for the younger ones.
She added that the students she was working with now were not as high functioning as the students she worked with before becoming TOSA. She was changing her task demands accordingly, but aiming at the same goals as her former programs.

*Finding:* Experienced ASs plan units around the track schedule, sometimes condensing the lessons to end before a track break, or to 'catch up' a returning class.

Any project could be taught in either setting, according to Margaret. The difficulty came in managing the rotation of each project with the classes. The options for a YR ASs were:

- Repeat and complete every unit, even if interrupted by a track break.
- Plan and execute lessons between track breaks only.
- Skip lessons the class missed while on track break and pick up on the lesson being taught at that age level.
- Teach general lessons to all grades or group lessons for morning classes and afternoon classes so production was more manageable.

Margaret had attempted each of these methods and characterized the two extremes.

The first method of repeating and completing every unit she called the "masochist." After a few rotations of tracks, within one grade level she would have four different units in operation. Even those working one the same unit were at different production stages, requiring different materials to be readily available. It eventually drove her "crazy" and she became "seriously ill," deciding never to do that again.

She then attempted the three-week increment plan, like Kevin's. She found that was reasonable for many first and second grade lessons, but too restrictive for the older students who could go more in-depth.
She adapted her planning units to incorporate in-depth lessons for most of the students and shorter versions for those who would be on track break in the midst of the unit. She describes her program plan.

I ended up condensing some units and extending others. I would have my three week version for the kids who were going to go on track break for three weeks and I had my six week version for my kids that were going to be there for that entire stretch of time. I’d do the three week version with the tracks that would missed the first three weeks or the second three weeks, and then I’d do the full fledge version with the other two or three tracks. That meant I was juggling a bit, but not a whole lot.

Finding: The difficulty of fitting all media experiences into the YR schedule for all students leads to the exclusion of lesson components such as quizzes, medium, or discussion time.

The components of DBAE were more likely to be excluded in a YR program because of condensing the lesson due to an oncoming track break, Margaret observed. But, she added, it had more to do with who the teacher was rather than the schedule. “There wasn’t a whole lot of art criticism or aesthetics going on in the district,” she said, “although that’s part of the curriculum. If somebody had to get the project done because the students were going on track break, the art history or the critical analysis was the first part to go. The kids want to have something finished.” Margaret found the YR ASs who were strong in DBAE and wanted to teach the components would manage to simplify the “depth or the breadth” to incorporate it, despite the schedule. Karen was the only YR AS
in the study who demonstrated that concern in her planning. Margaret added, “Some of our best teachers with the strongest DBAE training were at year-round schools and they just juggle it.”

Written evaluations were impossible, Margaret thinks, because the management of the grading would be “too time consuming” with the number of students a YR ASs had. This was characteristic of the feelings the other YR ASs gave for not using written evaluations like quizzes.

The decision to use the components of DBAE were based on the AS first, then the time allowed in the schedule determined the “depth and breadth.”

*Finding: YR AS confronts a chronic task of condensing, repeating, and staggering their lessons due to track breaks and the higher occurrence of holidays and assemblies than TC scheduling.*

Margaret explained why an interruption, such as an assembly or holiday, was detrimental to a YR AS more than a TC AS.

When one class out of a grade level would missed art because of an assembly [in the TC setting], then they were a week behind everybody else and we’d have to do a quick catch-up somehow. But, it’s more difficult at the year-round schedule because you have the students leaving on track break and there’s no time to catch-up.

It was the frequency of the interruptions that build the dilemma YR AS face.

*Findings: Time-out vacation days impede the YR art programs’ progression given that substitute lesson plans were fractional when compared to a regular art lesson taught by the AS.*
The time-out days Margaret schedules were during the summer for two reasons: she could arrange for a TC AS on summer break to teach more advanced lessons than what she would leave for an average substitute and to spend vacation time with her son who goes to a regular nine-month school. She explains the difference of having a TC AS in the summer.

If you take your time-out days during the summer, like many of us do, then you'll have a competent nine-month art specialist come in and sub while you have your 2-3 week vacation. And this was someone who knows how to teach a regular art lesson. If you take some of those time out days during the nine-month year, chances of getting a competent art sub for 2-3 week span were minimal and you end up having filler fluff activities that any sub could do.

Margaret’s strategy for taking time-out days demonstrates again her adaptive expertise. She had taken into account the knowledge shared by all ASs of substitute planning and the types of substitutes found in Phase II. Using this knowledge and reflecting on the experiences she had had over her years of experience, she had tailored her vacation time to avoid using an inept substitute to teach ‘fluff’ lessons, further salvaging her program from delayed instruction.

*Finding: Time-out vacation days require more program planning time for YR ASs than TC ASs.*

She minimized the amount of substitute planning time by using an experienced AS as a substitute. This was a progression from Kevin’s use of teachers from his school to an
expert with experience in class changes, managing multitudes of students, and teaching art content.

**Conclusions of Phase III.** Margaret suggested that intense staff development time was needed from the district to train YR ASs to adapt their programs without losing content. In her TOSA position she would receive requests for her to visit new teachers in YR or experienced ASs whose schools were adapting the YR schedule. They needed help in how to manage the multiple tracks and projects for each grade level. Now, there was no one in this position to assist the YR ASs and that was why Margaret felt the district needed to establish some training.

**Conclusions of Findings**

In a YR schedule, an art program incorporating DBAE can be managed, but it requires experience, time and planning over the long term. Based on the findings, ASs face many obstacles implementing such a program. One overriding factor was the lack of Professional Experiences and Development specific to implementing a YR art program. Such training was once offered in the district, but no longer. None of the higher education teacher training programs the participants in this study attended offered such training. DBAE training, management of activities taught during elementary art district in-services, and communication with other elementary ASs were the only sources of professional experiences and development mentioned by the participants.

The greatest difference in YR and TC art programs was time and scheduling. The TC setting was stable, allowing ASs to go in depth or extend a lesson if needed. The YR AS faced continuous disruption of sequencing lessons by track breaks, forcing the decision to
condense or skip the unit. Even the most experienced YR ASs found it impossible to repeat all units throughout the year.

The summer breaks allowed TC AS ample time to reflect and restructure the art program for the next year. YR ASs had no summers off to reflect. Their time-out days were burdens requiring additional planning time to arrange and hindrances to the progress of their programs because the substitute lessons were never as advanced as their regular lessons.

The Class Characteristics were similar for each setting, yet above the district average for class sizes in a regular classroom. The multi-track class combinations were special to the YR setting, requiring additional planning time than a regular class combination on the same track. Track segregation of students was mentioned by experienced YR ASs but not mentioned as a factor in planning the program.

Overall, the Instructional Methods were similar for the art programs in the study. Experience was the largest indicator of ability to implement a DBAE art program in either setting.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the differences of year-round (YR) and traditional-calendar (TC) elementary art programs. Four research questions were used to determine if differences in schedules affected the art programs. Those questions and their findings will be discussed in terms of their original hypotheses and their agreements or disagreements with current theory and research.

Research Question #1: Do art specialists have professional experiences or development training that helps them plan their programs around the schedules?

ASs lacked any professional experiences or development in how to implement an art program to the year-round schedule. This finding was aligned with the absence of any literature or research about YR art education, making the topic of this study essential in the discussion of YR education and art education. The training sessions that Margaret use to offer in the district focused on how to plan long-range around the track schedule. The YR ASs agreed the DBAE model and experience with teaching helped them plan the length of a unit, or adapt the areas of a lesson, like materials or content, needed to fit into the track changes. This type of training is needed to aid new ASs, like Tom, in adjusting the curriculum around the YR schedule.
Research Question #2: How are the two programs different in time and scheduling?

By working extended contract, it was hypothesized that YR ASs would have less time to plan and manage their program. Also, since the schedule was constantly changing and the TC was not, the amount of planning for the YR AS would be more extensive. The year-round schedule was changing constantly, whereas the traditional-calendar was stable. This difference made planning more consuming and frequent because of class changes, more class combinations, and multi-track combinations. Even though the YR AS had more prep time during certain track changes than the TC AS, this time was inconsistent and of no consequence when compared to the summer break TC AS had to utilize for reflection time.

