

A New View of Professional Development for Curriculum Reform Involving Language Arts and the Arts

Francine Morin and Deborah Begoray

The purpose of this university classroom inquiry was to design and enact a teacher education project aimed to help teacher-learners develop new understandings about language arts when defined more expansively to include multiple symbol systems offered by music and other art forms. This non-traditional project took place during summer session at the University of Manitoba in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada. The article provides a vivid, creative description of the project and teacher participants' responses to their experiences. The authors share how they reached the conclusion that a summer institute model of professional development is an effective way to bring about some immediate changes in teacher-learners' practices and understandings of the role of the arts in language arts education.

Cecil and Lauritzen (1994) remind us that, not unlike their predecessors, students in contemporary society represent a kaleidoscope of personalities, a situation that requires an amalgam of communicative forms for making and sharing meaning:

Due to their differing backgrounds, certain children may understand and express concepts better through art than they ever could through the written word; moreover, some children may understand and express themselves better through one particular art form than another. Music may speak with the greatest clarity to one child; to another, a painting conveys the strongest message; to yet another, poetry possesses the most intense appeal. (p. xiii)

There are many symbolic codes of meaning people use to express and convey what they know about their world. Curiously, traditional expressions of literacy fostered by language arts curricula in public school classrooms usually focus on the reading and writing of print material. Recent publications indicate, however, that a new perspective has been emerging among language and literacy educators which argues for replacing traditional language arts content with that which "expands the communicative potential of all learners through the orchestration and use of multiple ways

of knowing for the purposes of ongoing interpretation and inquiry into the world" (Leland & Harste, 1994, p. 339). In *The Languages of Learning*, Gallas (1994) presents a conceptual framework which suggests that "deep, transformative learning takes place when language is defined expansively to include a complex of signs" (p. xv). Similarly, Piazza's (1999) *Multiple Forms of Literacy*, aims to "extend communicative choices available to students by going beyond language symbols to that of multiple symbol systems offered by the arts" (p. iv). Other pivotal works such as Cornett and Smithrim's (2001) *The Arts as Meaning Makers* and Goldberg's (2001) *Arts and Learning* advocate the use of multi-media forms to enhance the more traditional literacy strands of reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

Careful examination of new language arts curriculum models also indicates that a new wind is blowing in the name of language and literacy education. The 1998 English Language Arts curriculum documents in Manitoba, Canada, for instance, provide evidence that educators are moving towards an expanded concept of literacy (Begoray, White, Ross, Rossnagel, & Thomas, 1998; Manitoba Education and Training, 1996a, 1996b), one which aims to help learners anticipate, comprehend, compose, and respond to a variety of texts. In addition, the new curriculum explicitly acknowledges the impact of media and technology

on the education of Manitoba students, and perhaps most significantly, includes “viewing and representing” as fundamental language arts processes along with the more traditional ones of reading and writing, listening and speaking.

Specialists in alternate sign systems might therefore have a more central role to play in literacy teaching and learning. Classroom generalists and arts specialists alike are finding themselves in the position of needing to rethink their discipline-based practices as well as the reciprocal benefits of new teaching partnerships. This realization provided us, teacher educators in music and language arts, with some common ground for entering into a collaborative inquiry about teacher learning and change in multiple forms of literacy.

The Role of Professional Development in Curriculum Change

The greatest responsibility for implementing new educational approaches that integrate language and the arts rests with practicing teachers. It is for this reason that professional development, the continuing education of teachers, tends to take on the burden of sustaining and shaping change in the schools. Professional development is considered by many authorities in the field of education to be the most crucial element in the reformation and improvement of curriculum and instruction (Birch & Elliot, 1993; Brown, 1995; Guskey, 2000; Leonhard, 1999; McLaren, 1994; Shroyer, 1990). Merely offering workshops, however, is no guarantee as professional development which aims to change practice “needs to involve teachers as willing and active collaborators in realizing society’s ambitions for education” (Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, 1999, p. 12).

