# *Minnesota Community Voices and Character Education*

## *FINAL REPORT AND EVALUATION*

Presented by

Connie Anderson
Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning

Dr. Darcia Narvaez and Tonia Bock
University of Notre Dame

Leilani Endicott and Jim Lies
University of Minnesota

---

*Grant # R215V980001 from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement*

*Spring 2003*

# *Minnesota Community Voices and Character Education*

## *FINAL REPORT AND EVALUATION*

This report has been funded by the U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
Grant # R215V980001
through the Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning

Spring 2003

For information on project and evaluation design contact:
Darcia Narváez, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
118 Haggar Hall
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556
dnarvaez@nd.edu

For information on the Partnership and copies of Partnership products contact:
Connie J. Anderson
Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning
1500 West Highway 36
Roseville, MN 55112
Connie.J.Anderson@cfl.mn.us

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

## Section I. Purposes of the Project



## Section V. Evaluation of Program Effectiveness, Part 1: Evaluation of School Implementation



## Section VI. Evaluation of Program Effectiveness, Part 2: Evaluation of Model and Materials



## Section VIII. Evaluation of Program Effectiveness, Part 4: Statistical Analyses of Perceptions of Climate and Effects on Students

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

We are grateful for the ongoing collaboration with representatives of local school partners in the Community Voices and Character Education Project. The wisdom and insights of our partners were fundamental in the development of materials and the project framework.

Caledonia Middle-High School
Canby Middle School
Clarkfield Junior High, Yellow Medicine East
Ellis Middle School, Austin
Fairmont Middle School
Janesville/Waldorf/Pemberton Middle School
Kasson-Mantorville Middle School
Montgomery-Lonsdale Elementary/Middle Schools
Rocori Middle School
Saint Paul's Fresh Start & BESTT
South Saint Paul Junior/Senior High School
Waseca Middle School
Winona Junior High School

We are also grateful to those who assisted the University of Minnesota Design Team:

The former members and affiliates of the University Design Team:
Christyan Mitchell, Jolynn Gardner, Ruth Schiller, Laura Staples, Jennifer Skuza.

University of Minnesota students who assisted us with data management:
Kayt Amundsen, Melissa Boetcher, Lynn Dahlquist. Kentaro Endo, Joni Johnson, Linda Litweiler, Delroy Tuorila, and Becki Winter

St. Olaf College undergraduates who assisted with data management:
Sara Erickson, Alanna Jerlow, Brooke Lee, Anna Sackett, Mara Sedlins, and Kelly Sweeney.

Outside experts who reviewed early drafts of skills:
Tim Hatfield, Steve McNeel, Elizabeth Vozzola

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1998, the U.S. Department of Education awarded the Minnesota Department of Children, Families, and Learning a four-year Partnership in Character Education grant to develop an approach to character education in the middle school. The project was called *Minnesota Community Voices and Character Education* (*CVCE*). Unlike most character education partnership projects, *Minnesota Community Voices and Character Education* focused on the development of materials for teachers. Also unique, this project reflects the historical and legislative emphasis in Minnesota on local control of curricular decisions.

The focus of the project was developing and providing an appropriate, research-based, framework for character education with teacher-friendly guidelines for how to do it. In collaboration with volunteer teachers, administrators and staff members, a model for character education with accompanying materials were designed and revised multiple times. Three of the four years were spent on creating, piloting, and revising materials for teachers in collaboration with school partner sites. The University Design Team tailored the delivery of staff development on a school-by-school basis.

The school partners were representative of urban, suburban, and rural school districts. The fourth year was strictly an implementation year during which site participants implemented their programs and pre and post test data were collected on general ethical skills. In the fourth year and beyond, a CD-ROM of all project materials was prepared and distributed to Minnesota junior high and middle schools, and support was made available to schools implementing CVCE materials.

The CVCE model provides a research-based, concrete view of ethical behavior, treating character development as the culitvation of a set of skills in ethical sensitivity, judgment, motivation and action. Students are placed at the center of their character development, responsible for skill development. Community members are to be involved in the development of a local implementation. Character skill development is to be integrated across the curriculum, infused into the lessons and climate of the school.

The evaluation had five parts: (1) Model and Materials: The first part of the evaluation matched the primary focus of the project which was to design a model and materials to guide teams of teachers in incorporating character skill development into regular instruction. For this part of the evaluation, assessment tools included teacher and local leader surveys and reports. On average, respondents thought the characteristics of the model were valuable. (2) Implementation: Part two of the evaluation was to examine the quality of implementation of the model by teachers. Implementation varied across sites in terms of depth and breadth. (3) Assessment Tools: Part three of the evaluation was to examine the validity of assessments. In doing so, we used the assessment tools to examine the effects of project implementation on students using student pre- and post-testing of perceptions of climate and general ethical skills. (4) Effects on Climate and Students: In the fourth part of the evaluation, we evaluated effects on students and teachers using self-report questionnaires of perceptions, attitudes and behavior. There were two challenges to finding significant differences in pre-post student assessments. First, our knowledge of character development assessment led us to believe that it would be a challenge to find significant pre-post differences within one year's time. Second, another challenge to finding cross-site differences was one of the strengths of the program—local control and local uniqueness of program implementation. Because the application of the model was locally controlled, each site's implementation was unique and could not be compared with another. Thus, for a particular implementation the numbers tested were small. Most teacher respondents found improvements in one or more student behaviors and students generally noted improvement in peer ethical behavior. (5) Replicability: Part five of the evaluation was to determine the replicability of the model. The model provides a comprehensive and effective framework within which existing character education programs can be integrated, extended and strengthened.

# SECTION I.
# PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT

## A. Setting

In 1998, the U.S. Department of Education awarded Minnesota Department of Children, Families, and Learning (CFL) a four-year Partnership in Character Education grant to develop an approach to character education in the middle school. The project was called Minnesota Community Voices and Character Education (CVCE). Unlike most character education partnership projects, Minnesota Community Voices and Character Education focused on the development of materials for teachers. Also unique, this project reflects the historical and legislative emphasis in Minnesota on local control of curricular decisions.

When the grant proposal was written, the writers envisioned the project focusing on developing curriculum that integrated character development with standards-driven instruction. Immediately after funding started, the project and research directors realized that one more character education program would not solve one of the primary challenges to school reform: adding one more thing into the school day—especially an external curriculum that could be easily shelved. The project director and designer, Connie Anderson and Dr. Darcia Narváez, respectively, decided instead to focus on developing guidelines for teachers to integrate character development into their own standards-driven instruction.

In Minnesota, as in states across our nation, school districts have been focusing on standards-based education. Minnesota districts have been seeking to address Comprehensive Goals which are the foundation for Minnesota standards and the standards in the Profile of Learning. CFL believes that it is important to integrate character education into standards-driven academic instruction. In Minnesota, the standards are directed by the Comprehensive Goals (which incorporate the elements of character such as caring, citizenship, justice and fairness, respect, responsibility, and trustworthiness).

## B. Goals of the project

Initially, there were multiple goals for the project that were changed only slightly from the proposal, based on input from partner schools and their communities. Within annual reports, requests were made and permission was given to modify goals and adjust activities. We modified goals in several ways. For example, instead of developing a curriculum for teachers, we developed guidelines for teachers to incorporate character development into their regular instruction. Instead of asking teachers to put together performance packages, per se, we asked them to design learning activities according to the high standards set for curricula in CFL's curriculum repository. Instead of using primarily community stories as an information resource for character development, we included many more types of activities. Throughout the project, we monitored teachers' use of the developed materials and, in the final year of project support, measured student effects. Overall, the project focus was primarily on materials development and teacher use in the classroom with students.

Thus the goals of the project became providing appropriate, research-based, teacher-friendly guidelines that impacted classroom instruction and student learning. In collaboration with volunteer teachers, administrators and staff members, materials were designed, piloted and revised multiple times.

Three of the four years were spent collaborating with school partners on creating, piloting and revising a framework for character education and materials for teachers. The school partners were representative of urban, suburban, and rural school districts. The fourth year was strictly an implementation year during which site participants implemented their programs and pre and post test data were collected on general ethical skills and moral climate. In the fourth year and beyond, a CD-ROM of all project materials was prepared and distributed to Minnesota junior high and middle schools, and support was made available to schools implementing CVCE materials.

Unlike most character education partnership projects, CVCE focused on the development of research-based guidelines for teachers. The primary goal of the project was to help middle school teachers develop performance-based, standards-driven activities that integrate character skill development.

The models created in this project are of national significance as they provide a research-based approach to character development. The project generated several products that have been shared across the state and across the country.

The final goals of the project were the following:

***GOAL 1. Develop a character education program for middle level students (grades 6-8).***

Character education efforts rarely target the middle school. Our project sought to correct this oversight by focusing efforts at this level. We spent our time and money on primarily middle school personnel, assisting them with character development in their students. Our materials were written primarily for the middle school teacher (although teachers of all age groups have used them). The grades included in middle school often vary by school, ranging from grades 5-9, so we expanded our focus from 6-8 to the entire range.