Some of the difficulties revealed in the study were consistent with the disadvantages of YR education found in the literature. The California Department of Education (1999) report on YR programs mentioned the "start-ups" and "endings" three times a year, lack of "storage space" while classes were gone, and no "common vacations," were found problematic for the art programs in this study (p. 5). Even with the best planning for the tracking in and out of students, variances of student/class progress, specialist absences, holidays and assemblies, collided with track breaks. Storage of materials for students who did not finish an assignment before track break amassed with projects of the present classes in the school.

No common break, except the same December Holiday Break, Spring Break, and days between school years, offers the AS a mental break from the activities of the classroom. Margaret planned her time-out days during the summer to create the "illusion" of having a summer vacation. "All you can do is collapse a little bit, try to get some rest,
spend a little time with your family and maybe get the house cleaned up for once. And
then, you’re off and running again.” This meager vacation is what Worthen and Zsiray
(1994) cited as a risk for burnout without “personal renewal” or reflection time that
regular track teachers receive (p. 12).

Even the vacation time-out days of YR ASs posed additional planning responsibility
in time and scheduling. The planned absence lesson plan was specific and detailed when
compared to an emergency absence, requiring more time to prepare. Even with effort to
continue the program while on time-out vacation days, the required absences were
viewed as “a negative effect” on the program since substitute lessons were never as
thorough as the ASs’.

Kevin counteracted the impact a substitute had during time-out days by using regular
teachers at his own school who were on track break during his vacation days. They were
more familiar with the school, procedures, and the students, making Kevin’s planning for
time-out days less involved. Using teachers on track break from the YR school as
substitutes was an advantage of the YR schedule mentioned by Brekke’s review of YRE
(1992). The irony of the benefit to using teachers on time-out days as substitutes was
when Kevin complained to an administrator about the loss of annual income due to the
required time-out days. He was reassured by the administrator that he could “sub for
himself” during those days to make up for the loss. Substitutes make less than half of the
licensed teacher’s daily rate of pay.

Research Question #3: Are class characteristics different because of the tracking of
students or overcrowded population?
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Class Characteristics was a research topic since the students were assigned to classes on a track system in the YR setting and the YR schedule was adopted because of overcrowding in the schools. During the literature review, it was hypothesized that classrooms were overcrowded in a YR setting and not a TC setting. Overall, the class sizes were equal across the schools. The art specialists were not treated equal to regular education instructors because they were serving twice the established district class-size reduction rates for primary age. Also, the year-round schedule did not reduce overcrowded classes, just the population within the facility at any given time. Throughout the year, the YR ASs taught more students than the TC AS, but the weekly average was no different.

The segregation of students by track assignment was believed to distinguish the classes of students and their ability levels, in addition to the traditional assignments of grade level and teacher. Those who had long-term experience in the YR setting hit upon the achievement segregation by parental choice. Similar to lower performing Track B, described by Cantrall and White (2001), Track II was the least favorite track, while Track V, the track most similar with the traditional calendar and A-track, was the most popular. It was suggested by the experienced YR participants that the result in greater achievement of student in Track V was due to parents who were involved in the students’ lives enrolling them in that track first. Children, whose parents were less likely to value education, move frequently, or less involved in their lives, were more likely to be assigned to Track II, the ‘dumping track’. This description of Track II fit Mitchell and Mitchell’s (1999) description of an accumulation of low-average students in the middle.
or less wanted track assignments. No instructional methods or planning was altered for these groups by the YR ASs.

*Research Question #4: Do the instructional methods differ between TC and YR settings?*

Instructional methods were expected to be less in-depth in YR than TC because the track changes interrupted the lessons. The depth of the lessons was similar across settings, but the lessons for classes leaving on track break or returning on track break were not. Experienced ASs planned units around the track schedule, sometimes condensing the lessons to end before a track break, or to ‘catch up’ a returning class. Fitting all media experiences into the YR schedule for all students was difficult and lead to the exclusion of lesson components such as quizzes, medium, or discussion time. Disrupting the sequencing of instruction (Hobbs & Rush, 1997) and limiting the time necessary to go in-depth with a lesson (Hope, 1999) puts the implementation of a YR art program at risk for becoming an incoherent program of “activity-to-activity” progression (Ahlgren & Kesidou, 1995). Kevin’s insistence that his three-week unit program was adequate raised questions of whether he was operating a program where “one activity follows another with no rhyme or reason” (Ahlgren & Kesidou, 1995, p. 45).

Repeating the lessons continuously was not a consideration without risking burnout. Only Margaret had attempted this repetition of every lesson unit, and experienced what Emmett, George, and Quinlan (1987) listed as extended contract employee “burnout” from less frequent breaks and higher demand on planning. Other than this case, none of the YR specialists gave the impression of being overtired, burnt out or griping (Emmett, George, & Quinlan, 1987). Instead, they were very dedicated to sustaining and providing the best possible art program under the conditions given. They even chose YR as a
challenge, willing to adapt their instruction to alternative scheduling, showing a greater sense of commitment to improving their profession. Karen described the mentality of YR art instruction as something very difficult, but self-inflicted out of interest for the program. “I think it is [more pressure], but a lot of it I think I put on myself,” she admits. “I don’t like things to go home unfinished. I want them to get the most out of their art time and their art experiences. So, I think I can sometimes make it more difficult than some other people do.”

It was hypothesized that the YR schedule posed a more complex challenge for the art specialist (AS) to implement an art program in than a TC schedule. In a YR schedule, an art program incorporating the Discipline Based Art Education (DBAE) model can be managed, but it requires experience, time and planning over the long term. To illustrate this conclusion a comparison of a novice (Tom) and expert (Margaret) YR AS implementing their art program in the YR schedule will be made using the Pedagogical Reasoning and Action (PRA) model (Shulman, 1987).

Pedagogical Reasoning and Action in YR Art Education.

The PRA model outlines the stages teachers go through while developing pedagogical content knowledge that organizes the subject matter for instruction. Pedagogical Content Knowledge (Shulman, 1987) is how content is taught in a specific situation. A YR AS must have strong pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) to rely on when planning for instruction. PCK was what the experienced YR ASs in this study used to adapt lessons in order to manage their programs without losing content. The more exposure an ASs has to pedagogy, content, and context of YR, the more knowledge a YR AS has to reason and
act affectively in planning around the schedule. The more exposure, knowledge, and understanding the AS had of teaching art in a YR setting the more successful they were at working around the schedule and were considered an expert YR AS. For a novice AS, the YR schedule posed an additional trial of context knowledge that must be understood in order to adapt and learn how to teach within it.

In developing PCK, the AS makes adjustments to the art program to fit the schedule. This process cycles through stages Shulman (1987) referred to as Pedagogical Reasoning and Action (PRA) (Shulman, 1987). For a DBAE program to exist in a YR setting, YR AS had to adjust their programs for multi-track combination classes, program continuity during time-out days, and rotation of class participation because of track rotations. The following comparative example in Table 25 of Margaret and Tom working through PRA characterizes the difference PCK of an expert has during PRA when compared to a novice.