Our present mechanisms for helping teachers grow and change are less than adequate, however. The convergence of evidence suggests that the failure of many curriculum reform efforts may in part be due to the ineffectiveness of the professional development models employed rather than to an individual teacher’s resistance to change. One-shot workshops, training without technical assistance or

follow up, passive experiences for teachers, top-down plans, lack of connection to classroom experiences, diffusion of products, lack of attention to teachers’ perceived needs, or reliance on external expertise have had little impact because they are approaches that are not designed to provide optimal conditions for professional change (Birch & Elliot, 1993; Clark, 1992; Evertson, Hawley, & Zlotnik, 1992; Hawley & Valli, 1997; Thiessen, 1992; Tovey, 1998).

Our University Classroom Inquiry

The literature challenged us to think about professional development in new and different ways. We aimed to design and enact a teacher education project that would encourage teacher-learners to develop new understandings about viewing and representing in language arts. Two central questions guided our professional conversations: How can an effective professional development program be designed that has the potential to help classroom teachers and arts specialists grow and change in their beliefs, practices, and understandings of multiple forms of literacy? What immediate impact can a summer model of professional development have on teacher’s beliefs, practices, and perceptions about their work in multiple forms of literacy?

This project put into practice the “collaborative inquiry” agenda so often identified in the scholarly literature, but rarely evident in university classrooms (Dolly, Holmes & Barry, 2002; Hutchens, 1998). Our collaborative work was exploratory, naturalistic, and field-oriented; the field being our university classrooms (Eisenhart & Borko, 1993; Bogdan & Biklan, 1992; Hubbard & Power 1993; Glesne, 1999; Lancy, 1993). Special mention should be made of our attempt to make the intangible nature of university teaching more tangible by leaving a record of our experience (Adler, 1993). Schulman (1986) advocates this practice and recommends creating case knowledge based on gathering “specific, well-documented and richly described events” (p. 11).

This article provides a creative description of the summer institute and teacher participants' responses to the institute. According to Krathwohl (1993), creative description "incorporates creativity first in perceiving important aspects of a situation missed by others and second in organizing and presenting that perception so richly and vividly that it comes alive in the theater of the mind" (pp. 5-6). We believe that such description will illuminate our teaching experience more deeply for our colleagues and facilitate their understanding and application of the ideas in their own settings. The creative description is grounded in artifacts produced by the teacher-learners in the course, such as assignments and formal course evaluations; as well as artifacts produced by faculty, such as process folios, records of course experiences, and notes from team planning meetings.

Designing the Institute

To address the professional development needs of educators attempting to embrace change in teaching for multiple forms of literacy, we decided to offer an innovative summer institute called "The New Language Arts Curriculum and the Arts: Viewing and Representing" at the Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba. We designed the institute collaboratively with two additional teacher educators. Our four-member team had combined expertise in five forms of literacy: language arts, music, movement, visual arts, and drama. The overriding goal of the institute was to engage participants in a pedagogical study of the viewing and representing components of Manitoba's new English Language Arts curriculum in ways that would allow them to explore the links between language, literacy, and the arts.

We agreed to model a collaborative inquiry approach to teaching and learning while instructing the course. Rather than beginning with a typical set of objectives, we launched the institute with six broad questions for inquiry: What are the characteristics of a literate person? How can this literacy be achieved in the schools? What characterizes good experiences in viewing and

representing? What are the new concepts of *literacy*, *text*, and *media*? How do we best support and enhance literacy learning with print and non-print media? How do we track and share evidence of literacy learning in multiple forms?

Teacher-learners were supported by a book of common readings the four of us custom-designed specifically for this summer institute. It contained current articles and book chapters drawn from journals and textbooks of reading, language arts, music and movement, visual art, and drama. Readings were assigned to provide participants with background for in-class experiences, with ideas for reaction and reflection, and for future reference once teachers returned to their schools.