***GOAL 2. Assist classroom teachers in developing performance-based curriculum, instruction and assessment.***

**2A. Build a framework that uses an up-to-date pedagogy based on current understandings of human learning.**

There are two competing notions of how people learn. The more prevalent but out-dated and mistaken notion of learning has been called the "receptive-accrual" view (Anderson, 1989). According to this view, students passively receive and store knowledge without transforming it. The teacher "pitches" the information to the student and the student "catches" it. If the student does not learn, it is the student's fault for not "catching" due to being inattentive or stupid. In contrast, the view of human learning held by those who study

it is the "cognitive-mediational" perspective. According to this view, individuals have unique conceptual structures or schemas that influence what and how they perceive, understand and remember. Learning involves an active transformation of schemas during cognitive activities such as "processing material through active, selective attention; relating new information to prior knowledge and forming new knowledge" and monitoring understanding in order to know when to ask for help or that understanding is complete (Anderson, 1989). The CVCE model is based upon constructivist principles that guide "best practice" instruction. Too often in character education, the constructivist approach has been replaced with a "transmission model " of teaching and learning---a model that assumes that teaching is a matter of adults handing off knowledge to passive "learners." In contrast, we adopt the view that individuals are active constructors of meaning, including skills for character. Individuals build conceptual frameworks, both declarative and procedural, in the process of learning to get along with others.

**2B. Convey the constructing ethical expertise model to teachers in a usable way.**

In collaboration with our partner schools and educators, materials were designed and revised multiple times. The result is a set of guidebooks for teachers that are easy to use. Feedback from our workshops and meetings with teachers were taken seriously in revising the materials. The final products were delivered in workshops during summer 2001.

The final products were well received, as can be seen in workshop comments from summer 2001 in Appendix A. This goal was assessed in Part One of the evaluation (see pp. 59f).

***GOAL 3: Improve Student Achievement: Create a model that integrates character development into standards-based regular instruction.***

Although the move in education generally has been towards performance-based learning, performance-based learning activities are in need of development across the country. The CVCE project supported teachers and districts in developing performance-based activities that promote character and a wide range of knowledge and skills. The learning activities developed by participating teachers are being shared through the web and CD-ROMs with other districts and teachers around the country. A list of learning activities developed by participating teachers is available in Appendix D.

***GOAL 4: Meet Minnesota Learning Standards.***

Each school district in Minnesota has the authority to design its own approach to meeting state standards. This emphasis on local control has strong historical and legislative roots. The CVCE model is designed to give teachers the tools to meet standards while teaching character skills. CVCE teachers used these tools to create learning activities that both teach character skills and deliver Minnesota standards.

In support of Minnesota's standards-based system of education, the Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning (CFL) has developed and maintains a website known as CLASS, Connecting Learning and Accountability for Students and schools. The site, located

at http://cflapp.state.mn.us/CLASS/index.jsp, includes the assessments and learning activities contributed by CVCE partner schools to the Minnesota Electronic Curriculum Repository (MECR). They were aligned with and transferred to CLASS.

***GOAL 5: Put together a framework for character development based on social science research that emphasizes ethical development and promotes emotional intelligence.***

We identified skills and subskills necessary for ethical behavior based on research in moral development, social skill development, prevention science, and positive psychology. We sought to develop a character education model that emphasizes character skills with respect to all the psychological components of ethical behavior (ethical sensitivity, ethical judgment, ethical motivation, ethical implementation)-- whose coordination is required for ethical behavior in any situation (Narvaez and Rest, 1995; Rest, 1983) as demonstrated in educational programs across the country (Rest & Narvaez, 1994).

***GOAL 6: Address community cultural contexts in the implementation of character education.***

**6A. Involve the community in designing and implementing the local program.**

The CVCE model balances two formative components critical to its implementation, (1) top-down principles for implementation and (2) bottom-up fidelity to the needs of the community. (See Figure I-1.) The top-down portion is the set of guidelines for optimal human functioning put together from research findings (28 skills—see Table I-1 for the list of skills and Appendix B for the list of subskills). This set of guidelines includes fundamental assumptions about the purpose of schooling (e.g., to nurture effective global citizens) and a set of skills for individuals to learn in community. The top-down principles also include the appropriate pedagogy for coaching expertise in the character skills—a novice-to-expert pedagogy. The set of guidelines is presented to teachers and community members who contribute the bottom-up portion of the model.

The bottom-up portion is the necessary local adaptation of the framework of skills to the community context. Each community discusses the framework in terms of specific community perspectives, needs, and diversity. The community takes the 28 skills and reshapes them according to its own common understandings of moral being. As a critical 'bottom up' feature, the skill categories are to be embedded in the cultural context where they are taught. To some degree, each community has its own understanding of the skills. For example, 'respecting others' can be expressed in various ways, as we know from cultures around the world. Likewise, identifying ethical problems and possible actions may vary among communities.

The local team also determines which skills are to be taught in which classes, when and for how long. Thus the local team also determines both the community-cultural component and the instructional component that comprise the bottom-up aspect of the model. The local team adapts the research-based model (top-down framework) according to the bottom-up aspect to create a unique implementation.

The project design encourages that the actual day-to-day practice of the skills be determined on site, by the community. The teacher is encouraged to work with the community on how to teach the skills and what to emphasize. The teacher tailors the classroom work to the local understanding of the skill. Further, the student is encouraged to gather information about the skill from the community (parents, elders) and bring back that information to the classroom. There will be various interpretations of the skills because of diversity in culture, religion, socio-economic status, regional background, and so on. When this diversity is brought into the classroom by the students themselves, it provides an appropriate backdrop for dialogue about the implementation of ethical skills and for teaching respect for differences. Such a practice can also be an important demonstration of how groups may have different practices while having the same underlying value.

In the CVCE framework, universal principles and skills meet local particularities and are melded together by the community itself. This top-down and bottom-up combination allows each community to make its own mark on the set of guidelines but within certain parameters, those of optimal functioning within a pluralistic democracy and a global community.

During the project, we asked each school partner to recruit community members for their local CVCE team and to help guide the local implementation of the project. Throughout the project, we used a process that incorporated community partner ideas into the development of the model. We suggested ways for schools and teachers to adapt the model to their community contexts and assisted school sites in contextualizing the model to meet their unique needs and circumstances.

Figure I-1 here

**Put Table I-1 here**

**6B. Involve students in community learning.**

A model for character education cannot be described without including the most important contextual variable: the students. Students have different needs and interests, levels of development and areas of skill. Yet they have in common what we all have in common. Each of us ultimately makes the decisions about whom and what we will become. Our decisions shape our characters and our futures. The 'constructing expertise' model helps students develop the skills for good choices but puts the onus on their shoulders for making the final decisions about their behavior. The integration of ethical skills across processes and within unique situations is a lifelong task. It is important to get children on the right track to taking interest in their characters, and to take on the project of "constructing a self…of cultivating the right kinds of desires and interests, of learning to take pleasure in the pursuit" (McKinnon; 1999). The self envisioned by the CVCE model is a self under construction, honing skills in order to actively participate in a pluralistic democracy as a global citizen.

The overall goal of the CVCE model is to build good citizens and community members. In order to do this, the sense of community and citizenship must be grounded within the student's own community. Projects that promote concern for the common good of the community foster student feelings of belonging to and being needed by a larger whole--the students' diverse neighbors. Our curriculum guidelines suggest using stories, values, and projects that are multicultural and appropriate to the particular community. During the project, partner schools used activities that lead the students back to the community, including service learning.

***GOAL 7: Evaluate program effectiveness and potential to replicate.***

**7A. Use assessments that measure different levels of effectiveness: School climate, individual student development and instructional effects to improve student achievement.**

In the CVCE guidelines available on the CD-ROM, we included suggestions for lesson assessment so that teachers can measure the success of particular activities in increasing character skill and academic achievement. For the final evaluation, we adapted several measures of student assessment, including school and classroom climate measures, and scales to measure general ethical skill development. The evaluation of the project used both quantitative and qualitative inquiry in assessing the effectiveness of the project model, materials, and implementation. During the fourth year, pre and post tests were given to students at participating sites as well as to a control group. This is discussed later in the report (Section VII, pp. 79f).

**7B. Develop a replicable approach to character education that can stand alone or can be integrated into other programs**

We developed several products that can be shared with other states. One is the research-based framework that describes the nature of character and the education of character. First, the overall framework we developed is useful in delineating the full dimensions of character

education and how character should be taught. The CVCE framework is useful as an overarching framework for structuring curriculum and identifying areas of need among the set of character education programs actively used by the school.

Second, we outline a model of community and student empowerment through classroom activities that both foster character development and meet graduation standards as well as link to the community.

Third, our teacher guidelines and other supporting materials are available to educators on the CFL website and project CD-ROM. See Appendix C for the list of project materials.

Fourth, last, although we targeted middle school, the model and materials are being used by elementary and high school teachers.

Last, specific curricula developed by partner educators based on the guidelines are available to educators across all grades.

## SECTION II.
## DESIGN OF THE PROJECT

### A. Model for Collaboration

### 1. Partnerships in Character Education

The MN Department of Children, Families & Learning (CFL), University of Minnesota and Minnesota schools partnered with the U.S. Dept. of Education through the Partnerships In Character Education grant (R215V980001) to construct and implement the Minnesota Community Voices & Character Education Project (CVCE). The project's overall goal was to provide middle school students with classroom experiences that integrate skills-based character development and standards-based education. CVCE supports schools' efforts to help students attain the Comprehensive Goals legislated in Minnesota's standards-based system. These include: Effective Communicators, Productive Group Participants, Purposeful Thinkers, Self-Directed Learners and Responsible Citizens.

Throughout the entire grant period the project partners worked in a collaborative spirit to provide guidance and direction and conduct extensive trial, review and revisions of project resources. Each entity of the partnership also accepted and carried out specific responsibilities identified to attain the projects stated goals.

- CFL, as project administrator, established partnerships, disseminated grants, provided oversight of the activities and maintained communications. The CFL Curriculum & Instruction Division carried primary responsibility for the CVCE project and alignment with Minnesota's standards. In addition, the Service Learning and Community Education Divisions served on the steering committee and contributed to the project success.