Table 25

**Expert/Novice Pedagogical Reasoning & Action (PRA) in YR Art Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRA Stage</th>
<th>Tom (Novice)</th>
<th>Margaret (Expert)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehension</strong></td>
<td>Tom demonstrated</td>
<td>Has a master’s degree in DBAE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the content and the ideas that must be taught.</td>
<td>Through displays in his room and during discussion.</td>
<td>DBAE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRA Stage</td>
<td>Tom (Novice)</td>
<td>Margaret (Expert)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Transformation</em></td>
<td>Preparation was limited to materials and procedures of production, no art examples from various cultures or time periods were prepared.</td>
<td>Production was based on age level and difficulty of the objectives. Several examples of artwork within a culture or across cultures were selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation, representation, instructional selection, adaptation and tailoring of information for others to understand it.</td>
<td>Adaptations of production requirements and instructions were made after reflection. No tailoring, yet. Lessons are planned one at a time and he keeps track of which classes have done what projects in his head.</td>
<td>Considerations of class size, grade level, and track assignment tailored lessons for each individual group ahead of time. Long-range plans incorporated the track rotation and which class would receive which version of a unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRA Stage</td>
<td>Tom (Novice)</td>
<td>Margaret (Expert)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction</strong></td>
<td>Only the teacher’s Cues for listening, rules of management, organizing, presentation of production was represented. No other centered questioning skills examples were offered. Instruction was limited to demonstration in a particular area, and production in seats. As problems arise in production, the teacher sounded a wind chime to signal silence so he could alert other students to potential problems that many students were having and how to handle that problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, organizing, questioning, and discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cues for listening, rules of management, organizing, presentation of production was represented. No other centered questioning skills examples were offered. Instruction was limited to demonstration in a particular area, and production in seats. As problems arise in production, the teacher sounded a wind chime to signal silence so he could alert other students to potential problems that many students were having and how to handle that problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRA Stage</td>
<td>Tom (Novice)</td>
<td>Margaret (Expert)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Dots on seating charts if students are ‘doing good.’</td>
<td>Uses grading rubrics for different areas of the unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking for understanding</td>
<td>All students received an E for excellent, when they were supposed to receive an S for standard. Did not understand grading procedure when grades were initially due.</td>
<td>There is a rubric for production that is graded individually and a group or class rubric for discussion and comprehension of content during critiques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection</strong></td>
<td>Describes reflection as the time when all the daily activities “hit” him on his drive home and he thinks about what happened and what it means. Or, when a lesson does not work as planned, he reflects on the problems and adjusts for them before instructing the next class.</td>
<td>Has taken place over many years and assists in planning long-term for units, curriculum, and vacation time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRA Stage</td>
<td>Tom (Novice)</td>
<td>Margaret (Expert)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Comprehension</td>
<td>There is no new comprehension, yet. Tom is just “trying to find [his] way through” because it is his “first year.” Frequently says, “I don’t know” or “I haven’t thought of that” when asked questions about teaching art and YRE.</td>
<td>Plans for track breaks so everything is finished before students leave on break. Plans vacation for the summer because it is easier to get a preferred substitute and she is able to have a family holiday. Has an idea of how to make YR easier for specialists. Understands other strategies for teaching art in a YR setting and explains rationale for the ones she implements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contrast of Tom and Margaret points to experience and expertise making a difference in planning and implementing an art program in a YR schedule. PRA is the cycle of activities that ASs have to go through to implement their YR art program. Tom did not have a program because his lack of experience did not offer him enough PCK to make rational choices during the PRA process. As already stated, Tom had difficulties
planning long-term because he did not know how long it takes students of different ages needed to complete a project. Due to lack of learner knowledge, he would only plan short-term art production activities, a characteristic found in novices by Borko and Livingston (1989). When asked if he knew what he was going to teach the rest of the year, he stated, "I just don't have enough lesson plans in my head to do that, yet." While this problem could occur for a novice in the TC setting, the inability to reteach a lesson in a new way, or predict the length of a lesson, before students left on track break in the YR setting posed a difficult task Tom experienced frequently.

Often, he could not predict where students would have difficulties in the curriculum. For example, his students were unable to finish the pumpkin project before Halloween because he didn't understand the developmental challenge of the task he assigned. He only taught production, with a limited amount of art history and criticism at the beginning of the year, because he could not get the students to focus on the discussion after showing the students what they were going to produce. "They're just itching to get started and then they rip up the tape," he describes.

Margaret, on the other hand, exhibited characteristics of an expert teacher (Borko & Livingston, 1989) because she was able to see things differently due to her PCK from experience. She mentally derived at how long a unit would last by considering technical skills and media. She asked herself, "Can my second graders do this activity, and can they do it in two class periods, or do they need three? And then, how much art history are they going to be able to sit still for. And, if I've got fifteen minutes of attention span to talk about art, how much will I do the first day, the second day, and the third day?" This improvisation of repeating art history over days of lessons so the students do not get
restless and lose attention (as Tom had a problem with), was a characteristic of the teaching schema available for expert teachers to plan and teach, using less time to prepare (Borko & Livingston, 1989).

A twist on the difficulties of teaching YR art and the amount of experience teaching are whether an experienced TC AS moving into a YR AS position will perform like a beginning novice AS without a new understanding of the YR schedule? In the example of Karen, the expert TC AS new to YR, she was better able to adapt to the YR schedule because she knew what materials would take less time to manage with the students and complete the assignment before track break. The objectives of art history and art criticism were still met, but the production was altered. Here is an example of the Henri Rousseau Jungles lesson Karen referred to:

The fifth grade did a 12”X18” [paper] of jungles with oil pastels. Well, it took them six lessons to do the whole thing. They did sketch, talk about the artist, [shading] and highlighting, that kind of stuff. So, the [fifth grade] group that just tracked in, I had them do a much smaller piece of paper. We still learned about the artist, learned about the jungles, but only on a smaller level. We drew it in pencil, traced it with marker, and they were coloring with q-tips and chalk pastels. They’re still learning all the concepts but it’s a much shorter project.

Therefore, the YR schedule is not as difficult for an expert AS from a TC schedule as it is for a novice AS.

Tom was unable to do this because his whole curriculum revolved around understanding the art production stages and developmental levels of the students. Tom’s
lack of experience does not imply he will never become an expert teacher. On the contrary, Tom exhibited Hatano and Inagaki’s adaptive expertise (1986) in the reflection stage that assisted in the adaptation and tailoring period of planning. On the day of observation, the first class had difficulty making coil pots as he had planned. He adapted the lesson for the remaining classes of the day so they made pinch pots, an alternative Tom decided was easier to manage, and found that change successful. He was also open to learning alternative strategies. When asked if he separated combined classes by tables so he knew which students where from which teacher, he replied, “no, but I think I’m going to have to do that.”

In summary, to implement an art program in the YR schedule, the YR AS must comprehend all that is necessary for a TC AS to teach art, but obtain additional comprehension of the YR schedule, such as time-out days and track breaks, in order to transform the program around the schedule.

Limitations of the Study and Future Research

A limitation of this study is that not all YR schools and ASs within the Clark County School District were represented in this study. Not all of the TC ASs were interviewed. The time and scope of the study did not encompass studying the long-range programs and student progress across sites and tracks. The main purpose was to understand the implications, if any, of the YR schedule on a YR program.

A suggestion for research on YR art education is to study many YR ASs within the same district, who are strong practitioners of the DBAE model, and have adapted their own model of YR art education to the YR schedule. By studying these various models,
adaptations that prove effective or experiences that were ineffective can be gathered and reviewed. A model for managing sequenced DBAE across the YR track changes could be developed with such focus.

A separate study is suggested for focus on multi-track combinations, and how to plan instruction according to the track and age level varieties being combined.

Substitute lessons are also a concern for future studies. Is there a format to design substitute plans so they contain all four components of DBAE (Alexander, 1992) that any “warm-bodied babysitter” could follow? How can a YR specialist achieve this with the least amount of effort, to reduce the stress of preparing for time-out vacations? This would minimize the break in regular instruction, for filler or fluff activities, and increase the amount of meaningful experiences in the diminishing schedule. Inter-district training should include some of the methods mentioned in this study of how to schedule time-out days to minimize the damaging impact of time-out absences on the art program.

It is suggested for future research consideration, based on this concept of track segregation, to compare artwork of each track assignment, after equal time allocations for the same lesson unit have been given, to see if there are any development differences in the products, providing evidence that the ability levels of students are segregated.

