Evaluation as Harvesting:
Drama in Education as Tender Fruit[*]

Philip Nagy
ontario institute for studies in education

Arlene Laskey
brant (ontario) county board of education

Patricia Allison
university of western ontario

Under pressure to appear objective and accountable, policy-oriented program evaluations emphasize easily specified, concrete objectives. Drama in education, by contrast, is concerned largely with "tender fruit," those objectives more global, harder to define, and susceptible to damage in the "harvesting" process. We suggest a compromise between these two positions, presenting an evaluation project as a complex adaptation of an innovation or growth profile, in drama in education. Although data collection involved neither outcome measures nor classroom observations, the report contained enough hard data to be acceptable to and useful for policy makers, yet provided a richness of information appropriate to the philosophy of drama in education.

Faisant l'objet de pressions pour paraître objectives et sérieuses, les évaluations de programmes qui suivent les politiques établies privilégient des objectifs concrets et faciles à identifier. Les cours de théâtre, eux, s'occupent surtout de "fruits plus tendres," d'objectifs plus globaux, plus difficiles à définir et susceptibles de s'endommager lors de la "récolte." Les auteurs suggèrent un compromis entre ces deux positions en présentant un project d'évaluation qui serait une adaptation complexe d'un profil d'innovation ou de croissance dans les cours de théâtre. Même si les données colligées ne comprenaient ni des mesures des résultats ni des observations en classee, le rapport contenait suffisamment de données objectives pour être acceptable et utile aux responsables des politiques et a fourni des informations suffisamment significatives pour servir de fondement à une philosophie de l'éducation relative à l'art dramatique.

What should be taught in the arts seems somehow more mysterious than what should be taught in math. (Lehman, 1988)

This article provides an example of program evaluation in a "mysterious" curriculum area, drama in education, and considers the relationship between drama in education and program evaluation. Decision-makers typically require outcome data as evidence of program success, while drama educators value process and often express concern about the appropriateness of outcome data for the evaluation of drama programs in education. We suggest the need for compromise to bridge this gap between the two communities. The evaluation we report for grades 4 to 6 exemplifies such compromise.

We are concerned with *drama in education* rather than with theatre or creative drama. Drama in education emphasizes the forging of meaning within collective "as if" or fictional contexts encountered while participants are "in role." Drama in education is viewed primarily as a learning medium, where many skills and strategies used in theatre serve educational goals. Theatre emphasizes performance; creative drama, the development of personal awareness, sensitivity, and self-confidence. Although certain strategies are common to all three forms, their goals differ.

We take as a guiding principle that drama in education has value; however, our argument generalizes to the broader issue of educational evaluation whenever the context includes a full array of program goals. We are concerned with situations in which evaluators must consider not only specific objectives, but also more global and less concrete objectives, and those that might be damaged in the attempt to assess success (e.g., by intrusive observation or transparent questionnaires). The problem of substituting easily collected data for more important and meaningful evidence exists throughout the curriculum; it is as serious in traditional subject fields as in such areas as drama.

On the value of drama in education, however, Gardner (in Brandt, 1987–1988) argues that artistic thinking uses the mind distinctively: "If we omit those [artistic] areas from the curriculum, we are in effect shortchanging the mind" (p. 30). Similarly, Miller (1988) argues that the current emphasis on student achievement, the basics, and thinking skills has contributed to the fragmentation of modern life, "yet the teacher must face the whole child who can never be limited by our categories and priorities" (p. 3). He outlines three curriculum positions, that is, *transmission,* the "delivering" of traditional school subjects, *transaction,* the problem-solving interaction of the child with curriculum experiences, and *transformation,* in which "there is a holistic emphasis, and the student is not just viewed in the cognitive mode, but in terms of his or her aesthetic, moral, physical and spiritual needs" (p. 6). Drama in education is an important aspect of a transformational curriculum. Despite recent attention to basic skills, we believe most students, parents, and taxpayers want more than "the basics" in the school curriculum.

Systematic program evaluation for accountability usually requires statements of specific expected learning outcomes and acceptable measures of them. Most program areas are characterized by a mix of outcomes types, some fairly easily specified and assessed and some not. In mathematics, for example, basic skills objectives can be spelled out with considerable precision, but higher-order problem-solving and affective goals resist such delineation. As a result of pressures to appear objective and to account for the use of public money, policy-oriented program evaluations generally concentrate on easily assessed objectives at the expense of those more elusive. The situation becomes particularly acute in the newer curricula, which include process objectives such as critical or creative thinking, and social objectives such as lifelong learning and attitude development. We have labelled elusive, difficult-to-assess objectives "tender fruit," drawing a parallel with the problems of mechanical harvesting of fruit such as peaches or strawberries.