By the end of the course, participants were expected to make gains towards:

- understanding and experiencing alternative forms of literacy (music, movement, visual art, drama, media literacy, and computer-based media)
- understanding the role of the arts and technology in language and literacy teaching and learning
- generating pedagogical principles in response to broad course and personal questions
- developing understanding and a repertoire of methods, materials, and resources for addressing the new language arts outcomes
- developing an open and positive attitude towards the arts and technology and their application in the language arts classroom.

As a team, we selected a central theme, *The Prairies*, to provide a context for the summer study and jointly planned ways to develop a general, but flexible sequence of learning experiences. The *Prairies* theme was selected because it was meaningful and significant for Manitoba teacher participants as well as broad enough for in-depth study. The theme could encompass our exploration of multiple forms of literacy, allow us to look at text through a variety of lenses, as well as provide us with a viable connection back to the new language arts outcomes at a variety of grade levels. In preparation for the *Prairies* study, we collected a

range of print (fiction, non-fiction, poetry, magazines, pamphlets) and non-print (films, community sites, photographs, audio-recordings, musical scores, dances, objects, and artifacts) media resources that could be used at the early years (grades K-4), middle years (5-8), and senior years (9-12) levels.

During the spring, a brochure describing the summer institute was mailed to approximately 50 school divisions in Manitoba. Announcements were made in the university summer session calendars and locally in all related professional journals. Limitations around enrollment allowed 46 participants to be admitted. Of these, 29 were preservice or inservice teachers working towards undergraduate education programs and 17 were inservice teachers working towards post-baccalaureate certificates or graduate degrees in education. The participants were from diverse backgrounds and encompassed both classroom generalists and arts specialists, with a wide range of teaching experiences and assignments.

The coordination of undergraduate and graduate course offerings is a relatively new practice in teacher education (Dolly, Holmes, & Barry, 2002; Martin Shand, 1996; Morin & Stinner, 1998). A critical problem in higher education is that graduate programs in arts education can be quite small, often generating enrollments of less than five students in any given discipline-specific course. Historically, institutions of higher education could afford to run low-number courses, but the economic climate of the last decade has forced teacher educators to rethink the ways graduate courses can be offered equitably for students in all areas.

Guiding our practice is a fundamental belief that educators at all levels learn from each other and that an ongoing dialogue is critical to our professional development as preservice teachers, inservice teachers, and teacher educators. This belief provided us with a shared foundation for moving into a collaborative inquiry involving multiple forms of literacy with teachers at different stages of development. In this particular institute, the undergraduate course was coordinated with the graduate course. The crossing of traditional course

boundaries that typically exist between language arts and the arts generated the student numbers needed to overcome the ongoing threat of course cancellations for our graduate students. Students seeking graduate credit participated in the summer institute and were provided with additional, more advanced experiences.

Enacting the Institute

The summer institute was held during July, meeting four hours daily over 16 weekdays for a total of 64 hours. Evaluation was based on two assignments: unit plans and portfolios for students enrolled at the undergraduate level, critical papers and portfolios for students enrolled at the graduate level. The unit plans consisted of a sequence of learning experiences which would provide the curriculum content for about three weeks of language arts instruction, while addressing outcomes, assessment, and the integration of the arts and technology within a particular classroom context. The critical papers explored the notion of multiple forms of literacy and responded to a research question of the participant's choice. Graduate students' work on these papers extended over several weeks beyond the summer institute and into the school year to allow for integration of theory and practice.

The portfolios, assembled during the three-week course, provided a holding place for participants to gather, preserve, and display evidence. Artifacts represented what they came to know and what they did to challenge themselves to learn more about the role of the arts and technology in language and literacy development (for example, see Castiglione, 1996). Portfolio contents included:

- a process learning log including daily/personal explorations of and reflections on the relationship between the language arts curriculum, the arts, and the mass media; written responses to discussions, presentations, and readings; research in a variety of modes (i.e. audio-recording, sketches, verbal note-taking, photography); viewing and critiquing of performances, visual

art, film, television, advertising; plus creative idea development for a range of written, visual, and performance pieces that implement the viewing and representing components of the language arts curriculum

- an individual or group creative product which would provide evidence of understanding of representing
- a synthesis statement of what was learned about the role of multiple forms of literacy in the new language arts curriculum and evidence of growth and change as a teacher of language arts and the arts.