**Implications of Study**

How members of the YR setting understood, experienced and arranged their program was concentrated on in this study, unlike any research found in current theory and literature of YR. This study found that most of the current YR studies focus on the classroom teacher and academic scores, rather than the entire school environment. The
advantages listed by the California State Department of Education (1999) of paced instruction, multiple vacations, and salary benefits for extended contract employees, were irrelevant, if not contrary, to the extended contract, or ‘rainbow’ employee, program. While the frequent breaks might allow classroom teachers time to reflect on instruction and how to pace it for their individual class (Oberg & Shields, 2000), the YR ASs in this study found the interruption of instruction a hindrance of content and depth. The multiple vacations were for classroom teachers only. While the extra pay from extended contracts was mentioned as an advantage for the YR specialists (California Dept. of Ed., 1999), the requirement of time to prepare substitute lessons for these vacation days was not considered a benefit of the deal. Kevin even noted that he’d rather work the extra days, continue his program, and make the extra money. He argued that classroom teachers would never be required to write three weeks of lesson plans for a substitute over the summer without compensation for their time.

For art education and the training of art educators, the implications of this study suggests that professors in higher education concentrate the training of prospective art educators in curriculum planning, with an emphasis on unit length and developmental sequencing, and methods for developing aesthetical awareness with young children. The inadequacy of aesthetic activities in the elementary classroom needs to be addressed in higher educational programs so incoming AS will be better adept at teaching aesthetics to young students. Perhaps aesthetics is being taught at the college level only and not being mentioned in the art education programs developmentally. AS in training need preparation and familiarity with the developmental stages of early aesthetical awareness.
With the exception of aesthetics, the model of DBAE (Alexander, 1992; Greer, 1984; Hobbs & Rush, 1997) was strongly present in all the classrooms studied. The management of classroom activities and procedures were adequate and highly developed, except in the case of Tom who demonstrated the inadequacies of a novice teacher, but his reflective and adaptive awareness may be able to pull him into expert status after some more experiences.

Due to their unequal treatment in class scheduling, the AS in both settings of this study provided evidence that art programs have low priority in overall educational goals of the CCSD. The class size ratios were double what regular primary classroom teachers have by combining two classes into one period for the AS (Bach, 2002). The inconsistent scheduling of multi-track combination classes shows a lack of importance for the continuity provided by consistent groupings of students. It is unlikely that regular classroom teachers would ever have to face such combinations temporarily every three weeks. With the large numbers of students, the possibility of knowing the learners characteristics in order to better fit the curriculum to the learners needs is unmanageable over a staggered multi-track schedule. The focus of the class schedule is on the regular teachers preparation period, not the AS ability to teach all of the classes, as argued by McGoff (1988). And finally, the decision to bring in a substitute three weeks out of the year trivialized the credibility of a licensed AS. Without knowledge of the learner, the substitute can never replace the original teacher. Art advocates should be concerned by the doubling of classes and replacement of an AS with a substitute, enough to demand the option for time-out days and equal representation of student to teacher ratios with regular classroom teachers.
In conclusion, it was found that both YR and TC ASs have a difficult task in teaching art education. This is not necessarily the intent of the district, but a result of the district becoming one of the fastest growing and largest school districts in the nation over the past ten years. The rate of growth has surpassed the school buildings, employment, and budget of the district. The doubling of classes for all specialists at the elementary school level counteracts the class size reduction ruling. But, under the conditions the district is under, doubling of classes is the only option for classroom teachers to get their daily preparation time. Amidst the difficult circumstances, the elementary ASs consider themselves “lucky to have a job” and find the conditions of instruction irrelevant when compared to the impact art has on the lives of their students.
Table 1

**Site Accountability Reports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Region A</th>
<th>Region A</th>
<th>Region B</th>
<th>Region B</th>
<th>Region C</th>
<th>Region C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Calendar</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>YR</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>YR</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>YR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>244,768</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transiency Rate</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Meals</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Per Student</td>
<td>$5,422</td>
<td>$5,090</td>
<td>$5,462</td>
<td>$6,944</td>
<td>$5,354</td>
<td>$5,666</td>
<td>$5,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Education</td>
<td>$24,001,408</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$466,683</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
<td>$2,560</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Reading, Language, Mathematics, and Science scores were reported by average percentile rank from the Fourth Grade Iowa Tests of Basic Skills Results. The results from the Region B YR school were in parentheses because the scores reflect the neighboring school that had a fourth grade. The Region B YR school was K-2 only.
Table 2

*Participant Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Region A</th>
<th>Region A</th>
<th>Region B</th>
<th>Region B</th>
<th>Region C</th>
<th>Region C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calendar</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>YR</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>YR</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>YR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Experience</td>
<td>(2/0)</td>
<td>(7/0)</td>
<td>(3/0)</td>
<td>(0/0)</td>
<td>(9/0)</td>
<td>(0/6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Overview of Data Collection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Method of Data Collection</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Teresa, Karen, Chelsea, Tom, Cindy, Kevin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document Collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Teresa, Karen, Chelsea, Tom, Cindy, Kevin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Member Check</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Figure 1.* Teresa's tables are grouped in rows, labeled by shapes and forms.
Table 4

*Teresa’s Schedule*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:10-10:00</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (35)</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (35)</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (35)</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; (19)</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:05-10:55</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (32)</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (32)</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (32)</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:50</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; (19-24)</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; (19-24)</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; (19-24)</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; (19-24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:50-12:45</td>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45-1:35</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; (18)</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; (20)</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:35-2:25</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; (28)</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; (30)</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; (31)</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:50-2:40</td>
<td>K &amp; K</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; (18)</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; (19)</td>
<td>Collaborations</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; (33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The numbers in parenthesis were the average number of students in those classes.*
Table 5

*Teresa's 1st & 2nd Grade Color Graph Lesson*

Instructions: Fill in the rows and columns with the identified colors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This primary lesson only requires the primary colors to make secondary colors.*
Table 6

*This intermediate lesson table requires primary and secondary colors to be mixed to create intermediate or tertiary colors.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Blue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Karen's Schedule: Track IV Out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:10-10:00</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>5/V</td>
<td>5/I</td>
<td>5/II</td>
<td>5/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:50</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>PREP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45-12:15</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-2:20</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>1/V &amp; 1/V</td>
<td>1/I &amp; 1/I</td>
<td>1/II</td>
<td>1/III &amp; 1/III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers represent grade levels and roman numerals represent track assignment. Two sets in one cell represent a combined class.*
Table 8

Karen's Schedule: Track V Out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:10-10:00</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>5/III</td>
<td>5/I</td>
<td>5/II</td>
<td>5/IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>PREP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45-</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-2:20</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>1/III &amp;</td>
<td>1/I &amp; 1/I</td>
<td>1/II</td>
<td>1/IV &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers represent grade levels and roman numerals represent track assignment. Two sets in one cell represent a combined class.
Figure 2. Karen's table arrangement is based on the color wheel.
Figure 3. Chelsea's room arrangement uses a U-shape. The patterns on the chairs represent the grouping of A-H captain assignment for every two tables.
Table 9

*Chelsea's Schedule*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:32-9:22</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>3 (20)</td>
<td>3 (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:18-11:08</td>
<td>1 (18)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>3 (23)</td>
<td>3 (21)</td>
<td>1/2 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:11-12:01</td>
<td>2 (17)</td>
<td>2 (19)</td>
<td>5 (30)</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>1 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:01-12:57</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>5 (30)</td>
<td>DUTY</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:57-1:47</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>3 (20)</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>3 (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:50-2:40</td>
<td>4 (22)</td>
<td>4 (25)</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>Art Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The numbers represent grade levels; the numbers in parenthesis represent class sizes.*
Figure 4. Tom’s classroom is divided with a grey shaded line representing the tape on the floor. The darker line represents the door. Tables were identified by the cafeteria style benches along the sides.
Table 10. Tom's Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:50</td>
<td>1/IIIa &amp; 1/IIIb</td>
<td>2/III</td>
<td>K/II</td>
<td>2/IV</td>
<td>K/Va &amp; K/Vb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:55-11:45</td>
<td>1/IVa &amp; 1/IVb</td>
<td>1/V</td>
<td>3/IVa &amp; 3/IVb</td>
<td>2/I</td>
<td>1/IIIc &amp; 1/IIIid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45-12:05</td>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:05-12:35</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>3/Va &amp; 3/Vb</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:35-1:25</td>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>K/V</td>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:25-2:15</td>
<td>1/I &amp; 1/III</td>
<td>K/IIIa &amp;</td>
<td>1/IIIa &amp; 1/IIIb</td>
<td>1/I &amp; 1/I</td>
<td>1/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20-3:10</td>
<td>2/IIIa &amp; 2/IIIb</td>
<td>2/V &amp; 2/V</td>
<td>1/I &amp; 1/I</td>
<td>1/II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numerals represent grade levels and roman numerals represent track assignment.