The difficulty is compounded in such "mysterious" program areas as drama in education, where clear, simple, and safely assessed goals are unavailable. Here, program evaluation tends to be difficult, expensive, and lacking in what some would consider hard evidence. At present, evaluation in "mysterious" program areas is unpersuasive to those not directly involved in the mystery. The compromises we propose are intended to alleviate this difficulty.

Wilson and Rees (1990) have suggested that educational decision-making ought to be viewed hierarchically, from student through classroom, school, and district to province. Decisions at different levels require different kinds of information, with more detail required at levels closer to the classroom. Many educators accept approaches to evaluation that portray program processes and constraints and that seek to make meaning from the perceptions of the program participants. Such educators, however, tend not to hold decision-making roles. Among political leaders, nothing succeeds like tables of percentages or lists of grade equivalents. We argue, within the Wilson and Rees model, for making more complex, valid, and useful information available at higher decision-making levels.

We do not wish to debate the relative importance of the types of objectives amenable to various types of assessment, nor do we wish to debate the relative importance of arts versus basic skills. We argue simply that ease or efficiency of assessment is not synonymous with importance, and that evaluation techniques in hard-to-assess areas merit serious attention. Both drama educators and decision-makers will have to compromise on what should count as a useful and valid indicator of program success. Although this compromise might strike some as incompatibility or inconsistency, it is nevertheless necessary if drama in education, or arts education in general, is to be taken seriously at the policy level.

Tender Fruit and the Goals of Drama in Education

The metaphor of tender fruit conveys our concern that, like peaches or strawberries, some educational objectives can be damaged in the harvesting process. Some official educational objectives, such as "to make explicit the unexpressed" or "to grasp 'essential truths'" (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1984) are so subtle and intricate that the outcomes might well be damaged by attempts to gather evidence of success. (These examples are also vague and unfathomable, but they constitute, at least in one province, the guidance provided to local decision-makers.) The danger of damage, as well as of irrelevance, is obvious for such instruments as test items, but perhaps not so obvious for such harvesting techniques as observation or questionnaires. The presence of an outside observer, however, can easily impede sensitive interactions within a classroom, and questioning children may make them self-conscious to the detriment of program goals. Peaches and strawberries *can* be successfully harvested, but only with great care to avoid damage.

The distinction between tender fruit and other objectives of schooling is more than a level of specificity; any global objective must be spelled out before it is in some sense observable. Consider, for example, two goals of education in Ontario: "acquire skills that contribute to self-reliance in solving practical problems in everyday life," and "develop values related to personal, ethical or religious beliefs and to the common welfare of society" (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1989, p. 3). These are equally general in their phrasing, and each requires further delineation to yield practical classroom directives. After some debate over priorities, however, the first goal yields clear and potentially easily-assessed objectives. The second, on the other hand, is tender fruit, in that more specific statements do not yield anything more easily assessed.

In drama in education, process is very important. We here report an evaluation of a drama program in the elementary classrooms of a largely urban, mid-sized southwestern Ontario county school system, an evaluation that attempted to capture process. The evaluation project brought together evaluators and drama educators to seek a common basis for formative evaluation of a recently established program. The goal was to reach policy-makers in a language they are comfortable with, while minimizing violence to the subtle *point* of drama in education. Emphasis on process is not only inherent to drama but has the additional beneficial consequence of providing something visible for the attention of policy-makers.

The first step involved discussion, introspection, and consultation to distil and define the essence of drama in education as distinct from the curriculum areas it supports. (Drama is, for example, a useful teaching tool for the social studies.) This entailed considerable effort, monthly meetings for about three years, to arrive at commonly understood terms for program features.

Second, we described, in a manner consistent with the philosophy of drama in education and the decision-makers' requirements, activities that would distinguish successful from less successful programs. The articulation of this shared meaning, arrived at with considerable compromise between sets of convictions, was summarized as a complex adaptation of an innovation profile (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1987). This profile, a detailed description of perceptions and activities characterizing a successful drama program, bridged the arts and evaluation perspectives.