- The University of Minnesota Project Design Team took responsibility for developing the framework for character development based on social science research, constructing the guidelines for teachers to incorporate character development into regular instruction, authoring the resources, training teachers and conducting action research.

- Partner schools supported classroom teachers' work with parents and local community to determine and deliver curriculum, instruction and assessment designed to help students develop skills for ethical Sensitivity, Judgment, Motivation and Action.

The collaborative partners worked together to develop the CVCE model of top-down and bottom-up integration and implementation of character development.

## 2. CVCE Partner Schools

Classroom teachers, administrators and community members partnering with CVCE received support through project grants and project sponsored statewide, regional and on-site training and meetings conducted by the University Design Team and CFL personnel. CVCE print and electronic resources were provided free of charge.

The following list identifies participating schools that received funding, training and/or support as CVCE participants. In addition to these specific schools it should be noted that project information and resources were made available on the CFL character education website and through the distribution of the project resources CD-ROM to all Minnesota schools.

School participation included:

- Core cohort of partner schools, in the following districts, most closely associated with the stages of development, implementation, research and revision CVCE experienced.

| | |
|---|---|
| Austin | Caledonia |
| Canby | Fairmont |
| Janesville-Waldorf-Pemberton | Kasson-Mantorville |
| St. Paul | South St. Paul |
| Winona | Yellow Medicine East |

- Schools from the following districts have received funding, training and/or resources to identify character education leadership teams and utilize CVCE resources.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Benson | Bloomington | Brainerd |
| Cloquet | Dawson-Boyd | Edina |
| Greenway | Inver Grove Heights | Lac Qui Parle |
| Lake Benton | Lakeview | Lewiston Altura |
| Mankato | MN River Valley Ed. District | Montevideo |
| Mora | Montgomery-Lonsdale | Ortonville |
| Robbinsdale | Roccori | Russell |
| Sibley East | St. Louis County | Staples Motely |

Minneapolis McGee Institute of Technology

- Teachers from schools in the following districts received CVCE-sponsored training.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Cambridge | Pierz | |
| Rosemount-Apple Valley-Eagan | Spring Lake Park | Waseca |

Participant schools have shared their insights and experiences through a variety of venues including formal reports and conference presentations. The following partner school quotes speak to the positive and proactive response to the CVCE project.

> “The framework works with all subject areas.”
> “Community involvement is vital to making it work.”
> “Focusing on student results helps us measure effectiveness.”
> “Students use the framework to analyze and resolve problems.”
> “It allows us to respond to our school board’s character education policy.”
> "As partner schools, our ideas, insights, experiences, and feedback were listened to, valued and taken to heart, incorporated and fully utilized."

**B. Calendar of Activities**

The grant project followed several phases: (1) Recruit, identify and convene volunteer school partners; (2) Design a collaborative model for developing a practical approach to character education; (3) Develop guidelines for nurturing character in the classroom; (4) Pilot and test the effectiveness of the guidelines for teachers and for student skill development.

**1998 -1999**

The Minnesota Department of Children, Families & Learning (CFL) was awarded a Minnesota Partnerships in Character Education Fall 1998. The grant activities provided direction and support for integrating character and standards-based education in the middle school. The Minnesota partnership, identified as Community Voices & Character Education (CVCE), was introduced to all Minnesota school districts in an invitation sent to superintendents, middle school principals and standards technicians to partner with CFL and the University of Minnesota.

An advisory committee was established with representation from CFL, the University of MN and middle school partners. The University Design Team and CFL personnel conducted advisory committee meetings and regional meetings with partner schools to elicit input on project goals, process and resources. Recommendations were also sought from the MN Humanities Commission and the MN Academic Excellence Foundation.

University Design Team under the direction of Dr. Darcia Narvaez initiated the researched-based framework for skill development that includes ethical Sensitivity, Judgment, Motivation and Action. Dr. Narvaez submitted the framework to review by national experts. The Design Team crafted a Teacher Guidebook for incorporating character skill development into regular teaching in a standards-based classroom. The guidebook serves as the basis for teacher in-service and support. Each Design Team member was assigned specific partner schools to mentor.

Stipends were established to compensate teachers and school teams for participation in *Nurturing Character in the Middle School Classroom*, a two-day workshop offered June and

August 1999 at which materials were disseminated. Teachers who designed an integrated curriculum and provided an implementation report received an additional stipend.

**1999 – 2000**

Partner schools were invited to apply for project grants. The applications carried specific requirements related to involvement in the implementation of the skills-based framework for character education and addressing the Comprehensive Goals that underlie Minnesota standards-based system of education. Teachers were invited to submit learning activities to the Minnesota Electronic Curriculum Repository (MECR).

The University Design Team provided on-going support and resources for the teachers who attended the summer 1999 trainings. The project's relationship with the divisions within CFL helped direct teachers to regional workshops on performance-based curriculum, instruction and assessment. The Service Learning and Community Education also took an active role on the advisory committee and support for the teachers

Minnesota standards are based on what students know and are able to do. Similarly, the skill-based Four Process Model provides what students need to know and are able to do to demonstrate skills in ethical behavior. The Four-Process Model of Ethical Behavior was further delineated during Year Two. The evolution of the framework for skills-based character development contributed to the on-going review and revisions of the Teacher Guidebook.

The University Team developed and disseminated student and teacher surveys. They expanded on the variety of student assessments available for each of the ethical skills, pilot testing several scales. Partner schools were encouraged to include character education as they engage in continuous improvement efforts based on data drawn from the Minnesota Comprehensive Tests (MCA) and Basic Standards Test (BST).

Local control is a key factor in Minnesota. Local leaders were identified and empowered to oversee local implementations. The University Design Team crafted a *Manual for Local Leaders* to assist leaders in decision making and to facilitate the work of district and School Character education leadership teams, hereafter referred to as "local teams," in their work with communities and school staff.

CFL and University staff shared project progress and resources at national and statewide conferences and at a network meeting with other Midwest state project directors.

**2000 – 2001**

Analysis of student and teacher surveys and recommendations from the advisory committee directed revisions and additions to the Teacher Guidebook. The approach to delivering

teacher training was changed from statewide workshops to on-site training for partner schools' staff. Session evaluations reinforced this mode of delivery.

Classroom implementation was enhanced through the design and publication of project posters and bookmarkers. The posters and Teacher Guidebooks were distributed at staff development meetings and conference presentations.

The partner schools successful experiences and interest generated across the state encouraged CFL to place a character education site on CFL's website at http://cfl.state.mn.us/charactered. The site connects the user with project resources as well as state and national agencies and organizations that support character education. The site also serves as a direct link to the state project director.

Presentations by Dr. Darcia Narvaez at the national Character Education Partnership (CEP) conference and statewide Minnesota Educational Effectiveness Program conference were also opportunities to share project progress and invite feedback.

**2001 - 2002**

Each year the opportunity for CVCE participation with training and funding was renewed within the core partner schools and other interested schools. During year-three the project partnered with the MN River Valley Ed. District and worked across the seven districts that comprised the cooperative.

The determination of a final format of four booklets for the Teacher Guide allowed the project to direct resources to the development of a project CD. The CD includes the entire set of booklets, power point presentations on working with the community and getting started, sample lesson plans developed by partner schools and a variety of tools the Design Team and partner schools had developed over the course of the grant. The CD was distributed to all middle schools at no charge and can be requested via the website.

CFL established a new website entitled 'Connecting Learning and Accountability for Students and Schools' (CLASS) that encompasses information on Minnesota standards and test data. The MN Electronic Curriculum Repository and the teacher-created learning activities and assessments were relocated to CLASS.

Partner schools stepped forward and presented at the statewide Leadership Conference, the Middle School Teachers Conference and the School Administrators' Conference. They demonstrated to audiences that CVCE provides a framework that is compatible with other character education programs and approaches that a local school board or community may have in place.

Pre and post testing with student surveys was a prominent component in the project evaluations conducted the University Design Team. The project identified a new partner willing to serve as a 'control' school. The Design Team also identified guidelines for partner

schools progress reports. The data and analysis resulting from these activities are displayed in this document.

The head of the University Design Team, Dr. Darcia Narváez, was invited to speak at a White House conference on Character and Community. Laura Bush hosted and spoke at the event along with President Bush, Secretary Powell, Secretary Paige, five researchers and several youth volunteers. A version of Dr. Narváez' presentation is posted on the Department of Education's website at http://www.ed.gov/inits/character/narvaez.doc. The actual talk has been printed in the newsletter of the American Educators Association and is available at http://www.aaeteachers.org/newsletters/julyaugustnews.pdf.

**2002 - 2003**

The opportunity for an extension allowed the project to follow-up on interest resulting from the CD, website and conference presentations. CFL is providing grants and support to schools across Minnesota and the Design Team personnel are available on a consultant basis.

Partner schools presented at state-wide leadership conferences.

In October, 2002, the head of the University Design Team, Dr. Darcia Narváez, was invited to an event organized by the White House in St. Louis. She participated on an expert panel discussing character education that was filmed by Court TV. Excerpts from the event were broadcast on Court TV in the Classroom (January, 2003) and on Open Court (April 4, 2003).

On March 18, 2003, Dr. Darcia Narváez was invited to be the expert on the Department of Education's live talk show, "Education News that Parents Can Use," whose topic was character and civic education. It was broadcast live from WETA studios in Washington, D.C., and made available on tape locally throughout the nation.

In April, 2003, Dr. Darcia Narváez gave a keynote address about the project at the Annual Character Education Conference at Fresno State University (Fresno, California).

In June, 2003, Dr. Darcia Narváez speaks about the project at the Connections in Character Institute at Azusa Pacific University (Azusa, California).