Lower case letters represent separate classes from the same grade level and track. Team-teaching classes were represented with the same numerals and roman numerals during the same period.
Figure 5. Cindy's classroom is arranged by rows of tables between the board and sink area.
Table 11

Cindy’s Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:50</td>
<td>5 (27)</td>
<td>5 (28)</td>
<td>5 (27)</td>
<td>5 (28)</td>
<td>5 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:55-10:45</td>
<td>2 (30)</td>
<td>4 (33)</td>
<td>4 (35)</td>
<td>4 (33)</td>
<td>3 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50-11:40</td>
<td>3 (24)</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>3 (29)</td>
<td>2 (16)</td>
<td>3 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-1:20</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>4 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:25-2:15</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>2 (38)</td>
<td>K (25)</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>3 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20-3:10</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>3 (24)</td>
<td>1 (28)</td>
<td>2 (33)</td>
<td>PREP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The numerals represent grade levels and the numbers in the parenthesis represent class sizes.
Figure 6. Kevin's classroom was the smallest in size. His tables were separated with extra chairs facing the dry erase board.
Table 12

*Kevin’s Schedule: Track III Out*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:10-10:00</td>
<td>5/I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/II</td>
<td>5/IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUNCH &amp; PREP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:25-2:15</td>
<td>1/IV &amp; 1/IV</td>
<td>1/Va &amp; 1/V</td>
<td>1/IV &amp; 1/IV</td>
<td>1/IV</td>
<td>1/III &amp; 1/III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/IVa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers represent grade levels and roman numerals represent track assignment. Two sets in one cell represent a combined class.*
Table 13

*Kevin’s Schedule: Track I Out*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:05-</td>
<td>3/II</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>3/III</td>
<td>3/Va</td>
<td>33/V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-</td>
<td>4/III</td>
<td>3/IV</td>
<td>4/V</td>
<td>4/II</td>
<td>4/IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUNCH &amp; PREP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:25-2:15</td>
<td>1/IV &amp;</td>
<td>1/Va &amp;</td>
<td>1/V &amp; 1/V</td>
<td>1/II &amp; 1/II</td>
<td>1/III &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/IV</td>
<td>1/IVa</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers represent grade levels and roman numerals represent track assignment. Two sets in one cell represent a combined class.*
Table 14

**Professional Experiences and Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBCATEGORIES</th>
<th>TERESA</th>
<th>CHELSEA</th>
<th>CINDY</th>
<th>KAREN</th>
<th>TOM</th>
<th>KEVIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of Teaching Art (TC/YR)</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>9/0</td>
<td>6/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education/In-service Training</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Responsibilities</td>
<td>Integration Yearbook Duty</td>
<td>Integration Traveling Selling food and books Duty Academic night</td>
<td>ArtSmart-a-thon Character Education Development Mural Babysitting</td>
<td>Contests Holiday art After school program Duty</td>
<td>Traveling Duty Mural Committees</td>
<td>Scheduling Intramurals SIT Yearbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Teaching Situation</td>
<td>Smaller classes Prep and lunch at same time every day</td>
<td>Smaller classes One school</td>
<td>Smaller classes Block scheduling</td>
<td>Smaller classes Three classes in morning</td>
<td>Smaller classes One school</td>
<td>Smaller classes Larger room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>School Art Interact Specialists</td>
<td>School Art Interact Specialists</td>
<td>School Art Interact Specialists</td>
<td>School Art Interact Specialists</td>
<td>School Art Interact Specialists</td>
<td>School Art Interact Specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role as AS</td>
<td>Production Art History Production</td>
<td>Production Art History Production</td>
<td>Production Art History Production</td>
<td>Production Art History Production</td>
<td>Production Art History Production</td>
<td>Production Art History Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Art Education</td>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>Experiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 15

**Time and Scheduling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALENDAR</th>
<th>TRADITIONAL</th>
<th>YEAR-ROUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBCATEGORIES</td>
<td>TERESA</td>
<td>CHELSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Description</td>
<td>Scattered</td>
<td>Scattered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation Minutes (250)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Combinations (#):</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-Teaching (#)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Singles (#)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Track (#)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute Preparation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flex or Personal Day</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick Day</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Out Days</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itinerant/Humanities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of Schedule</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Responsibilities</td>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>Prep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

*Class Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TERESA</th>
<th>CHELSEA</th>
<th>CINDY</th>
<th>KAREN</th>
<th>TOM</th>
<th>KEVIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBCATEGORIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Pace: Track</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary vs. Intermediate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single vs. Double</strong></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single vs. Team</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Depends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Sizes:</strong></td>
<td>18-33</td>
<td>17-38</td>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>22-35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Sizes:</strong></td>
<td>17-19</td>
<td>20-27</td>
<td>24-35</td>
<td>22-35</td>
<td>19-35</td>
<td>18-36</td>
<td>18-36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Sizes:</strong></td>
<td>17-19</td>
<td>20-27</td>
<td>24-35</td>
<td>22-35</td>
<td>19-35</td>
<td>18-36</td>
<td>18-36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 17

**Instructional Methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Calendar</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Year-Round</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Rules</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive Program</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room Arrangement</td>
<td>Figure #</td>
<td>Figure #</td>
<td>Figure #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Criticism</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Production</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Units</td>
<td>Artist Demo Production</td>
<td>Artist Demo Production</td>
<td>Demo Production Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*quiz</td>
<td>*quiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Reports</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating Lessons</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting Lessons</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALANDAR TRADITIONAL YEAR-ROUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBCATEGORY</td>
<td>TERESA</td>
<td>CHELSEA</td>
<td>CINDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute Planning</td>
<td>One-day</td>
<td>One-day</td>
<td>One-day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Discussion</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates the AS does perform the function.
Figure 7. The schedule differences and similarities of traditional and year-round art schedules are represented in a Venn diagram.
Figure 8. Differences of year-round and traditional art programs are shown by the shaded areas representing the year-round elements and the striped areas representing elements common to both.
### Table 18

#### Planning Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALENDAR</th>
<th>TRADITIONAL</th>
<th>YEAR-ROUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
<td>TERESA 1-3</td>
<td>CHELSEA 3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class periods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Pace</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Work pace</td>
<td>Assemblies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assemblies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Length</td>
<td>Steps, age</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>No; projects do not end at the same time</td>
<td>Yes; learn content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

_Holidays and Breaks_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALENDAR</th>
<th>TRADITIONAL</th>
<th>YEAR-ROUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONS</td>
<td>TERESA</td>
<td>CHELSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemblies</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condense</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filler</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Condenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move on</td>
<td>Condenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday/Friday</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon./Fri.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Break</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish Early</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20

Substitutes and Substitute Lessons: Types of Substitutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CALENDAR</th>
<th>TRADITIONAL</th>
<th>YEAR-ROUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONS</td>
<td>TERESA</td>
<td>CHELSEA</td>
<td>CINDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Sub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach my plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high standards,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn’t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School list</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan in advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from subbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Prep Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown sub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21