In keeping with our collaborative teaching paradigm, rubrics for assessing assignments were negotiated with the participants (for example, see Boomer, Lester, Onore, & Cook, 1992).

Flexible block scheduling was employed in the summer institute, progressing from a more structured and convergent set of learning experiences to those which were more fluid and divergent. On the first morning, our institute opened with a large cohort meeting during which time we clarified definitions, considered the general principles of language arts as a context for viewing and representing, and raised participant awareness of the explicit and implicit uses of the arts in the new language arts curriculum. Various concepts of critical terms were presented to facilitate discussion among the group. For our working definitions, we agreed that *viewing* is an active process of attending to and comprehending visual media and *representing* is the communication of information and ideas through a variety of media. *Media* are means of communication; *text* is all language forms (print, oral, and visual) that can be discussed, studied, and analyzed; and *literacy* is the ability to access, analyze, evaluate, and communicate messages in a variety of forms (Hobbs, 1997).

After settling on definitions and reviewing the course outline and assignments together, we moved on to a more focused examination of the new language arts curricula by grade level. Participants reviewed the language arts curriculum for specific learning outcomes that could only be met through

uniting language with artistic forms of communication. They then considered how the arts could be integrated even where they were not specifically mentioned. For example, one outcome mandates that students be able to “create texts using a variety of forms”—an explicit invitation for writing a song, choreographing a dance piece, or producing a slide presentation. Students are also expected to be able to “collect and explain preferences for particular forms of text”—an outcome which could be accomplished by reviewing and preparing critical responses to book, film, and musical drama versions of the same story.

In the afternoon, we shifted into two smaller groups to begin a rotation of workshops that would introduce participants to multiple forms of literacy. The aims of the workshops were to provide a basic knowledge base in each of four art forms (music, movement, visual art, and drama); offer a safe, supportive environment for personal exploration in the arts; and provide a forum for exploring the methods, materials and challenges of integrating the arts into the language arts curriculum. Using the music component to illustrate, these workshops targeted questions such as: 1) What is musical literacy? 2) How is music “text”? 3) How do we “view and represent” a subject from a musical perspective? 4) What are the communicative advantages and disadvantages of this symbol system? 5) What are the fundamental, authentic processes unique to music? 6) What are the building blocks through which musicians work? 7) How can we begin an exploration of viewing and representing in, about, through, and with music? 8) What are the music connections to the new curriculum documents? 9) What viewing and representing experiences involving music can be provided for learners at different levels? and so on.

Another goal of the institute was to initiate participants into the inquiry-based approach to teaching advocated in *The Common Curriculum Framework for English Language Arts* (Governments of Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, Northwest Territories, Saskatchewan, and Yukon Territory, 1996) curriculum documents (upon which the four western provinces and two territories

in Canada base their local language arts curriculum). This was accomplished by giving teachers the opportunity to engage in an authentic, integrated study as teacher-learners. During the afternoon of day two, we modeled this paradigm and set the *Prairies* theme into motion. As we worked, a framework was revealed for participants contemplating similar inquiries in their own classroom settings. The major outcome of these interactions was the identification of participants' personal relationships to the prairies and a host of questions about the prairies that were categorized thematically and later used as the central focus for participants' ongoing inquiry.

Participants' collaborative inquiry process involved the exploration of local prairie sites such as Manitoba's Tall-Grass Prairie Reserve, Prairie Living Museum, Fort Whyte Center, Riel House, and Assiniboine Forest Nature Park. On day three, the large cohort met briefly with each of us to consider the task of looking at the prairies using multiple languages. For instance, participants were challenged to become "musicians" as they investigated a prairie site by making a sound map; making an audio or video recording; listing or charting sounds discerned; creating representative symbols for sounds; gathering sonorous materials; noting objects with potential for sound interpretation; and recording words or phrases inspired by sound images.