**C. Model for Character Development**

The issue of character development and moral education is conflicted these days. While there is a consensus about the need for character education, there is little consensus on what it should entail. The usual criticisms lofted against character education programs include the superficiality of content and activities and the lack of an empirical base. The CVCE approach attempts to recover a classical view of what character is and wed it to current psychological literature. The Platonic notion of *techne*, expert skill, provides a useful

framework for understanding the nature of moral character, a notion that is also compatible with a component model of moral functioning and an expertise model of learning. CVCE seeks to provide clear guidance on what should be taught and how it should be taught. The purpose of CVCE is to provide a roadmap for teachers about what character is and how to teach it.

**1. A Contrast with other Approaches**

The CVCE research-based framework contrasts with other approaches to character education in several key ways. First, CVCE is grounded in psychological theory of what ethical behavior entails, what skills people of good character have. CVCE does not teach personality traits but focuses on skills, skills for ethical sensitivity, ethical judgment, ethical motivation and ethical action. In some ways the CVCE model reflects a classical notion of good character development. In *The Republic*, Plato repeatedly draws an analogy between the practice of professional skills and the practices of a just person. A just person is one who has particular, highly-cultivated skills. Plato describes the just person as knowledgeable and effective in ethical 'know-how', as is an expert craftsman in his or her field.

Second, unlike programs that lack depth or concrete guidelines on how to foster good character beyond a simplistic set of traits in students, CVCE specifies skills and identifies subskills that should be addressed, and suggests activities to foster these within regular lessons. For example, "Developing Conscience" entails such things as learning to be empathic, learning self-command, self-awareness, and stewardship.

Third, few character education approaches use current knowledge of how to teach for understanding and how to structure lessons to move students towards proficiency. According to the CVCE model, character development can be described as a skill-developing activity in which one becomes more expert through practice and apprenticeship. This kind of skill develops from authentic experience; practical action is developed in incremental steps using such approaches as guided participation, scaffolding, and apprenticeship.

Fourth, it is not uncommon for moral education programs to be actively resisted by communities, particularly when it is unclear whose moral values or preferred traits are being inculcated. CVCE provides a research-based framework to local teams of educators and community members who adapt the framework to the local context. The skills are taught in ways that match local custom and family preference.

Fifth, in contrast to the vast majority of programs that are designed to be appended to existing classroom curricula (requiring schools and teachers to find room in the schedule for another subject), CVCE integrates character development across the curriculum within standards-driven instruction.

## 2. Underlying Assumptions of the Community Voices and Character Education (CVCE) Research Framework

The CVCE research framework for character development is based on four ideals garnered from the work of diverse scholars and researchers. These are: (1) common understandings of what it means to be good*;* (2) conclusions from social sciences about what skills are required for ethical action and what characteristics psychologically healthy individuals and communities have; (3) the consensus among leaders worldwide on the necessary characteristics of a citizen in the 21st century; (4) up-to-date knowledge of how humans learn and how instruction should be structured. From these four sources we draw a framework for character development education that explicitly delineates philosophical and psychological underpinnings.

Following Blasi (1990), we define goodness according to common understandings and ordinary language. According to this view, 'we know it when we see it.' The individual recognizes "(1) when the conditions for a certain meaning have or have not been fulfilled and (2) when an interpretation corresponds to his experience" (ibid, p. 62). Etzioni (1996) states: "certain concepts present themselves to us as morally compelling in and of themselves" (p. 241). We do not explain the nature of a good person precisely. Instead, we delineate the skills that a person needs to have in order to function as a moral being in the world.

CVCE offers a framework of skills that are based on universals such as human rights (e.g., the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights), common notions of democratic citizenship, and the elements that foster human flourishing, both individually and within a community. Specifically, citizenship education fosters skills, attitudes and knowledge in students that enable them to effectively and responsibly participate in civic life. Davidson (2000) aptly points out that in a global world it is no longer feasible to consider citizenship "within the terms of the nation as something whose parameters are national" (p. 5). Rather, citizenship becomes a global 'public' value. Consequently, citizenship in the 21st century must be considered in terms of what it means to be a citizen in a global society, rather than in a particular nation or social group. Others suggest the need to cultivate a democratic personality (Wing-On & Sai-Wing, 2001).

The Citizenship Education Policy Study Project (Cogan, 1997) was undertaken to yield a global consensus on the demands of citizenship in the early 21st century from a global society perspective. Policy experts (n=182) from nine countries and many different fields (e.g., government, business, science, education) participated in the project. They were asked to identify the global trends that will have a significant impact in the next 25 years, and the necessary characteristics of citizens to enable them to cope with these trends. The experts identified several global trends that should be treated as priorities by policy makers. Trends to be assuaged include increased disparities among peoples, a deterioration of the environment, increased consumerism and rising government control. Trends to be encouraged include more regional alliances, fewer systematic mistreatments of marginalized groups, and the necessary adoption of environmentally-friendly methods by business and industry.

The policy experts in the Citizenship Education Policy Study Project identified the public virtues and values that a global citizen should have in the 21st century. It is anticipated that if people around the world do not develop these characteristics, there will be more wars and threats of war. The experts agreed on the following characteristics, in descending order of importance.

1. Approaches problems as member of a global society
2. Works cooperatively with others and takes responsibility for one's roles and responsibilities in society
3. Understands, accepts, and tolerates cultural differences
4. Thinks in a critical and systematic way
5. Resolves conflict in a non-violent manner
6. Adopts a way of life that protects the environment
7. Respects and defends human rights
8. Participates in public life at all levels of civic discourse
9. Makes full use of information-based technologies.

Although virtually every moral education curriculum addresses item two, the other eight items are not reliably found in moral curricula. The CVCE model incorporates skill development in them all except number nine.

## 3. The Community Voices and Character Education Model

We designed the CVCE framework to address several widespread weaknesses in character education approaches: (1) minimal empirical foundation in terms of what character is and a lack of concrete guidelines for specific instruction, (2) an old-fashioned view of human learning, (3) minimal focus on student empowerment, (4) lack of local community involvement and control, (5) programs that are added on to existing curriculum, (6) not paying enough attention to the climate of the classroom and school.

The "ethical expertise model" appeals to research literatures in the cognitive and social sciences in order to defend a model of moral functioning. In delineating the elemental skills of good character, CVCE addresses *character* education. We integrate the findings from developmental psychology, prevention science, and positive psychology. In proposing the best approach to instruction, it addresses character *education.* We integrate findings from research in learning and cognition. CVCE has the following characteristics.

### (a) CVCE emphasizes the development of ethical skills rather than the learning of dispositional traits.

Based on a follow up of Rest's (1983; Narvaez & Rest, 1995) review of social development research, Narvaez and colleagues have identified the characteristic skills of persons with good character (Narvaez, Mitchell, Endicott & Bock, 1999). These skills extend Rest's four psychologically distinct processes (ethical sensitivity, ethical judgment, ethical motivation, and ethical action) by outlining a set of social, personal, and citizenship skills. The four process model provides a holistic understanding of the moral person, who is able to demonstrate keen perception and perspective taking, skilled reasoning, moral motivational orientations, and skills for completing moral action (Narvaez, 2002; Narvaez, in press; Narvaez & Bock, in press; Narvaez & Endicott, in press; Narvaez & Lies, in press).

For example, experts in the skills of Ethical Sensitivity are able to more quickly and accurately "read" a situation and determine what role they might play. These experts are also better at generating usable solutions due to a greater understanding of the consequences of possible actions. Experts in the skills of Ethical Judgment are more skilled in solving complex problems, seeing the crux of a problem quickly and bringing with them many schemas for reasoning about what to do. Their information processing tools are more complex but also more efficient. Experts in the skills of Ethical Motivation are skilled at maintaining their focus on prioritizing the ethical ideal. Their motivation is directed by an organized structure of moral self-identity. Experts in the skills of Ethical Action are able to keep themselves focused and take the necessary steps to get the ethical job done. They demonstrate superior performance when completing an ethical action. The CVCE approach suggests seven ethical skills, each with three suggested subskills, for each of the four processes (see Appendix B).

**(b) CVCE incorporates constructivist views of teaching and learning using structured experience in helping novices move toward expertise.**

Whereas most character education programs rely upon a "transmission model " of teaching and learning---a model that assumes that teaching is a matter of adults handing off knowledge to passive "learners"—the present model is based upon constructivist principles that guide "best practice" instruction. This view assumes that individuals are active constructors of meaning. It assumes that individuals build conceptual frameworks, both declarative and procedural, in the process of making sense of one's experience. Learning involves an active transformation of schemas during cognitive activities such as "processing material through active, selective attention; relating new information to prior knowledge and forming new knowledge" and monitoring understanding in order to know when to ask for help or that understanding is complete (Anderson, 1989).

Expertise is a dominant focus among researchers in human learning (e.g., Ericsson & Smith, 1991), in particular the view of a learner as a novice gaining expertise (e.g., Sternberg, 1998). According to this view, human learning proceeds along a continuum between novice status and expert status. Experts are different from novices in several important ways. Unlike novices, experts know what knowledge to access, which procedures to apply, how to apply them and when. According to Sternberg (1998), experts have (a) large, rich, organized networks of concepts (schemas) containing a great deal of declarative knowledge about the domain; (b) well-organized, higher interconnected units of knowledge in the domain.

Human experience is by and large dependent on a vast network of tacit or implicit knowledge, learned inside and outside of school. Tacit knowledge forms the rich base of practical intelligence within a particular domain (Sternberg, 1998). How do educators begin to foster in students the vast network of schemas that make up a domain's practical intelligence? According to Marshall (2000), there are several levels of knowledge in a fully-developed schema, from less to more complex: identification, elaboration, planning, and execution knowledge.