Substitutes and Substitute Lessons: Types of Absences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>TERESA</th>
<th>CHELSEA</th>
<th>CINDY</th>
<th>KAREN</th>
<th>TOM</th>
<th>KEVIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency/</td>
<td>Easy vs.</td>
<td>None (Art)</td>
<td>Easy vs.</td>
<td>Easy vs.</td>
<td>None: Filler</td>
<td>None: Filler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Detailed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Absence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress:</th>
<th>Set-back</th>
<th>Behind</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Behind</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress:</th>
<th>None;</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes; different</th>
<th>Assume the</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>planned sub –</td>
<td>classroom</td>
<td>planned classroom</td>
<td>same; not planned</td>
<td>sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positive/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Positive (Art)</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neither with proper planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bingo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 22

Substitutes and Substitute Lessons: Types of Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALENDAR</th>
<th>TRADITIONAL</th>
<th>YEAR-ROUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONS</td>
<td>TERESA</td>
<td>CHELSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Sub drawer</td>
<td>Desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Agreed location</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Referred to in</td>
<td>Easy access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason:</td>
<td>office sub folder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluff vs.</td>
<td>Easy vs. mess</td>
<td>Art bingo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials (No)</td>
<td>Paint, oil pastel,</td>
<td>Paints, inks, clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>glue, clay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities (yes)</td>
<td>Book, video,</td>
<td>Games, drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>draw, color</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALENDAR</th>
<th>TRADITIONAL CALENDAR</th>
<th>YEAR-ROUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONS</td>
<td>TERESA</td>
<td>CHELSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as Reg.</td>
<td>Yes if drawing</td>
<td>Yes if drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents/Instructions</td>
<td>Seating charts, schedule, duty, medical alert, special students</td>
<td>Schedule, seating charts, grade 4, book, behavior, record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Prep Time</td>
<td>Fluff</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of</td>
<td>Every absence</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONS</td>
<td>TERESA</td>
<td>CHELSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work YR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning YR</td>
<td>Extended lessons</td>
<td>Hectic and crazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Program</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges of YR</td>
<td>Expanding lessons</td>
<td>Unable to finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>long lessons before track break.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24

*For Year-Round Only*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>KAREN</th>
<th>TOM</th>
<th>KEVIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC In-Depth</td>
<td>Yes, from experience</td>
<td>Depends on the schedule</td>
<td>No, 3-week block sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of YR</td>
<td>Extra pay; breaks from students; time</td>
<td>Not sure yet</td>
<td>Extra money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instead of summer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work W/O Time-</td>
<td>20 needed to recupereate</td>
<td>Option for more money; sub planning</td>
<td>Work with extra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out Days</td>
<td></td>
<td>takes away from vacation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal # of Time-</td>
<td>15 enough</td>
<td>Conflicted</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Skip Medium</td>
<td>Painting and clay</td>
<td>Rare medium (clay) Clay; student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>preference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Out/Track</td>
<td>Never considered</td>
<td>Yes, track 3</td>
<td>Evenly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Time-Out</td>
<td>Attach to scheduled</td>
<td>Every 7-9 weeks</td>
<td>Summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>holidays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Visual Arts Grade One Standards
Nevada Grades K-12 Content Standards
1.0 Students know and apply visual arts media, techniques, and processes.
2.0 Students use knowledge of visual characteristics, purposes, and functions.
3.0 Students choose, apply, and evaluate a range of subject matter, symbols, and ideas.
4.0 Students understand the visual arts in relation to history and cultures.
5.0 Students analyze and assess characteristics, merits, and meanings in their own artwork and the work of others.
6.0 Students demonstrate relationships between visual arts, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts.

ESSENTIAL CONCEPTS, SKILLS, AND EXPERIENCES

ART CRITICISM
It is expected that students will:
(1) 1.1 Describes works of art, using appropriate vocabulary, e.g., list or name subject matter, identify visual characteristics [NS 2.3.1]
(1) 1.2 Analyze works of art, e.g., name elements and principles of design; discuss media, techniques, etc. [NS 2.3.1]
(1) 1.3 Interprets works of art, e.g., describe possible meanings [NS 5.3.3]
(1) 1.4 Judge works of art
a. Share opinions to evaluate the presentation of subject matter, symbols and ideas
b. Share opinions to assess observed characteristics, merits and meanings
c. Support opinions, points of view by citing artwork
(1) 1.5 Share/assess/evaluate own artwork for
a. Presentation of subject matter, symbols and ideas
b. Characteristics, merits and meanings

ART HISTORY
It is expected that students will:
2.1 Examine historical/cultural context, e.g., observe works of art as belonging to particular cultures, times, or places [NS 4.3.2]
(1) 2.2 Discuss materials, processes, purposes and functions, e.g., learn how artist's choices are influenced by time and place [NS 4.3.2]
(1) 2.3 Discuss artistic styles, e.g., find characteristics in works of art that identify individual artists, groups of artists, or cultures [NS 4.3.2]
AESTHETICS
It is expected that students will:
(1) 3.1 engage in aesthetic inquiry through various aesthetic issues/topics
a. Artist’s intent and viewer’s interpretation
b. Purposes for works of art
(1) 3.2 Discover aesthetic positions/stances
a. Realism (art that is true to life)
   b. Expressionism (art that shows feelings)
   c. Functionalism (art with a practical purpose)
ART PRODUCTION
It is expected that students will:
(1) 4.1 Demonstrate elements of art as observed in artworks and in nature: line, shape, color, texture [NS 2.3.4]
(1) 4.2 Demonstrate design concepts & principles as observed in artworks and in nature: repetition, pattern, symmetry, geometric shape, color theory (mix secondary colors from primary hues) [NS 2.3.4]
(1) 4.3 Demonstrate choice of subject matter and symbols to communicate an intended meaning [NS 3.3.2]
(1) 4.4 Draw; using varied media, techniques and processes [NS 1.3.3]
(1) 4.5 Paint; using varied media, techniques and processes [NS 1.3.3]
(1) 4.6 Create a minimum of one three-dimensional art form using varied media, techniques and processes:
   a. Sculpture (fully three-dimensional) [NS 1.3.3] or
   b. Relief (raised elements on a background) [NS 1.3.3] (Media may be chosen from paper, paper mache, found objects, plaster, modeling clay, etc.)
(1) 4.7 Create a ceramic object using media, techniques and processes
   a. Clay modeling (manipulating in three-dimensions) e.g., forming human figures, animals, etc. [NS 1.3.3] or
   b. Pottery (functional vessels) e.g., pinch pots, coiled cups, slab bowls or boxes, etc. [NS 1.3.3]
(1) 4.8 Make prints; using media, techniques and processes for
   a. Stamp prints [NS 1.3.3]
   b. Mono prints [NS 1.3.3]
(1) 4.9 Weave using varied media, techniques and processes [NS 1.3.3]
(1) 4.10 Represent architecture; using two-dimensional or three-dimensional media, techniques and processes [NS 1.3.3]
(1) 4.11 Work in at least one mixed medium; using varied techniques and processes, e.g., collage, wearable art (garments, head pieces, etc.), puppetry, bookmaking, jewelry, animation, combined media, etc. [NS 1.3.3]
(1) 4.12 Create a work of art that shows the influence of a particular historical period or culture [NS 4.3.3]
APPENDIX B

CONSENT FORM

Participation Agreement:
Comparative Study of Year-Round and Nine-Month Elementary Art Programs
Ashley J. Forgey, graduate student in the College of Educational Psychology at UNLV, is conducting a study, which examines how schedules impact elementary art programs in year-round schools compared to traditional nine-month schools. Your permission to share your classroom instruction and arrangement will provide valuable information and insight to assess what practices are valid in special scheduling situations or general settings. The collection of instructional techniques and strategies that prove effective in different scheduled settings will be shared with elementary art specialists in CCSD.