Third, we interviewed teachers and administrators about the profile. Although data collection involved neither outcome measures nor classroom observations, the report contained enough "hard data" to be useful to policy-makers while providing a richness of information appropriate to the philosophy of drama in education.

DRAMA IN EDUCATION AND EVALUATION

The Goals of Drama

Drama presents a difficult implementation and evaluation challenge for several reasons. The first is teacher expertise. Drama is surrounded by an aura of mystery, which, coupled with limiting preconceptions and misperceptions about the nature and value of drama, contributes to its marginalization. In the school system studied, prior to program initiation in 1984, only two of over 500 elementary teachers had assignments emphasizing drama, while a handful of generalists also incorporated drama into their programming. Even if we could set aside worries about the effect (and cost) of classroom observations, a case can be made that such observation would be unwise. Given low levels of teacher expertise and comfort, any attempt to observe classes might have been perceived as staff evaluation, tipping the balance between the pressure and support Huberman and Miles (1984) advocate for implementation of new programs. Although one might argue that this problem is a happenstance of a particular context, limited numbers of trained personnel seems typical of school systems in Canada and the United States. For example, from 1985 through 1990, fewer than 500 individuals qualified as drama specialists in Ontario, a province employing about 100,000 teachers.

The problem central to this article is the specification *in theory* of outcomes appropriate to drama. Drama's global goals do not translate into easily observable objectives; they are *tender fruit.* For example, Ontario sets out eight specific goals of drama in education, abbreviated and paraphrased as follows:
— receptivity, to see other points of view;
— comprehension, to face issues and grasp "essential truths";
— inventiveness, to use imagination and creativity;

—curiosity, to research and explore issues;

—expressiveness, to communicate holistically, express feelings;

—self-awareness, to make explicit the unexpressed;

—body awareness and control, to express appropriate thoughts or feelings

—skill in group relations, to share ideas and trust oneself and others. (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1984, p. 4)

Although one could, with effort, write observable objectives that might *exemplify* some of these goals, or at least aspects of them, such objectives would not *capture* them enough to constitute sufficient evidence of program success. Beyond this difficulty, there is the problem that attempts to document such goals as receptivity and the expression of feelings might be so obtrusive as to destroy the phenomena.

Another difficulty with the goals of drama is that they are intertwined with goals of other subjects, drama becoming a teaching method as much as a subject area. Drama is typically used as an aid to clarifying and solving problems in the social studies or language arts. For example, after reading a story involving a conflict between family members, children can explore motivations and relationships by improvising scenes based on details from the text (from Ontario Ministry of Education, 1984). Such uses of drama in education makes it difficult for the evaluator to concentrate on what is unique to drama.

Evaluation in the Arts

The literature in arts education reveals two perspectives on evaluation. First, arts educators favour evaluation of process rather than outcomes. They argue for a responsive rather than preordinate mode (Stake, 1975/1983). A responsive evaluation is interactive, sensitive to emerging concerns, continuing, and formative, while a preordinate evaluation emphasizes preselected concerns, and, typically, outcome measures. One policy document for the Ontario drama program describes responsive evaluation as focusing more directly on activities than objectives, and as an attempt to respond to the natural ways in which people arrive at understanding. It strives for a holistic orientation to a complex and dynamic experience rather than precision of measurement. This approach is especially useful when the purpose is to monitor the program and its larger goals and to achieve understanding of the program's activities as well as of students' strengths and weaknesses (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1981).

Stake (1975) notes the problem in trying to judge value by focusing on outcomes in arts education: "it is not always best to think of the *instrumental* value of education as a basis for evaluating it. The value may be diffuse, long-delayed, or forever beyond the scrutiny of evaluators. It is sometimes the purpose . . . to provide experiences and training for the *intrinsic* value alone" (p. 16, italics in the original). Similarly, Braskamp and Brown (1975), writing about

accountability in arts programs, argue that "although it might not be customary for evaluation to consider process as the primary criterion, it might very well be the logical choice for a program that focuses extensively, if not exclusively, on process" (p. 68). Distinctive of this view of evaluation is that examination of process is the preferred choice, not simply the best we can manage until better outcome measures come along.