Identification knowledge establishes the boundaries of the domain. Students become familiar with the essential nature of domain situations. Students learn to recognize critical elements in the dynamic context (simultaneous processing of multiple elements). Identification or pattern recognition is based on interpreting a configuration of elements. For example in moral education, one helps students distinguish between a moral dilemma like "Heinz and the drug" and a non-moral dilemma like "Heinz and his pillow". One helps students identify the features of a moral dilemma (e.g., two or more competing moral values, valid reasons for every side of the issue, etc.). The student learns to notice dilemmas where none were seen before. The student learns to take the perspective of others who see a dilemma when the student does not.

Elaboration Knowledge is declarative knowledge that enables the creation of a situation/mental model. It encompasses individual experiences and general abstractions, including sensory information. Students focus on the details of the elements in particular situations (verbal and visual). Initially, a student needs a prototypical example with which to make comparisons. Students create mental models of a specific problem from the particular situation or from a generalized schema. The moral educator, for example, might help students elaborate on the elements of several prototypical dilemmas. For example, "Heinz and the drug" contains elements of fairness such as the pitting of property rights against human life, or interfering to save a life versus letting things take their course. "The Doctor's dilemma" involves elements of fairness like proactive euthanasia versus human life, or letting things take their course versus choosing to end things prior to extensive suffering.

Planning knowledge refers to the way a schema can be used to make plans, create expectations, and set up goals and subgoals. Given more than one situation in a problem, students must acquire knowledge necessary for determining which situation to examine first and how the situations are related to one another. Students learn to formulate a plan of action. Planning knowledge is difficult to acquire, and is greatly dependent on having the right mental model and being comfortable working with it. Planning knowledge is rarely displayed in overt measurable settings, often detectable only by inference. Moral educators might supply opportunities for students to plan and make moral decisions, perhaps in relation to tutoring younger students, or to providing a social service in a respectful manner. Those who have repeated opportunities to plan and implement real-life moral decisions (e.g., police officers) will likely develop an expertise in the area of practice.

Whereas planning knowledge is used to determine the steps to take in solving a problem, execution knowledge allows the student to carry out the plan. It consists of algorithms or techniques to complete each step in a plan. Students learn what knowledge to apply when and why. As each step is completed, the execution knowledge is called on to address subsequent steps. For example, the experienced manager of a homeless shelter will demonstrate execution knowledge in moral sensitivity, judgment, motivation and action as he or she nightly balances one need against another within the limits of existing resources.

CVCE articulates a set of strategies for developing expertise. The development of moral expertise is seen to proceed in four levels of activities.

Level 1: Immersion in examples and opportunities. In this initial phase, attention is drawn to the big picture and to the recognition of basic patterns in the domain. Accordingly, the teacher plunges students into multiple, engaging activities. Students learn to recognize broad patterns in the domain and begin to develop gradual awareness and recognition of elements in the domain (comprising identification knowledge).

Level 2: Attention to facts and skills. In this phase of development, knowledge is built through a focus on detail and prototypical examples. The teacher focuses the student's attention on the elemental concepts in the domain in order to build more elaborate concepts. Skills are gradually acquired through motivated, focused attention (comprising elaboration knowledge).

Level 3: Practice procedures. At this level, one sets goals, plans the steps of problem solving, and practices skills. The teacher coaches the student and allows the student to try out many skills and ideas throughout the domain to build an understanding of how skills relate and how best to solve problems in the domain. Skills are developed through practice and exploration (comprising planning knowledge).

Level 4: Integrate knowledge and procedures. At this level, one executes plans and solves problems. Deliberate practice at this level over a long period of time can lead to expertise. The student finds numerous mentors and/or seeks out information to continue building concepts and skills. There is a gradual systematic integration and application of skills and knowledge across many situations. The student learns how to take the steps in solving complex domain problems (comprising execution knowledge).

Character *education* should be based on psychologically valid research. The pedagogy used in CVCE is based on the expertise paradigm that has gained prominence among educational researchers (e.g., Sternberg, 1998; 1999) and provides a map for instruction. Adopting a cognitive approach to learning and teaching that assumes that children actively construct representations of the world (Narvaez, 2002; Piaget, 1932; 1952; 1970), CVCE offers guidelines for helping children move along a continuum from novice to expert in each content domain that they study. Best practice instruction provides opportunities for students to develop more accurate and better organized representations and the procedural skills required to use them (Anderson, 1989). In order to do this, children must experience an expert-in-training pedagogy for each skill that they learn.

**(c) CVCE empowers the student with the grave responsibility of constructing a self.**

A model for character education cannot be described without including the most important contextual variable: the students. Students will have different needs and interests, levels of development and areas of skill. Yet they have in common what we all have in common. Each of us ultimately makes the decisions about who and what we will become. Our decisions shape our characters and our futures. The 'constructing expertise' model helps students develop the skills for good choices but puts the onus on their shoulders for making the final decisions about their behavior.

In CVCE, the central questions for the students are "Who should I be?" (a question put on the project's classroom posters, bookmarks and bookcovers) and "What do I want to become?" In the words of Christine McKinnon, individuals must 'do the work necessary for constructing a character' (1999, p. 42). Humans are "the kinds of beings who invest their lives with meaning by creating a self which identifies them as the kind of person they are and which provides a unifying link to the various facets of their lives" (p. 42). McKinnon also states that "the person of integrity has a self-reflexive concern with the compatibility and consistency of her many different traits and interests." (p. 38). Wickedness is a sign of failing to invest in answering the questions of becoming. McKinnon describes wickedness in the following way:

> "What has gone wrong is that insufficient or unsuccessful attention has been paid to the task of constructing a self, of developing a character, of cultivating the right kinds of desires and interests, and of learning to take pleasure in the pursuit…..The conceptual point remains that the functionally best kind of human life involves much critical evaluation and self-reflexive awareness and practice in the making of a self. Human lives deficient in these respects will be less than good human lives" (p. 43).

The student must see the continuum of possibilities from best to worst (e.g., where the pitfalls of human bias are, what the dangers of wickedness are). This will aid them in constructing a self as they answer in their actions day by day, 'Who should I become?" The integration of ethical skills across processes and within unique situations is a lifelong task. It is important to get children on the right track to taking interest in their characters, and to take on the project, in McKinnon's words, of "constructing a self…of cultivating the right kinds of desires and interests, of learning to take pleasure in the pursuit". The self envisioned by the CVCE model is a self under construction, prepared to actively participate in a pluralistic democracy as a global citizen.

**(d) CVCE specifies the importance of adjusting the framework to community contexts.**

The CVCE framework balances two formative components critical to its implementation, (1) top-down principles for implementation and (2) bottom-up fidelity to the needs of the community. The top-down portion is the set of guidelines for optimal functioning (28 skills) that we have put together from research findings in collaboration with public school educators. This set of guidelines includes fundamental assumptions about the purpose of schooling (to nurture effective global citizens) and a set of skills for individuals to learn in community. The set of guidelines is presented to teachers and community members who represent the bottom-up portion of the model.

The bottom-up portion is the necessary local adaptation of the framework of skills to the community context. The community takes the 28 skills and reshapes/adapts them according to its own common understandings of moral being. Each community discusses the framework in terms of specific community perspectives, needs, and diversity. As a critical 'bottom up' feature, the skill categories are to be embedded in the cultural context where they are taught. To some degree, each community has its own understanding of the skills. For example, 'respecting others' can be expressed in various ways, as we know from

cultures around the world. Likewise, identifying ethical problems and possible actions may vary among communities.

The project design encourages that the actual day-to-day practice of the skills be determined on site, by the community. The teacher is encouraged to work with the community on how to teach the skills and what to emphasize. The teacher tailors the classroom work to the local understanding of the skill. Further, the student is encouraged to gather information about the skill from the community (parents, elders) and bring back that information to the classroom. There will be various interpretations of the skills because of diversity in culture, religion, socio-economic status, regional background, and so on. Although the principle of respect may be the same across communities, the specific implementations and manifestations will differ. When this diversity is brought into the classroom by the students themselves, it provides an appropriate backdrop for dialogue about the implementation of ethical skills and for teaching respect for differences. It can also be an important demonstration of how groups may have different practices while having the same underlying value.

In the CVCE model, universal principles and skills meet local particularities and are melded together by the community itself. Thus, optimal functioning is grounded in the specific context of the individual and his or her community. This top-down and bottom-up combination allows each community to have its mark on the set of guidelines but within certain parameters, those of optimal functioning within a pluralistic democracy and a global community.

**(e) CVCE embeds character education across the curriculum rather than being an add-on program.**

When the research framework is applied in a particular context, the 'constructing ethical expertise' model is in action. Although contexts of implementation will always vary, one of the absolutes of implementation is the embedding of character education into regular instruction. This should happen in every subject area.

**(f) CVCE emphasizes the importance of the classroom (and school) climate in promoting ethical development.**

Teachers teach character in everything they do, but particularly in how they treat students, expect students to treat one another, and how they relate to other adults in the school. Teachers must model ethical skills and provide environments that support ethical skill development.

In summary, the CVCE model provides a research-based, concrete view of ethical behavior, treating character development as the development of expert skills. Students are placed at the center of their character development, responsible for skill development and how they make use of their skills. Community members were involved in the development of the model and should be involved in the development of each local implementation approach. Character skill development should be integrated across the curriculum, infused into the lessons and climate of the school.