Participation in this study will require three half-day observations, two interviews (approximately one hour each before or after school), and collection of data (seating charts, long-range plans, class sizes, and class schedules). The interviews and observations will pertain to how you organize and deliver your curriculum in relation to class size, time, and schedule changes (if any). These interviews will be conducted privately and tape recorded. No one will hear the tape recordings except myself.

Risks or discomforts involve having an observer in the classroom, which may or may not change student behavior. You will not receive any compensation for your participation. The only cost to you is your time. You, and your school, are assured anonymity. All data collected will be kept completely confidential. Records will be maintained in a locked filing cabinet at my residence for at least three years after completion of this study.

Your participation is strictly voluntary and you may withdraw from participation at any time.

Please feel free to ask any questions you may have about the information being provided to you about this study.

If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact myself, Ashley Forgey, or my advisor, Dr. Lisa Bendixen, at 895-4632 in the UNLV Department of Educational Psychology. For questions involving the rights of research subjects, please contact the UNLV Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at 895-2794.

I have received an explanation of the research study Comparative Study of Year-Round and Nine-Month Elementary Art Programs by Ashley J. Forgey. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw my participation at any time. I also understand that confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained through the use of pseudonyms.

__________________________  ____________________
Name                          Date

__________________________  ____________________
Researcher                    Date
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS
What are your classroom rules?
Do you allow students time to make up work or catch up on work outside of class time? Why or why not?
How do you organize the room?
Do you do art criticism with your students? If so, how much time is spent doing it? What techniques do you use to make time efficient?
What are your substitute plans?
How do you inform substitutes of the track and schedule changes in case of an emergency illness?
Do you teach a different lesson for each grade level, every day, or do you group lessons across primary and intermediate?
Do you teach weaving? What grades? How do you manage weaving?
How many ceramic projects do you do a year with each grade level? How do you manage clay projects?
How many painting assignments do you do a year with each grade level? How do you manage paint projects?
Do you reteach lessons for students who were on track break?
What instructional methods do you use in a unit?
Do you change units or lessons to meet track and schedule changes, or do you carry them on after the students' return from track break?
What types of motivation or incentive programs do you use, if any?
How do you organize your room for the class sizes and grade level changes?
Is there a difference teaching a single class and a double class? What, if any, are the differences?
Are there any differences between a double class that team teaches compared to a double class that is combined during specials only?
Do you incorporate writing in the classroom? Why or why not?
Do you take students on art field trips? What types of arrangements must you make to go on these trips?
Do you find it easy or difficult to teach aesthetics? Why?
Do you use portfolio assessment? Why or why not?
What are your instructional patterns?
What criteria do you use to evaluate artworks and interpretations made by students about works of art?

**PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCES AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

How long have you been teaching in a traditional or year-round setting?
What professional training has influenced your program and teaching?
Do you notify parents of student progress or give teachers progress reports on their class?
    If so, how?
Name the responsibilities you have as an art specialist.
Which of these responsibilities takes the most time?
What would be your ideal elementary art teaching situation? Why?
Do inservices help you instruct or manage your program (district, school, art)? In what ways? Can they be improved?
How often do you communicate with other art specialists?
Do you socialize at work with other classroom teachers and/or specialists? Why or why not?

Choose an analogy to describe your role as an art teacher at a year-round school or traditional school.
Choose an analogy to describe your role as an art teacher, in general.
Do you see your role, as an art specialist, as being the same or different from that of other area specialists in relation to class size and job responsibility?
How would you describe your schedule to someone who's not an art educator or someone who's at a school with a different schedule? What would you compare it to?
Would you ever consider becoming a regular classroom teacher? If so, why would you decide to make the change?
What formal and informal philosophies of art education do you have?
What type of teacher preparation did you have in higher education?
Did you ever attend a teacher education program that discussed how to manage an art program within a year-round setting? If so, where and what were you taught?
What skills did you gain from teacher preparation that enabled you to balance an elementary art program in a year-round school, either indirectly or directly?

**TIME AND SCHEDULING**

Do you have extra time allotted in your schedule for students to have extra art experiences, outside of the standard district time of 50 minutes a week?
What type of class combinations do you have in your schedule, if any?
Do you have an art club? Before or after school?
How much time do you spend preparing for a substitute?
Who makes the prep schedule? Are specialists involved in any way?
Are there any changes you would make to your schedule now? What changes, and why?
What would be your ideal schedule?
Do you find there's a different or similar work pace according to track or grade level classes? If so, can you describe the differences or similarities?
Do your lessons or units revolve around the scheduling of classes and track breaks?
How does an itinerant affect your schedule (positively/negatively)? Describe why.
What grades do the itinerant art teachers have?
Do you have a Humanities teacher? How does Humanities fit into the schedule? Has this addition changed your schedule or program?
Have you or could you ever rearrange your schedule to attend special events, with or without students?

**CLASS SIZE**
What is the average number of students to a table?
How would you describe the ratio of yourself and the students in your room? What is the ratio of students to yourself?
Is there a difference in class size between a combined double class and a team-teaching double class?
What is the difference between a low number fourth grade and a high number fourth grade?
What's the difference between a high number primary class and a high number intermediate class?
What are your average class numbers?
What is your school size?
APPENDIX D

LAST ROUND OF QUESTIONS

Some of these may seem repetitive and may have similar answers. It will vary upon the individual. Please continue answering all of them as if you were being asked for the first time. Also, if you can illustrate your point with specific examples, it would be most helpful.

I'd appreciate getting your responses by February 14th. Whatever format is easiest for you to respond to these questions will work for me. (Ex. Fax, email, handwritten, etc.) If you have any questions about these, don't hesitate to contact me: 799-8160, 858-6886, Interact, or ajforgy@pcweb.net.

PLANNING UNITS
How many class periods do you plan most of your units or lessons for?
Do students usually stay in the planned time span or do they sometimes go over?
If they do go over, what do you do?
What are some of the results of students taking longer to finish the lesson?
What are some reasons for shortening or lengthening a lesson?
What is the key to deciding or planning how long a lesson will last?
What makes you decide to make a lesson only a certain amount of class periods?
Do you schedule time for quizzes or tests at the end of a unit? Why or why not?
If not, what would you have to do to schedule this activity into your planned unit?

HOLIDAYS OR ASSEMBLIES
Are assemblies scheduled to not overlap with the prep schedule?
Have you ever shortened a lesson for a class that missed due to a holiday or assembly?
If so, what did you condense? (Learning objectives, materials, size, requirements.)
Have you ever used an easy lesson during a week when there was a holiday so the students not attending art that week didn't miss anything?
Do you teach the same lesson for the classes that missed due to a holiday or assembly?
If so, do you find those classes are always on a different lesson than the other classes?
If not, why wouldn't you repeat the lesson as planned without the holiday?
Are classes on Monday and Friday behind the other classes due to holidays?
Do you find you need to review and remind students on Mondays and Fridays about the rules and procedures more frequently than the other days?
After spring break or holiday break, do you find you need to review or remind students of the rules and procedures?
Track Changes and Holiday Breaks
Do you ever feel pressure to finish a lesson because a holiday or track break is coming?
If so, how do you handle it?