A second perspective on evaluation in the arts comes from the writings of Eisner and Courtney. Eisner (1985) has developed the notion of educational connoisseurship, and evaluation as criticism, guided by the unique characteristics of a particular situation. He believes the search for generalization through reductionism leads to oversimplification, and that attempts to evaluate objectively can lessen the ability to communicate the quality of human experience. Connoisseurship is the private art of appreciation; criticism, its public counterpart, the art of disclosure. In criticism, one describes, interprets, and evaluates or appraises. To do this effectively requires an empathetic response to the life of another.

Courtney, a drama educator, argues, with other ethnographic researchers (e.g., Dorr-Bremme, 1985), that truth depends on the observer's perspective and that, from Berger and Luckman (1966), all perspectives are socially constructed (Courtney, 1987). He outlines seven philosophical orientations and their role in enquiry into arts education, and argues that current enquiry must be pluralistic or perspective-seeking. Central to his argument is that we all have our own frames of reference, and that the researcher, and by extension the evaluator, must choose a method that depends upon the type of knowledge sought.

At the heart of Eisner's and Courtney's views are two points: that arts education involves artistic expression, and that outcomes of the arts are inherently unpredictable. On the first, just as qualified critics might disagree on the quality of a piece of art, evaluators might disagree on the worth of an educational program. On the second, if, for example, someone is asked to draw a picture based on "happiness," there can be few a priori criteria for the product.

In summary, evaluation of drama in education is problematic in that its goals can be difficult to define and assess, it is often a teaching tool for other disciplines, and few teachers have much expertise in the area. What is educationally important in drama is the process, not the product. Substantial compromise is needed if there is to be a meeting of minds between drama educators who distrust outcome data and policy makers who require outcome data as evidence of program success.

THE EXAMPLE

History

The school district we studied operates 41 elementary schools. Historically, there was a limited base of drama expertise; initial inservice activities in the late 1970s

therefore produced only sporadic results. A needs assessment for drama in 1983–1984, however, despite showing resistance, disinterest, and little training, also showed a desire among some for inservice. A designated change agent was appointed in the fall of 1984, with the task of making drama an accepted component of all elementary students' classroom experience. The first years of this initiative were successful due, *inter alia,* to administrative support, careful development over time, and the novelty and mystery of the innovation itself, which lent an air of intrigue as teachers were gradually inducted into practice.

The profile development aspect of the project was completed some five years after the appointment of the change agent. The profile was used in two ways: first, as the vehicle for a formative evaluation of the program mid-point in the implementation; and second, as a clear model (Huberman & Miles, 1984) of classroom practice useful for personal and staff professional growth in the later stages of implementation. In earlier stages of the innovation, various documents provided some clarity with respect to system and provincial expectations of the drama program. Huberman and Miles (1984) have argued that later stages of implementation require movement from a rational top-down to a more responsive problem-solving approach. To their position we would add that in circumstances such as those presented by drama, one critical aspect of a responsive approach is the provision of increasingly clear and detailed expectations as familiarity builds and barriers drop.

The Profile

Construction of the implementation profile for drama was lengthy, involving a variety of interested parties and constituting in itself a valuable experience in defining desirable classroom objectives and behaviours. Indeed, the construction of the profile took considerably longer and was a much more intensive activity than the implementation study. The profile construction represents an important facet of this project: the careful construction of a shared understanding of what the implementation of drama in education should look like in specific behavioural details provided a template classroom teachers could later use to enhance their implementation. At the same time, it could be used as the basis for an evaluation of the level of implementation at a given time to provide administrators and policy-makers with substantive, quantifiable information.

The profile in the form used for this evaluation (it has since gone through some reorganization) consisted of six dimensions: Delivery; Role-Playing Method; Method for Supportive Experiences; Evaluation; Resources; and Preparation. Each dimension was divided into from two to seven specific subdimensions. In this paper we concentrate on the dimension Role-Playing Method, divided into seven subdimensions, each considering a specific aspect of the way drama is used in the classroom. Table 1 shows abbreviated definitions of four of the seven subdimensions.

For each subdimension, four levels of implementation were defined as in Table 1: entry, development, effective, and innovative. The definition of these levels is at the heart of the compromise between the drama perspective and the evaluation perspective. Each set of four descriptors was unique to the subdimension, and provides quantifiable data while adhering to the philosophy of the drama program. For example, the subdimension Teaching Stance, at the Development level, shows the expected direction of exploration of those teachers beginning to show growth from Entry level behaviour. Directing, narrating, and side-coaching behaviours appear before more sophisticated and exposing teacher-in-role behaviour, which permits a higher level of functioning within processes specific to the drama program.