## D. Materials

### 1. Evolution of Materials

In 1999, the University Design Team sifted through psychological, philosophical, and education research literatures to gather information about the characteristics of good character and of teaching for understanding. The culmination of this work was the guidebook for teachers: *Nurturing Character in the Middle School Classroom*. The table of contents for the first edition is listed below

**Table of Contents**

In summer 1999, the classroom application chapters had the following outline for each skill.

**Classroom Application Chapter Outline**

General description of the skill
Relation to MN graduation standards
Attitudes for the teacher to promote
General methods (levels of expertise) for teaching the skill
Activity ideas (plus which standard is addressed)
Assessment ideas
Search Institute Assets addressed

The 2000 edition was similar, only it included more ideas and MN comprehensive goals were added at the beginning of each skill section.

For the 2001 version, we made changes based on teacher feedback that the earlier versions were too overwhelming and hard to use. As a result, the large guidebook was broken down into five separate guidebooks and put into Pagemaker format for a more professional and teacher-friendly look. Instead of describing ethical sensitivity, judgment, motivation, and action as components, we described them as processes to emphasize the need to learn them all. Chapters 1 (introduction) and 3 (component model) of the 1999 version became the Introduction booklet. Chapters 9 (on citizenship) and 11 (on climate) were broken down and incorporated into the four activity booklets. Chapter 12 was made into a worksheet and put in the appendix. The table of contents for each activity booklet followed the outline listed below.

**Activity Booklet Contents**

- Booklet organization
- Skill Overview
  - List of skills for all four booklets
  - Page describing all skills for the particular process addressed in this book
  - What the process is, why it is important, what the role of the teacher should be
  - What students should learn first
  - Tackling excuses and hangups
  - How the skills fits with virtues
  - General tips for teachers
- Skill chapters
- Appendices
  - Chart of related graduation standards
  - Chart of related Search assets
  - Lesson planning worksheet
  - Linking to the Community worksheet
  - Special activities
  - Resources

The following structure was used in each skill section.

**Skill Section Contents**

- What the skill is and Why it is important
- What students should know first
- Overview of subskills
- For each of three subskills
  - Exemplar
  - Ideas for developing skills by level of expertise
    - Immersion
    - Attention
    - Practice
    - Integrate
  - Assessment hints
- Creating a climate to foster the skill
- Sample student self-monitoring
- Selections to post in the classroom (to foster the skill)

These changes were highly appreciated by our teacher collaborators. (One of the few things that teachers still desired was a list of activities in a one or two-page format.)

These booklets were placed on the website and on a CD-ROM, along with the materials prepared by partner teachers.

**2. Teacher-prepared Materials**

Throughout the project, teachers were taught how to integrate character skill development into academic instruction using a novice-to-expert approach. Here are some examples of the character units our teachers have integrated into their curricula (an extended list appears in Appendix D):

Caring by Connecting to Others Around the World (World Languages)
Examining Bias in Media and Everyday Situations (Language Arts)
Analyzing Ethical Problems in Technology Plagiarism (Technology)
Developing General Reasoning in Current Event Analysis (Social Studies)
Values and Ethical Identity in Music (Performing Arts)
Helping Others Using Accounting and Research (Math)
Overcoming Obstacles in Nature Conservation (Science)

**3. Dissemination of Materials**

Dissemination of information and resources has been an on-going practice within the Community Voices & Character Education Project (CVCE). During our initial year a project brochure was developed and distributed throughout the state. The brochure included a statement of goals, outline of the framework for the Four Process Model and an invitation to participate. It also provided other states with information regarding Minnesota's initiative.

As CVCE progressed, resources were developed and by the University Design Team and used by project partner schools. Throughout the project these materials, including teacher guidebooks, posters and bibliographies, have been disseminated free of charge to partner schools and other interested parties. Additional resources were developed including printed materials to assist districts in taking a leadership role and conducting similar projects that involve the community in the process of curriculum and performance assessment development. See Appendix C for a list of project materials.

Availability of information, resources and assistance to all local, state and national educational agencies occurred several ways: on websites at the MN Dept. of Children, Families & Learning (http://cfl.state.mn.us.charactered). To assist the on-going character education research, the University of Minnesota has posted reports on http://www.coled.umn.edu/EdPsy/PSYCHF/CSED/default.html. Updates on project related research and materials can be obtained by contacting Dr. Darcia Narvaez at dnarvaez@nd.edu or Connie Anderson at: connie.j.anderson@state.mn.us.

The project work related to Minnesota's standards-based system of education is incorporated on the CFL website designated as C.L.A.S.S. (Connecting Learning and Accountability for Students and Schools) at http://cflapp.state.mn.us/CLASS/index.jsp. This site supplies data and information about the standards, learning activities and assessments in a user-friendly format to students, teachers, parents, principals, administrators, community members and policy-makers.

Dr. Darcia Narvaez and the University Design Team have conducted school, cluster and regional meetings and workshops since the project's inception. Dr. Darcia Narvaez has also presented at the Character Education Partnership (CEP) national conference, the White House Conference on Character and Community and at other national and international seminars and conferences.

As the project progressed partner school representatives have given presentations at statewide conferences for middle school teachers, administrators and leadership teams The project partner schools have also prepared and presented PowerPoint/slide presentations that have been incorporated into the project CD.

The Community Voices & Character Education has in place a project CD that provides a cost effective format for distributing classroom application booklets, lesson plans, posters and bookmarkers and tools such as Needs Assessments, Checklists, Surveys, etc. developed by both partner schools and the University Design Team.

## SECTION III.
## DESCRIPTION OF FINAL-YEAR SCHOOL PARTNERS

Over the course of the grant, the list of our partner schools shifted based primarily on the ability of schools to participate in implementing the project model and materials. In this section we describe the partners who were participants in the fourth and final year. For a description of additional school partners from previous years, see Appendix E.

In terms of program implementation, we expected that each site (1) to use the CVCE skills development approach alone or in combination with other approaches to character education; (2) use a novice to expert pedagogical approach; (3) make community input and participation a fundamental feature of the CVCE implementation; (4) perform pre and post assessment of skill development in the final year of funding; (5) use CVCE terminology (four big processes with 7 skills in each); (6) embed the CVCE skills development approach across the curriculum; (7) meet graduation standards or comprehensive goals with CVCE implementation. We encouraged each site at the outset to enlist community participation (e.g., parent council, business community, 4-H, etc.) and administrative buy in.

In the following sections we describe for each school site: (a) the community context, (b) details about the district, (c) previous experience with character education, (d) initial (and adaptation of) goals for CVCE, (e) attitudes toward CVCE model, (f) school site's record keeping, (g) school site's progress through CVCE model, (h) school site's CVCE implementation approach.

### 1. School Site A

#### a. School Site A's community context

| | |
|---|---|
| Population (2000 Census): | Under 5,000 |
| Economic Overview: | |
| Low to middle class families, largely agrarian. | |
| Free/reduced lunch students: | 32% |
| Average dual income families: | $40,000 |
| Little to no transience. | |
| Cultural/Ethnic/Racial Percentages: | |
| African American: | 0.3% |
| American Indian: | 6.7% |
| Asian/Asian-American: | 0.4% |
| Caucasian | 86% |
| Hispanic | 5.7% |

#### b. Details About School Site A's District

* The elementary school provides after-school busing for after school activities.
* After school sports are available at the elementary school.
* 5th & 6th grade students go on an overnight field trip to a local environmental center.

* ITV classes are offered in French, astronomy and creative writing.
* School A has three fully equipped computer labs.
* All classrooms at School A have computers.
* The DRAMA department at School A participates in state one-act-play competition.
* School A's band and chorus perform four annual concerts.
* The drama department at School A performs one annual play.
* A Post Secondary Options program is available to School A students.
* College courses through a local state university are available on premises.
* A breakfast and lunch program is available to all students.
* Kindergarten is offered as a full day program.
* The Princeton Review recognized School A for their use of technology to enhance learning.
* Recognized as one of the top 100 wired schools in the nation.
* Strong commitment to quality contemporary educational services.

**c. Previous and Existing Character Education Programs at School Site A**

Elementary Level: Published character education workbook series
Middle School: Intermittently offered during advisory periods
High School: None

The content of the previous programs was user friendly, but very basic, with worksheets and readings provided. The impact, though somewhat difficult to gauge, was not enthusiastic. Students saw it as "something we do if we have extra time." Teachers, too, viewed it as an add-on program, to be used when there was extra time.

**d. Initial (and Adaptation of) School Site A's Goals for CVCE**

School A's original intent was to focus implementation on the middle school level. The advisory period, which meets daily, was the perfect fit for the early integration of character education lessons. Over time, with teacher training and enthusiasm, the CVCE approach began to be embedded into the curriculum and extended from grades 5-9, eventually "spilling over" into K-12. The project was modified based on data garnered from formative evaluations. The principals, too, used the CVCE approach in various ways with the students.

The CVCE approach was utilized in a variety of ways based on the premise that these skills can be taught and learned. The option to focus on a particular skill that might need attention was especially helpful, allowing for an adaptation of the approach to the particular needs of the class or student. At School A, there was a conscious attempt to integrate the program into standards based instruction, making it more appealing to the teachers. It allowed for the meeting of two important goals: the development of character in the students and the satisfaction of portions of the graduation standards.

The implementation of CVCE at School A required and generated a great deal of community involvement. The Systems Accountability Committee (SAC) and the local school board were involved from the outset. The project itself engendered some

community-school connections (e.g., several newspaper articles, student interviews of parents and community members, etc.).

**e. School Site A's Attitudes Toward CVCE Model**

Although the infusion of character education into the curriculum required more work on the part of the teacher, it eventually proved the most effective way to insure its use. Formative evaluation pieces (teacher surveys, student surveys, etc.) were administered during the advisory periods and used to modify what teachers were doing.