SUBSTITUTES AND SUBSTITUTE LESSON PLANS
What is the difference between an emergency substitute lesson and a planned absence (flex/personal/time-out day) substitute lesson?
Where do you store your emergency substitute lessons? Are they in the same place as your planned absence lessons? Why do you pick those locations? Describe the characteristics of a preferred substitute? How do they differ from an unknown or emergency substitute? How do you find a preferred substitute? What is the availability of a preferred substitute? Compare a 'fluff' lesson to a regular lesson? What type of materials or projects would never be assigned during an absence? What types of activities are considered 'easy' for a substitute to do? What kind of documents or instructions do you have for any type of substitute lessons (ex. schedule, seating charts)? Which type of substitute takes the most time to prepare for? Which type of substitute lesson takes the most time to prepare? How often do you have to prepare an emergency lesson plan? How often do you have to prepare for a planned absence? How do emergency absences affect the class' progress? Do planned absences affect class progress the same as emergency absences? If not, what's different? Is it a positive or a negative effect? Is a substitute plan ever the same lesson you would teach if you weren't absent? Under what conditions would this occur? FOR NINE-MONTH ONLY:
Would you work year-round, extended contract, if the kids were always there and not rotating in and out on track breaks? How do you imagine lesson planning in a year-round setting? Do you think your program would be possible in a year-round setting? What would be the challenges of continuing your program, year-round, if any? FOR YEAR-ROUND ONLY:
Do you think you would teacher longer, more in-depth lessons in a nine-month setting? What are the benefits of teaching year-round? If you could work the whole 20 add-on days, with the extra pay, would you. Why or why not? If you could take any number of those 20 days off (instead of the required 15), what would be your ideal number? Why? What type of lessons would you never let a class skip because they were on track break (if you ever do)? Is it mostly the medium or the content that you base your decision on? Do you ever consider how many of your time-out days are during the same track breaks? If so, why? How do you decide when to take your time-out days?
APPENDIX E

LETTER TO ADMINISTRATORS

Letter to Administrators
Ashley J. Forgey
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Graduate Student.

October 21, 2002

Name of Elementary School

Street Address
Las Vegas, NV.
Phone:
Fax:
Attention: Principal

Regarding: Comparative Study of Year Round and Nine Month Elementary Art Programs

I am Ashley J. Forgey, a graduate student in the College of Educational Psychology at UNLV. I am conducting a study, which examines how schedules impact elementary art programs in year-round schools compared to traditional nine-month schools. I am asking for your permission to conduct my study on your campus, in order to observe and interview your school's art specialist, (specialist's name). The collection of instructional techniques and strategies that prove effective at your school, and others in the study, will be shared with elementary art specialists in CCSD during 2002-2003 school year staff developments.

Participation in this study will require three half-day observations, two interviews (approximately one hour each before or after school), and collection of data (seating charts, long-range plans, class sizes, and class schedules) from your art specialist. The interviews and observations will pertain to how the art specialist organizes and instructs the art curriculum in relation to class size, time, and schedule changes (if any). These interviews will be conducted privately and tape-recorded. No one will hear the tape recordings except myself.

Risks or discomforts involve having an observer in the classroom, which may or may not change student behavior. Neither the art specialist nor the school will receive any compensation for participating. Your school is assured anonymity. All data collected will be kept completely confidential.

The participation of your school's art specialist is strictly voluntary. Participation may be withdrawn at any time.

If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact myself, Ashley Forgey, or my advisor, Dr. Lisa Bendixen, at 895-4632 in the UNLV Department of Educational Psychology. I can be contacted at the above address, or through CCSD school mail: Ashley Forgey, Elaine Wynn Elementary School; (702)-799-8160.

Thank you for considering my research study.
Sincerely,

Ashley Forgey
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MEMBER CHECK INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Is learning being compromised by the year-round schedule?

Do nine-month teachers have greater flexibility in planning the length and depth of a lesson?

Why or why not? What factors are involved?

Are any of these a result of having lessons extended?
  Better artwork
  Shorter lessons afterwards
  Management problems for those students who like to finish quickly

Are there any other results?

Are any of the following a result of shortening a lesson because of an assembly, holiday, or track break approaching?
  Complicated lessons
  Increased understanding
  Class progress
  Classroom management problems
  Planning changes
  Student abilities

Any others?

How does an art specialist decide the length of a lesson?
  Media
  Age level
  Student work pace
  Track breaks
  Others/

What is the main reason for art specialists to not use written evaluations of student work?
  Less hands-on time for projects
  More time reviewing concepts and skills
  Organization
  Students finishing at the same time
  Make up work for quizzes
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Grading time

How do assemblies interfere with instruction? How is it different for specialists compared to the classroom teacher?

When holidays, assemblies and track breaks interfere with lesson plans, what usually happens?
   Materials are condensed for less work time and clean up time
   Art history and art criticism is shortened or omitted
   Work is continued the next time or after track break

Do most art specialists try to cover everything with all of the students, even if they were on track break, or do they just catch them up by condensing or skipping things? What are their reasons for it?

How do the required 15 time-out days affect the year-round specialist's program?

Why does the district require year-round specialists to take these days instead of working them?

Do the students get the same education during these time-out days?

Does a substitute do the same as an art specialist on most emergency or planned absences? What are the differences?

What is the best method for continuing an art program during these time-out days so students don't miss out?

Are there any differences between the tracks, student wise? Why or why not?

Is one track better than the other? Why or why not?

What decreases learning in a year-round school more, track breaks or time-out days?

Which is the most difficult for a year-round art specialist, planning around the track schedule or planning for a substitute?
APPENDIX G

TRADITIONAL CALENDAR FOR THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
2002-2003

CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
2002-2003 CALENDAR (2-MONTH SCHOOLS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>Twelve-Month Administrators, Begin Work Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 4-5</td>
<td>Independence Day (No School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1</td>
<td>Eleven-Month Administrators Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 13</td>
<td>Ten-Month Secondary Deans Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 14</td>
<td>New Licensed Employees Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 15</td>
<td>Ten-Month Administrative Specialists Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 21</td>
<td>Licensed Employees on Leave of Absence Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 21</td>
<td>All Other Licensed Employees Return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 28</td>
<td>Classes Begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2</td>
<td>Labor Day (No School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 24</td>
<td>Nevada Day Observed (No School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 31</td>
<td>End of First Grading Period (47 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 11</td>
<td>Veteran's Day (No School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 23</td>
<td>Thanksgiving Day and Family Day (No School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 20</td>
<td>Winter Break Begins – End of Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(No School December 23-January 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6</td>
<td>Classes Resume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 17</td>
<td>End of Second Grading Period (43 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 20</td>
<td>End of First Semester (90 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 21</td>
<td>Martin Luther King, Jr. Day (No School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 17</td>
<td>Second Semester Begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 21</td>
<td>Presidents' Day (No School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11</td>
<td>End of Third Grading Period (43 Days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21</td>
<td>Spring Break Begins—End of Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 26</td>
<td>Classes Resume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 4</td>
<td>Memorial Day Observed (No School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 5</td>
<td>End of Fourth Grading Period (47 Days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6, 9, 10</td>
<td>Emergency Days (If Needed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12</td>
<td>Ten-Month Secondary Deans End Work Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 13</td>
<td>Ten-Month Administrative Specialists End Work Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30</td>
<td>Eleven- and Twelve-Month Administrators End Work Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contracted Days</th>
<th>Returning Licensed Employees</th>
<th>184 days</th>
<th>12-Month Administrators</th>
<th>267 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Licensed Employees</td>
<td>189 days</td>
<td>11-Month Administrators</td>
<td>226 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-Month Deans</td>
<td>206 days</td>
<td>10-Month Admin. Spec.</td>
<td>205 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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YEAR-ROUND SCHEDULE FOR CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

2002-2003
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUGUST 2003</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER 2003</th>
<th>OCTOBER 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOVEMBER 2003</th>
<th>DECEMBER 2003</th>
<th>JANUARY 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEBRUARY 2004</th>
<th>MARCH 2004</th>
<th>APRIL 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAY 2004</th>
<th>JUNE 2004</th>
<th>JULY 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUGUST 2004</th>
<th><strong>Teacher Work Days</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Track 1: Saturdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Track 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Track 3: Staff Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Track 4: No School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Track 5:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOLIDAYS 2003**
- Sept. 1: Labor Day
- Oct. 31: Nevada Day Obs.
- Nov. 11: Veterans Day
- Nov. 22-25: Thanksgiving Break
- Dec. 19: Winter Break Begins
- (End of day) Dec. 22-Jan. 2

**HOLIDAYS 2004**
- Jan. 19: M.L.King Jr.'s B'day
- Feb. 16: Presidents' Day
- Apr. 20: Spring Break Begins
- (End of day) Apr. 5-Apr. 9
- May 31: Memorial Day
- July 5: Independence Day Obs.
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