The nature of data produced bears scrutiny. To consider the subdimensions quantifiable, they must be viewed as ordered categories. Intervention to Shape the Drama, for example, interweaves three strands of growth: a change in number of strategies, a movement from without to within the drama, and a shift from preordinate to responsive strategy selection. The levels, based on experiences and expectations of drama educators, have inherent validity. From a measurement perspective, however, there are problems. The subdimensions are not independent; they represent different filters through which to examine one phenomenon. For example, Teacher in Role appears both as an element of Teaching Stance and as a subdimension itself. Also, the different scales are anchored to each other only through the judgment of the development team that descriptions at the same level are comparable across subdimensions. The reduction of a phenomenon as "mysterious" as drama in education to even a complex set of scales, however, represents substantial compromise from the drama side; acceptance of averaging the numbers derived from the profile is the corresponding compromise required from the quantitative perspective.

Evaluation

The team constructing the profile concentrated on defining classroom behaviours as clearly and specifically as possible, and thus the profile itself was the heart of both the interview schedule and the analysis of interview responses. All interviews were conducted within a four-week period, during the school day and on site at the various schools. All were conducted by the same interviewer, who had been briefed on the study itself, the profile, the interview schedule, and appropriate interview techniques. All schools in the system were included in the sampling, and in each school, a teacher of grade 4, 5, or 6, or the principal, was interviewed. Teachers were asked specifically if they had had any drama training in their preservice education: one teacher reported having had specific drama training; four others reported having had some drama training as part of another Ontario Ministry inservice course.

TABLE 1

Profile Definitions—Dimension: Role-Playing Method

Subdimension	Innovative	Effective	Development	Entry
Intervention to shape the drama: Teacher selection of strategies such as manipulation of pace, side-coaching, use of disclosure, role selection, and adjusting tensions within the drama.	Selects appropriately and responsively from the menu to shape the drama from within as well as without.	Uses several intervention strategies to shape the drama from within as well as from outside.	Uses one simple strategy to shape the drama from outside.	Allows the drama to develop without teacher intervention.
Student experiences in role: Students may engage in a variety of role-playing activities, such as writing in role, improvisation, using puppets, enactment, interviewing in role, reporting in role, discussing in role, and debating in role.	Selects appropriately from a wide menu of role-playing strategies when structuring student experiences in role.	Provides opportunities for students to experience many role-playing strategies.	Provides opportunities for students to experience more than one role-playing strategy.	Provides opportunities for students to experience one role-playing strategy.
Teaching stance: Considers the variety of ways in which the teacher becomes involved in the role-playing activity: side coach; teacher in role; instructor; director; and/or narrator.	Uses a variety of appropriate teacher stances, and moves comfortably among them.	Consistently uses a variety of teacher stances.	Most often directs and instructs, occasionally experiments with side-coaching, and teacher in role.	Relies on directing and/or instructing from outside the role-playing situation.
Teacher in role: The choices which the teacher makes about his/her role: power (king or mayor), middle rank (go-between or representative), parallel status (spokes-person), reciprocal status (one of the group), or underdog (one who appeals to the group).	Is able to function in many types of roles appropriate to the desired learning outcome.	Is able to function in more than one type of role.	Assumes a role similar to traditional teacher role (power role). Is able to function in one type of role.	Directs and/or instructs but does not assume a role.

Analysis of the interview responses was initially qualitative, but on the basis of this analysis, numerical implementation levels were assigned. For most subdimensions, responses were easily categorized according to the definitions of the levels. The lowest level was the Entry level, wherein teachers were just beginning to experiment with drama in education; at the Development level teachers were extending their experimentation; at the Effective level teachers were providing a wide variety of activities; at the Innovative level teachers were providing an excellent variety of activities and introducing new and unusual elements. Questions about professional development, under the dimension Preparation Stage, were handled slightly differently, as they dealt with system availability of opportunities as well as use by the individual teacher.