**f. School Site A's Record Keeping**

In their third year with the project, 2001-2002, School A participated in pre- and post-testing: a teacher's observation checklist for the advisory groups and a school-wide tolerance survey of their classrooms. In the fourth year they conducted school-wide pre- and post-test surveys.

**g. School Site A's Progress Through CVCE Model**

School A's implementation was a combination of core team implementation and advisory group implementation, and school-wide projects. School A used their weekly advisory periods for their all-school implementation. They used this time to address issues as simple as manners training and as complex as ethical decision making. They eventually gathered a group of 15 teachers to form the original core group who implemented within their respective classrooms and subject areas. CVCE grant funds financed School A's CVCE training sessions.

School A met their original long-term objective of implementing in every classroom in grades 4-8, as well as the social work/mental health team, the special needs team, while receiving public support from the administration. School A provided a number of items, i.e., flowcharts and graphs, outlining School A's core group implementation. They were fortunate to have remarkable leadership throughout the course of the project. Their two local leaders were both very effective at engendering enthusiasm and facilitating the relationship between the local team and the University team.

**h. School Site Site A's CVCE Implementation Approach**

The local team consisted of nine members of the teaching staff. School A saw a high level of support from the administration and the K-12 staff, including social workers, counselor and those who worked with students with special needs. The administration saw the program as very positive and offered much encouragement to staff and students. The School A team attended training workshops offered by the University Design Team. They intended to meet once each month, which proved difficult because the local team was from three different buildings. The local team members attended a conference on FirstClass, a software interface designed to allow classmates and teachers to communicate with each other electronically, with the hope of improving interaction and communication among them.

Additionally, School A offered a character education component during their teachers' Fall K-12 In-service, conducted by members of the local team.

---

**2. School Site B**

**a. School Site B's community context**

| | |
|---|---|
| Population (2000 Census): | Under 5,000 |
| Economic Overview: | |
| Largely agrarian community | |
| Average Annual Income: | $33,750 |
| Free/reduced lunch students: | NA |
| Cultural/Ethnic/Racial Diversity: | |
| Students of Color | 4.1% |
| Caucasian | 85.9% |

**b. Details About School Site B's District**

- Students participate in Future Farmers of America.
- The high school went to a four-period day in 1996-97.
- The middle school competes in the Science Olympiad.
- A peer tutor program is available to high school students.
- A newly built elementary building was completed in the Fall of 1996.
- Sports include football, basketball, track, soccer & softball.
- Kindergarten is offered as a full day program.

**c. Previous and Existing Character Education Programs at School Site B**

School B had very limited exposure to character education initiatives before becoming involved in the CVCE project. Occasionally, the 45-minute per week Friday advisory period, which had no set curriculum or lesson plans, would attend to character education issues. There was a great deal of frustration related to the advisory groups because they lacked consistency and quality control. The need for a comprehensive character education program in the district had long been in evidence.

There was a great deal of frustration concerning the inadequate and inefficient implementation of character education. Although there was appreciation of the need for character education among the staff, although effective ways of integrating it had not been found.

**d. Initial (and Adaptation of) School Site B's Goals for CVCE**

The original objective was to become familiar with the CVCE Guidebook and other related resources. Additionally, their intent was to improve the use of the advisory period to achieve this end, and to develop the students' expertise in selected skill areas during the

course of the year. Regarding content, the implementation of respect and responsibility activities across all advisories was deemed ideal. Teachers would construct the lesson plans, perhaps in pairs, and then distribute them for use by the entire staff. Over time, respect, responsibility, honesty, and valuing/respecting intelligence were seen as important topics for School B to address.

Ultimately, the integration of character content into particular subjects was seen as desirable, with Math, Computer Applications, Art Education, and Health initiating this move. Implementation in at least two periods for each of these disciplines, during the course of a week, ultimately became the norm.

School B was driven to pursue particular skills in light of five objectives that were drawn from an extensive student survey conducted before CVCE came on board. The five primary objectives were to insure physical safety; respect others; engender a sense of belonging; responsibility for work and personal behavior; and enhance individual self-worth.

**e. School Site B's Attitudes Toward CVCE Model**

Both the students and the community had very positive responses to the implementation of character education programs at School B. In fact, at the Parent Open House, parent survey results indicated that character education as the thing parents liked most about the school.

The local team was made up of all teachers since they all had advisory responsibilities. Within the local team was a core group who spearheaded the creation of the local manual and a suggested implementation schedule. The local team, however, expressed some resistance to the plan to implement character education two days a week for the entire academic year, rather than one day during each of the first six weeks of the year. The latter was the original announced plan before the core team put together an extensive manual and realized they were materials enough to extend throughout the year. While School B had one of our strongest and most supportive local leaders, there was some resistance to moving beyond the advisory level because they were already feeling a bit overwhelmed in the classroom, and originally perceived it as imposing an addition to their already packed curriculum.

**f. School Site B's Record Keeping**

Student and teacher (CVCE) survey data, along with internal data such as student truancy and behavioral referral data was intended to be used to track any marked changes from the pre- and post-implementation periods. In their third year with the project, 2001-2002, School B participated in formative evaluation using: a teacher's observation checklist and a school-wide tolerance survey. In the fourth year they conducted a comprehensive school-wide pre- and post-implementation survey.

**g. School Site B's Progress Through CVCE Model**

School B used the advisory model in implementing the CVCE curriculum originally. They chose to focus on respect and responsibility activities for their weekly advisory meetings. Teachers worked in pairs and divided respect into respect for self, respect for others, and respect for property. Activities included cross-age mentoring with elementary school (teaching mini-lessons to younger students), using music to compare ideas of respect, and working to improve the school. Responsibility activities included visits from community members such as veterans.

School B met all expectations of the CVCE grant and worked well with the University Design team in taking their implementation beyond the advisory level toward infusion across the curriculum. They worked on character education fairly regularly because it was incorporated into their in-service time and early release days. The principal, who was also the local leader, provided strong and encouraging leadership.

**h. School Site B's CVCE Implementation Approach**

- School B's local team consisted of 13 teachers in grades 7-8, with the principal as a member of the team.
- The local team attended University Design Team training workshops.
- The Character Education Implementation group met twice a week, Mondays and Fridays.
- Implementation covered grades 7-8, and were taken from a manual (and enhanced with related materials) which was compiled the previous summer (2001) by the teachers who attended the University Design Team workshop. Implementation took place in Art, English, and Health/Physical Education
- All School B teachers implemented during the weekly advisory period using a team-created manual.
- School B's implementation approach involved both advisory periods and integration into the curriculum.
- They have concerns about the future of character education at School B with regard to both financial support and the loss of the external accountability that was provided by the University Design team.

**3. School Site C**

**a. School Site C's community context**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Population (2000 Census): | | Over 20,000 |
| Economic Overview: | | |
| Free/reduced lunch students: | | 100% |
| Cultural/Ethnic/Racial Diversity: | | |
| Students of Color | | 82% |
| African American | [44%] | |
| Asian American (largely Hmong) | [21%] | |
| Hispanic | [10%] | |
| Native American | [7%] | |
| Caucasian | 18% | |

**b. Details About School Site C's District**

- The students in School C are from neighborhood districts in an urban area.
- School C is advantaged in implementation because of the self-contained nature of its classrooms. This model seems to reduce disciplinary issues and strengthen consistency of implementation.
- Because the students are from all over the city, tracking transients can be difficult.

**c. Previous and Existing Character Education Programs at School Site C**

School C replaced an earlier program that was eventually shut down for lack of success. Like School C, the earlier program attempted to promote academic achievement as well as the development of character and social skills. No particular character education or curricular programs were adopted. A behavioral reinforcement program called Climate for Learning (CFL) was used in which teachers were trained to intervene in disruptive behavior and redirect. In a related program, School C provides a weeklong training for students, staff, and administration, at the beginning of the year, in violence prevention

Beyond the Climate for Learning program, there were few tools in place to teach the students about more appropriate behavior. Climate for Learning came to be a good deal more appreciated when coupled with CVCE in that the Climate for Learning's "code of conduct" was reinforced with particular lessons and unit plans in the classroom.

**d. Initial (and Adaptation of) School Site C's Goals for CVCE**

Since students are drawn together from throughout an urban area, building a sense of community has been the largest challenge for School C. On an individual level, many student problems are related to a lack of social skills. The local team, which consisted of the entire teaching and administrative staff, decided to focus particularly on social skills development and some attention to school climate. Each local team member planned to develop a unit plan(s) taking up a certain area in ethical sensitivity and then share his or her

lesson plan(s) with the other team members. They planned on having a weekly meeting, each Wednesday afternoon, but in reality the small staff touches base frequently throughout the week on a variety of issues.

**e. School Site C's Attitudes Toward CVCE Model**

The administration and teachers (i.e., the entire local team) in School C were very positive about the CVCE program. The implementation of the CVCE model proved to aid them in the most important task that they faced, that of improving the social skills and ethical sensitivity of the students. The skills based nature of the project made it easy to address a particular need and focus the curriculum on attending to it. They were particularly grateful for the efforts of the University Design Team members in assisting them in developing integrated curricula and in keeping them on track with ongoing assessment items and workshops.

Community involvement has been difficult with School C because of the nature of the school and the disparate nature of the families involved. Additionally, many of the neighbors of the present building were less than happy about the arrival of the program into the neighborhood. Since their arrival, there has been limited, though largely positive, contact with the neighbors.