The next several days were scheduled quite intensely with some blocks of time assigned for sign-specific work in music, movement, visual art, and drama. The primary focus of these blocks shifted to focus more comprehensively on viewing and representing the Prairie theme through these sign systems. Our opening move required some risk-taking on our part as we improvised a collaborative response to Paul Sigurdson's (1984) poem, *Prairie*, each instructor using the sign system in which we were most uncomfortable. Incidentally, this was the same poem used later on in the institute as the inspiration for a professional artistic response involving music and dance. This instructional shift gave our teaching team the opportunity to suggest a range of language arts teaching and learning

strategies that incorporated multiple forms of literacy and provided the mechanism for both connecting back to the language arts outcomes and making salient the multi-dimensional nature of literacy.

To illustrate, one of the specific outcomes at the middle years level states that students should be able to "connect self, texts, and culture by comparing the challenges and situations encountered in daily life with those experienced by people in other times, places and cultures as portrayed in oral, literary, and media texts (including texts about Canada)." During the institute, participants sang and/or listened to recordings of songs about the prairies that offered opportunities for interpretation and learning about their own culture:

- *Saskatchewan*, a comical song written during the depression years of the 1930s which pokes fun at the drought problems prairie farmers were experiencing at that time
- *Chanson de Louis Riel*, a provocative song written by the Canadian prairie's most controversial revolutionary leader to his mother while awaiting execution
- *Grandma's Song*, a humorous piece which describes the early settlement days on the prairies.

Other blocks of time during the institute were devoted to seminar discussions on various aspects of media literacy as we acknowledged teachers' needs in helping students develop an informed and critical understanding of the mass media, including television, film, radio, music videos, and advertising. In the music component, for instance, participants had the opportunity to experience music media as well as to focus on what it means to teach about the appreciation and critical analysis of music media products. Most importantly, we studied methods and tools for helping K-12 students evaluate the products of the popular music media. Working with contemporary music recordings and videos produced by Canadian prairie artists like the *Wyrd Sisters* and *Crash Test Dummies*, participants experienced strategies for deconstructing and

formulating critical responses to music text. Discussing and analyzing the sound tracks of feature films, television shows, and advertisements helped participants understand the communicative influence of music and sound as technical elements of film.

The role of technology was also addressed during the institute as we recognized how frequently it mediates the arts. In addition, we tried to address the overwhelming need of participants to gain facility in using technology as a teaching tool. To support our teacher-learners in the area of computer technology, we enlisted the help and expertise of Dr. John Begoray, University of Winnipeg. Securing special grants¹ for our teaching allowed us to purchase a digital camera that saved images to a regular 3.5" floppy disk. These pictures could then be printed out or loaded onto web sites. We also purchased a scanner, and participants learned how to transfer pictures to a disk, when once again they were available for use on their web sites or in PowerPoint presentations.

Other technology was used as well. Many large cohort sessions were delivered using a laptop computer attached to a projection system. In addition to midi keyboards, microphones, and mixers, we also made use of camcorders and videotape players, 35 mm cameras, and audiotape machines, both to record our own work and to lend to participants to use in their own inquiries.

In addition to technology-related equipment and other instructional materials, funding for this project covered honorariums for guest speakers. As part of the institute, connections were made with artists and teachers in the field. These presentations highlighted select multi-media works and offered potent insights into how the viewing and representing processes work. For example, Zane Zallis, who teaches high school music and does underscoring for television, joined our instructional team for three days with responsibilities in the area of technology-assisted composition in music. He also contributed

to a session we did on storyboarding as a tool for recasting print text in non-print forms. Brian Murphy, of the Manitoba Association for Media Literacy, delivered a presentation on the controversial aspects of television and urged participants to weave media awareness into their teaching. Bob Armstrong, from the University of Manitoba Public Relations, showed and discussed the making of the newest television ad for marketing the University of Manitoba. Vladimir Simosko, a local artist, showed how Paul Sigurdson's poem *Prairie* was celebrated in a multi-media performance piece involving dance, language, and music. We also capitalized on some of the special expertise our participants brought to the institute. Catherine Boldt of Vincent Massey Collegiate discussed her use of sound, music, and alternative comics to accomplish language arts outcomes in the senior years classroom.