Results

Every teacher interviewed scored at the Innovative Level on at least one sub-dimension and at the Entry Level on at least one other subdimension, indicating that the program was not being fully implemented anywhere, but neither was it being consistently ignored anywhere. Numerical analyses of subdimensions high-lighted those areas in which implementation was furthest advanced and those that would benefit from more attention. At the same time, the reported results includ-ed extensive quotations from the interview transcripts, thus providing specific descriptions of the types of behaviours identified at each level of implementation. These descriptive quotations were very useful in planning professional develop-ment activities and enhancement of classroom implementation.

Table 2 provides a précis of the report on the Role-Playing Method dimension, with sample quotations for selected levels. The numerical analysis in the table provides two levels of detail: a breakdown of the percentage of teachers coded at each level, and an average implementation level for the subdimension (which assumes subdimension scores can legitimately be averaged). These data show that Student Experiences in Role are relatively well implemented, but Teaching Stance is not.

Teachers were dealing well with the provision of student experience and story material. The majority reported providing a wide variety of experiences for students in role playing, including letter writing in role and interviewing in role; they also reported using a good variety of story material, and exploring its dramatic potential through enactment, elaboration, extension, and often invention as well.

The weakest subdimensions were clearly those relating to teacher behaviour within the drama. Very few teachers gave the impression that they used a variety of stances or moved comfortably between them. Similarly, very few reported feeling comfortable with actually playing a role themselves, and those who did were most likely to choose a supervisory role, allowing them to control the drama. This same orientation was evident in the reasons commonly given for

intervention: most teachers reported intervening to maintain control rather than to shape the drama. Teachers were generally uncomfortable with taking a role themselves, not sure how this would be useful to the drama and often somewhat nervous about maintaining control of the activity. Teachers' levels of comfort and expertise will develop with experience, but in the early stages this will have to follow a broadening of student experiences: the more varied and frequent the student experiences, the more the teacher will acquire expertise and confidence. Nonetheless, this identified weakness could be ameliorated by specific inservice activities, as we recommended to the county board.

One purpose of the evaluation was to identify specific areas and/or groups that might benefit from carefully targeted inservice. As it turned out, there was no relationship at all between implementation levels on specific dimensions or subdimensions and any recorded demographic characteristics of teachers. Furthermore, very few patterns of implementation were found among respondents. Such patterns as there were related to logically connected behaviours. Professional development was found to be valuable, since teachers who had had more professional development did better in implementation. This relationship, however, is logically attributable to motivation, since those teachers who had sought out more professional development opportunities could be expected to be more interested in implementing a good drama curriculum in their classrooms. It was also evident, and logical, that classroom drama activities were much enriched when they were integrated across a broader spectrum of curriculum areas: teachers who used drama in a wider variety of subjects had more subject matter to choose from and could offer a wider variety of experiences to their students.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

We have outlined the need for a middle ground between two perspectives on education and, for that matter, on the nature of evidence. The detail we have provided concerning drama in education demonstrates its "mysterious" nature, and shows that drama educators' concerns are ill-served by emphasis on outcome evaluation. The type of compromise we suggest clearly has benefits. Although some might find our numerical data wanting, others would be dismayed that there are numbers at all. Although some consider this difficulty a sign of fundamental incompatibility, our view is that compromise of the kind we outline points toward a solution.

From the perspective of drama educators, the choice of Leithwood and Montgomery's (1987) growth profile model may seem contrary to the purpose of honouring the nature of drama, but in truth it allowed a happy marriage of inside-out and outside-in ways of working that in no way demeaned the power of drama in education. We set out to describe in concrete terms the drama practices we hoped would be seen as desirable by teachers. Although our proce-

TABLE 2

Interview Results—Dimension: Role-Playing Method

Subdimension	Innovative	Effective	Development	Entry
Intervention to shape the drama (Mean=2.1)		"I may use sound signals to guide the role-playing, or I may take a role." (21%)	"I usually stop the group which needs to be put back on track." (67%)	"I usually don't intervene unless the role-playing deteriorates into mere nonsense." (12%)
Student experiences in role (Mean=3.2)	"We do written dialogue in role, interviewing in role, small group problem solving in role, creative writing, letter writing in role and puppet plays." (39%)	"We do puppet shows, mime, small group role preparations, story drama and some script writing." (39%)	"We do small group role-playing, individual responses in class, imagining a setting." (18%)	"We use ready parts in a play." (3%)
Teaching stance (Mean=1.9)		"I encourage them; sometimes I act as narrator; I might direct a group or model a role." (27%)	"I may take a role, which is difficult. I give praise or unobtrusive direction." (42%)	"I supervise; sometimes I give signals during a performance to keep it going." (30%)
Teacher in role (Mean=2.1)	"I use a variety of roles including narrator or extra." (3%)	"Sometimes I play a leader; sometimes I take the most insignificant part." (33%)	"I choose a role that is 'in charge' — to direct the drama." (36%)	"... guide the process better from outside." (27%)

dures could not link our program findings to Ontario Ministry goals — given the vagueness of Ontario Ministry direction, this may not be very important — we *were* able to link them to the expectations of a knowledgeable group of drama educators familiar with the local context. We wanted drama practices to appear manageable, clear, and appropriate. Although a program profile approach may not be a viable compromise in all such encounters between "mysterious" educational goals and program evaluation, in this context it has been useful to both drama educators and policy makers.

In working toward this goal, we also aimed to work in a manner harmonious with drama's essential nature. That we were successful in process as well as product is attributable to a number of factors. First, the task was accepted as collegial and interactive, and ample time and resources (both personnel and material), were committed. The task and process were supported by the senior school system administration. The working group for the project comprised stakeholders from many perspectives — principals, teachers, system consultants, and external (to the school district) evaluators.

Together the work group talked about drama — as they knew it from personal experience, as they had observed it in various contexts, and perhaps most importantly, as they understood it through reflection on practice, their own and others'. Uncounted hours were spent trying to tease out the *drama* from the web of experiences associated with it. This collective effort was the cornerstone of all subsequent work.

The process of creating the profile was transformative (Miller, 1988) for all concerned as we shared our knowledge, our concerns, our needs to know, our fears, and our hopes. We also shared our understandings, not just of the nature of drama but of the nature and purposes of education, and because of this we changed each other. None of us emerged with the same beliefs. All of us learned more — about drama, about curriculum processes, about assessment, about group process, about how people learn, about ourselves, and about each other — and this may have been one of the most valuable products.

REFERENCES

Berger, P.L., & Luckman, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality.* New York: Doubleday.

Brandt, R. (1987–1988). On assessment in the arts: A conversation with Howard Gardner. *Educational Leadership, 45*(4), 30–34.

Braskamp, L.A., & Brown, R.D. (1975). Accountability for the arts. In R.E. Stake (Ed.), *Evaluating the arts in education: A responsive approach* (pp. 59–71). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Courtney, R. (1987). *The quest: Research and inquiry in arts education.* New York: University Press of America.

Dorr-Bremme, D.W. (1985). Ethnographic evaluation: A theory and method. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7,* 65–83.

Eisner, E.W. (1985). Educational connoisseurship and educational criticism: Their forms and functions in educational evaluation. In E.W. Eisner, *The art of educational evaluation: A personal view* (pp. 87–102). Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.

Huberman, M., & Miles, M. (1984). *Innovation up close: How school improvement works.* New York: Plenum Books.

Lehman, P. (1988). What students should learn in the arts. In R.S. Brandt (Ed.), *Content of the Curriculum: 1988 ASCD Yearbook* (pp. 109–131). Alexandria, VA: American Society for Curriculum Development.

Leithwood, K., & Montgomery, D. (1987). *Improving classroom practice using innovation profiles.* Toronto: OISE Press.

Miller, J.P. (1988). *The holistic curriculum.* Toronto: OISE Press.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (1981). *Dramatic arts: Intermediate and senior divisions.* Toronto: Ministry of Education.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (1984). *Drama in the formative years.* Toronto: Ministry of Education.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (1989). *Ontario schools: Intermediate and senior divisions* (rev. ed.). Toronto: Author.

Stake, R.E. (Ed.). (1975). *Evaluating the arts in education.* Columbus, OH: Charles Merrill.

Stake, R.E. (1983). Program evaluation, particularly responsive evaluation. In G.F. Madaus, M. Scriven, & D.L. Stufflebeam (Eds.), *Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation* (pp. 287–310). Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff. (Original work published 1975)

Wilson, R.J., & Rees, R. (1990). The ecology of assessment: Evaluation in educational settings. *Canadian Journal of Education, 15,* 215–228.

Philip Nagy is in the Department of Measurement, Evaluation, and Computer Applications, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario, M5S 1V6. Arlene Laskey is with the Brant County Board of Education, Ontario. Patricia Allison is in the Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, N6G 1G7.