Throughout the institute, participants had many opportunities to experience a range of art works inspired by the prairies theme, from picture books, paintings, and poems to orchestral works, ballets, and films. These experiences gave participants some sense of how artists have used multiple forms of literacy to work with the theme and how notions of prairies had provided many with the aesthetic content for their creative efforts. Large blocks of time during the final days of the institute were planned in large part to accommodate participants' self-directed individual and/or small group creative work. Here the struggle began as teacher-learners worked intensely, with our support, to create original texts and demonstrate their understanding not only of their prairie inquiry questions but of multiple forms of literacy as well.

The last day of the institute was devoted to a time of sharing and celebration to give both small groups and individuals the opportunity to select and showcase their collective and performance-based prairie texts. First, a large, open pit in a multi-purpose space came alive with performance pieces ranging from original musical compositions and videos to puppet theatrics and dramatic monologues. Later we walked through the "institute art gallery" which had been erected around the perimeter of the

1. This research was funded by the Faculty of Education Endowment and Continuing Education Division Summer Innovation Funds, University of Manitoba.

room to view a stunning mosaic of media works. These pieces included a digitized slide show with voice over about the Steinbach Mennonite Village; a hilarious video featuring a small group of institute participants in a synchronized swimming extravaganza inspired by sunflowers; a mixed media quilt crafted with prairie images to be viewed while listening to an original computer-generated soundtrack; and a musical diorama juxtaposing contemporary and historical images which portrayed the plight of native peoples on the prairies.

The morning proved to be an exhilarating experience for participants as our prairie theme was artistically woven into a rich tapestry of language, music, art, technology, electronic media, movement, and drama. Participants' creative idea development clearly demonstrated their increased understanding of how meaning is shaped and communicated through multiple sign systems. Instructors were awed at how these extensions and expressions of participants' ideas revealed the complexity of factors which make up life on the prairies, further suggesting that multiple forms of literacy had genuinely been explored as tools of inquiry.

We continued to celebrate over lunch, and concluded the institute, exhausted but personally and professionally satisfied, with round table discussions during which selected highlights from the portfolios were shared among participants. We said our final farewells and made plans for future professional development initiatives in language arts and the arts.

Teacher-Learners' Responses to the Institute

Information on the teacher participants' reactions to the summer institute was gathered through the University of Manitoba's Instructor/Course Evaluation Form², a highly structured and standardized evaluation tool. Thirty-two rating scale items are grouped according to nine broader categories: learning, enthusiasm, organization,

group interaction, individual rapport, breadth, examinations, assignments, and overall. Participants appraised each item using a five-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

The evaluation forms were optically scanned for the purpose of calculating participants' responses. Forty-one teacher-learners reported great satisfaction with the institute on the anonymous evaluation forms completed on the last day of class. Evaluations were completed separately by those participants taking undergraduate or graduate credits. An overwhelming majority of respondents, indicated agreement or strong agreement (4 or 5) with all 32 applicable items which were quantified by percentages.

Open-ended comments were also invited on the evaluation forms. Thirty-seven percent, or fifteen people, also wrote a total of thirty-one comments on all evaluations. Of these comments, eleven were judged by the instructors to be negative. For example, seven comments (five by undergraduates), were made about the course work being "heavy" and/or "vague." We now speculate that less experienced participants were sometimes overwhelmed with the number of "new" approaches available. Sometimes, perhaps, too much choice can lead to insecurity. In order to encourage creativity, we perhaps needed to assist students' convergent thinking by giving further examples; however, we did not have exemplars of projects to share, since this was an innovative course.

Sixty-six percent of the comments, twenty in all, were evaluated as positive. Three observations appeared frequently. First, eight comments, by equal numbers of undergraduates and graduates, revealed that the course had "excellent" or "valuable" course content. Second, participants found instructors to be "enjoyable," "passionate," and/or "knowledgeable." Finally, respondents commented that they had "learned a lot" and/or "increased understandings of the sign systems."

Reflection on our practice revealed some strengths and areas in which we would like to improve. Generally speaking, we were pleased with our ability to create a sense of community and positive learning climate for participants. Explicit

2. Based on Student Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ), permission granted copyright 1976, 1991, 1993 Herbert W. Marsh.

connections between faculty experiences and the curriculum documents proved to be an effective way to make the new goals of the language arts curriculum more comprehensible for participants. The development of an intensive sequence of learning experiences encompassing opportunities to develop theoretical, artistic, as well as pedagogical understandings and skills was critical in our minds. The provision for differentiated assignments and some faculty experiences helped us to address diverse learning needs common to the group, as well as those of individuals at different stages of teacher development. Opportunities for peer support and collaborative problem-solving were also provided successfully through the group inquiries. Graduate students' classroom-based trials of new curriculum practices, as well as feedback from students, would clearly be advantageous. We feel the project could have been strengthened by finding a way to include school-aged learners in ways that would allow teacher participants, both preservice and inservice, to apply understandings in a more authentic way, and with our immediate support. We could have also developed a way to provide our inservice students with a more continuous system of feedback, follow-up, and support once back in their classrooms.

We caution others who may wish to schedule such courses at their own universities that any concept of teacher transformation involving multiple forms of literacy requires a large commitment of time, emotional energy, and money. For example, instructors have to develop the curriculum as a team and then respond collaboratively with mid-course changes to answer participant needs. This flexibility also requires considerable risk-taking in working within a four-person team with diverse specialties (and personalities!); coordinating students with diverse experiential and educational backgrounds; managing visiting speakers, equipment, and materials; and providing maximum experiences to accomplish a full course in a brief and intense time period.

We recognize that more empirical evidence is needed to evaluate the impact of the summer institute on teacher change over a longer term. A

more formal study will be designed to follow up on participants' reformed practices and attitudes one year after returning to their regular personal and professional lives. Further questions will be explored: What long term impact can a summer model of professional development have on teacher's beliefs, practices, and perceptions of student achievement in multiple forms of literacy? What are the most promising features of the summer model employed? How can the summer study model be further refined?

References

- Adler, S. (1993). Teacher education: Research on reflective practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 9, 159-167.
- Begoray, D., White, G., Ross, L., Rossnagel, N., & Thomas, J. (1998). *Kindergarten to grade 4 English Language Arts: A foundation for implementation*. Winnipeg, MB: Manitoba Education and Training.
- Birch, D. R., & Elliot, M. (1993). Towards a new conception of teacher education. In L. L. Stewin & S. J. H. McCann (Eds.), *Contemporary educational issues: The Canadian mosaic*. Toronto, ON: Copp Clark Pitman Ltd.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (2nd ed). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Boomer, G., Lester, N., Onore, C., & Cook, J. (1992). *Negotiating the curriculum: Educating for the 21st century*. London: Falmer Press.
- Brown, J. L. (1995). Professional development and observing dimensions of learning. In *Observing dimensions of learning in classrooms and schools* (pp. 99-112). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum and Instruction.
- Castiglione, L. V. (1996). Portfolio assessment in art and education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 97(4), 2-9.
- Cecil, N. L., & Lauritzen, P. (1994). *Literacy and the arts for the integrated classroom: Alternative ways of knowing*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Centre for Educational Research and Innovation. (1999). *Staying ahead: Inservice training and*

- teacher professional development*. Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development.
- Clark, C. M. (1992). Teachers as designers in self-directed professional development. In A. Hargreaves & M. G. Fullan (Eds.), *Understanding teacher development* (pp. 75-84). New York: Routledge.
- Cornett, C. E., & Smithrim, K. (2001). *The arts as meaning makers: Integrating literature and the arts throughout the curriculum*. Toronto, ON: Pearson Education Canada/Prentice Hall.
- Dolly, M. R., Holmes, J. H., & Barry, L. (2002). Crossing disciplines and education levels. *The Teaching Professor*, 16(3), 5.
- Eisenhart, M., & Borko, H. (1993). *Designing classroom research: Themes, issues and struggles*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Evertson, C. M., Hawley, W. D., & Zlotnik, M. (1992). Making a difference in educational quality through teacher education. In J. M. Rich (Ed.), *Innovations in education: Reformers and their critics* (pp. 207-224). Boston: Allyn Bacon.
- Gallas, K. (1994). *The languages of learning: How children talk, write, dance, draw, and sing their understanding of the world*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Glesne, C. (1999). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Goldberg, M. (2001). *Arts and learning* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Governments of Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, Northwest Territories, Saskatchewan, and Yukon Territory. (1996). *The common curriculum framework for English language arts kindergarten to grade 12*. Winnipeg, MB: Manitoba Education and Training.
- Guskey, T. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Hawley, W. D., & Valli, L. (1997, January). The essentials of effective professional development: A new consensus. *Manitoba ASCD Newsletter*, 3-4.
- Hobbs, R. (1997). Literacy for the information age. In J. Flood, S. B. Heath, & D. Lapp (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching literacy through the communicative and visual arts* (pp. 7-14). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.
- Hubbard, R. S., & Power, B. M. (1993). *The art of classroom inquiry*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hutchens, J. (1998). Research and professional development collaborations among university faculty and education practitioners. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 99(5), 35-40.
- Krathwohl, D. R. (1993). *Methods of educational and social science research: An integrated approach*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Lancy, D. F. (1993). *Qualitative research in education: An introduction to the major traditions*. New York: Longman.
- Leland, C. H., & Harste, J. C. (1994, September). Multiple ways of knowing: Curriculum in a new key. *Language Arts*, 71, 337-345.
- Leonhard, C. (1999). Grand masters series: A challenge for change in music education. *Music Educators Journal*, 86(3), 40-43.
- Manitoba Education and Training. (1996a). *Manitoba curriculum framework of outcomes and grade 3 standards: Kindergarten to grade 4 English Language Arts*. Winnipeg, MB: Manitoba Education and Training.
- Manitoba Education and Training. (1996b). *Manitoba curriculum framework of outcomes and grade 6 standards: Grade 5 to 8 English Language Arts*. Winnipeg, MB: Manitoba Education and Training.
- Martin Shand, P. (1996). An innovative approach to music teacher education, *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 5(2), 14-20.
- McLaren, P. (1994). *Life in schools* (2nd ed.). Toronto, ON: Irwin.
- Morin, F., & Stinner, A. (1998). Interdisciplinary studies in music and arts for middle school teachers. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 7(2), 6-13.
- Piazza, C. L. (1999). *Multiple forms of literacy: Teaching literacy and the arts*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Schroyer, M. G. (1990). Effective staff development for effective organizational

- development. *Journal of Staff Development*, 11(1), 2-6.
- Schulman, L. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15, 4-14.
- Sigurdson, P. (1984). *Prairie*. Winnipeg, MB: Silverstone Productions. [Poem set to original music by V. Simosko & C. Rutkowski. Musical score and text available from: V. Simosko, School of Music Library, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB Canada, R3T 2N2.]
- Thiessen, D. (1992). Classroom-based teacher development. In A. Hargreaves & M. G. Fullan (Eds.), *Understanding teacher development* (pp. 85-109). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Tovey, R. (Ed.). (1998). *Harvard educational letter focus series No. 4: Professional development*. Cambridge, MA: President and Fellows of Harvard College.

Francine Morin, Ph.D., is Acting Head of the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning and Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, where she teaches in the areas of music and movement education. (e-mail: fmorin@cc.umanitoba.ca)

Deborah Begoray, Ph.D., is Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education, University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia. Dr. Begoray teaches in the areas of reading, language arts, and curriculum theory. (e-mail: dbegoray@ms.umanitoba.ca)