**f. School Site C's Record Keeping**

The small staff at School C works very well together and touches base often throughout the course of the day. They keep an internal behavior log in which each violation of the "Code of Conduct" was recorded. Attendance is taken each day and monitored over time. Truancy is very high, approximately 15%. Also, in their final year of the grant period (2001-2002), School C participated in pre- and post-testing and a school-wide tolerance survey of their classrooms.

**g. School Site C's Progress Through CVCE Model**

School C was our only full faculty implementation because of the remarkably small teaching staff they have (n=5). School C's resident counselor presented character education lessons in each classroom once weekly and attended to a particular character education lesson developed and agreed upon by the local team as timely. Additionally, each team member took up the lesson plans created at their joint summer (2001) workshop. The lesson/unit plans were developed by the local team during the course of the workshop and addressed the perceived needs of the community, particularly in the area of ethical sensitivity training.

The CVCE funds were spent on a summer workshop, which was conducted for the local team, including their director, in order to assist them in implementing across the curriculum. Full implementation was accomplished with a joint effort of the director, the teachers and the school counselor.

School C was transformed from one program to another during the project period. School C's first incarnation showed little success in meeting the CVCE grant expectations. We received little documentation of ongoing implementation from the earlier programs. School C's second incarnation implemented the CVCE model in the final year. With the help of the new school counselor, the local team met all of our expectations in a timely manner. School C's emphasis on character education and basic social skills training, along with its small size, made it well suited for implementing the CVCE model. They have a very enthusiastic faculty who saw our program as perfectly suited to their mission and efforts. The further appeal of School C was the opportunity to implement across the curriculum because of the small faculty and mutual goals.

**h. School Site C's CVCE Implementation Approach**

The local team consisted of seven people including the counselor and principal. The local team came to realize that referring to a lesson or unit as character education elicits a collective groan from the students. They have worked hard to integrate such lessons into their curriculum without overstating the obvious. For example, at the state-wide meeting, School C shared a powerful poetry lesson which asked students to write a poem about where they live and its impact on their selves.

---

**4. School Site D**

**a. School Site D's community context**

| | |
|---|---|
| Population (2000 Census): | Under 20,000 |
| Economic Overview: | |
| Lower to middle class families. | |
| Median Income | $30,000 |
| Free/reduced lunch students: | 45% |
| Educational Attainment: | |
| Further education after High School: | 70% |

**b. Details About School Site D's District**

- All grade levels encourage parent involvement.
- There is an elementary school band, choir and orchestra.
- Approximately 77% of graduates further their education beyond high school.
- 38% of teachers have a masters degree.
- High School D has an International Baccalaureate Program.
- Computers at High School D have access to the Internet.
- A number of new Business courses are available at High School D.
- Kindergarten is offered as a full day program.
- The North Central Association of Schools & Colleges accredits High School D.

**c. Previous and Existing Character Education Programs at School Site D**

The School D district implemented the "Respect Initiative" on the K-4 level 10 years ago. It was an "add-on" program that was fit into the day whenever there was time available. A "Stop and Think" and the democratic classroom approaches were also used for a time during the 1990s. Finally, a monthly trait/theme was promoted through posters, but not in the curriculum.

School D found that the attempts at character education did not seem to translate into behavior, particularly as the students reached the middle school level. The add-on nature of the programs left them often unattended and lacking in consistency across classrooms.

**d. Initial (and Adaptation of) School Site D's Site Goals for CVCE**

School D wanted to find a program that would focus on the character development of their students. They wanted to find a program that could be infused in the curriculum so that it wouldn't be perceived as an add-on. The hope was to infuse character into $5^{th}/6^{th}$ grade literature, FACS (Family and Consumer Sciences), Health, 7th grade Social Studies, and Exploring Options. All members of the local team filled out lesson planning worksheets as on-going evidence of embedding the components and skills into students' daily school lives.

School D also used the CVCE language in developing their disciplinary referral forms and in classroom management. The local team also hoped to continue to expand the program to all teachers and include staff in whatever way they can. The "Respect Initiative" looks to complement CVCE well and has become a priority for the staff.

**e. School Site D's Attitudes Toward CVCE Model**

The local team met once a month and the teachers were generally very excited about their ongoing implementation and their linking of the project language to disciplinary referral sheets. Eventually, School D hopes to include athletic teams and clubs into the ongoing character education enterprise.

The administration, including a new principal, strongly supported the ongoing implementation at school D. The principal also hopes to investigate ways to further involve the community in character education.

The students "latched on" to the service learning components, particularly. They seemed to more easily comprehend the skills-based approach and that they themselves could master them. Peer mediation and peer-mentoring have proven quite popular with the students.

**f. School Site D's Record Keeping**

The "Middle School Referral Intervention Form" was used to track student behavior internally over time. The students choose in which of the skills their behavior seemed to reveal a lack of expertise, and then develop a plan for acquiring those skills. Additionally,

in their third year with the project, 2001-2002, School D participated in formative evaluation using a teacher's observation checklist and a school-wide tolerance survey. In the fourth year they conducted comprehensive school-wide pre- and post-implementation surveys.

**g. School Site D's Progress Through CVCE Model**

The local team at School D consisted of a group of teachers who hoped to be the means by which others would come to know of the project over time. Some of examples of the implementation at School D: "Operation: KIT" (Keep It Together) addresses planning and working hard. A University Extension person developed and trained their Student Council in leadership and planning using skill categories. A local theatrical professional that works in the Cities took time to edit their school play on Conflict Resolution that introduces a familiar conflict resolution strategy. She also designed a movable setting for student productions of CVCE plays in the new Commons area.

Additionally, School D's incorporation of the language of the CVCE model into their disciplinary process expanded their implementation to the school project model. The referral form (used for disciplinary action) for classroom and office use that addresses the ethical skills and has the students identify the skill deficit(s) from the sub-skills. The students then write an action plan to address the skill(s) they need to develop. Also, in hopes of reducing aggression in middle school students, class meetings were conducted to address the bullying issue.

Their third year's implementation included a 6th hour exploratory period, in which the students who don't participate in the music programs are able to do something other than study hall. The local team identified many of these students as "at risk" and wanted to provide opportunities for them to explore their personal potential. The exploratory areas that related to character education are:

1. Wildlife reserve (including environmental and conservation concerns)
2. Cookies of Kindness (coordinating baking for nursing home residents)
3. Newspaper
4. Reading to Elementary School Kids
5. Peer Teaching in Friendship and Decision-Making (including, but not limited to, students referred for behavior problems participate in curriculum writing for younger students [5th grade].)
6. Fitness Fun (designing personal fitness plan and implementing it)
7. Thank you cards to businesses as a gesture to the community.

A particularly impressive plan generated by the local team at School D was a Peer Review/Assistance/Coaching proposal. This program insured teacher development with particular emphasis on character education and embedding the process model in the classroom lessons and climate, ethical classrooms, and implementing graduation standards. Although the local team focused on middle school staff development, the High School associate principal also showed interest in CVCE and the character education emphasis in

the Peer Review/Assistance/Coaching proposal. It began the expansion of the CVCE effort from the 8th to the 12th grade levels by training new staff.

School D expressed some concern over time that their district had been resistant to the idea of infused character education. They seem to be locked into the idea of an add-on program. In their third year, they had a meeting with the RespecTeam, a District Wide initiative that has been in existence for several years (they lean toward a trait approach via weekly 40-minute lesson plans).

**h. School Site D's CVCE Implementation Approach**

The local team consisted of eight members of the teaching staff and administration. They had very strong local administrative support.

---

**5. School Site E**

**a. School Site E's community context**

| | |
|---|---|
| Population (2000 Census): | Under 20,000 |
| Economic Overview: | |
| Largely lower middle class families. | |
| Free/reduced lunch students: | 26% |
| Educational Attainment: | |
| High School: | 70% |
| Associate of Arts Degree: | 18% |
| Bachelors of Arts Degree: | 10% |
| Graduate Degree: | 2% |
| Cultural/Ethnic/Racial Diversity: | |
| Students of Color | 7% |
| Caucasian | 93% |
| Limited English Proficiency | 1% |

**b. Details About School Site E's District**

- Four foreign languages are offered to High School E students.
- Day care is available in the district.
- All grades may participate in drama through the Community Youth Theater.
- There is an extensive International Baccalaureate Program at the high school.
- Elementary grades have in-classroom computers.
- High School students compete in the Academic Bowl.
- School E has a chess team.
- The North Central Association of Schools & Colleges accredits High School E.
- The North Central Association of Schools & Colleges accredits the local elementary school.

**c. Previous and Existing Character Education Programs at School Site E**

School E first considered character education in 1995, when several staff members went to a national character education conference. The conference engendered a great deal of immediate excitement and enthusiasm. A 30-member district and community advisory council was established and the school board passed a resolution in support of character education in the curriculum. The district developed a set of six core values/principles, and purchased the "Heartwood Ethical Stories" series in hopes of sustaining the implementation of character education. Citizenship and various civic virtues were selected as weekly or monthly themes. "Youth Frontiers" and a "Kindness Retreat" were used on the elementary level.

The approaches were generally trait-based and add-on programs which eventually fell into disuse. The primary frustration was rooted in the process of transitioning from principles into practice. There was less overall impact on the students than was originally hoped causing the initial excitement about the respective programs, which was genuine, to diminish.

**d. Initial (and Adaptation of) School Site E's Goals for CVCE**

The original objective was to become familiar with the CVCE Guidebook and other related resources. Additionally, the local team's intent was to design a pilot program that integrates character education and state standards into the curriculum. Finally, School E hoped to involve the community in the project and to build district and community support throughout implementation. The latter two goals, i.e., integrated curriculum and community support, became the focus of the local team's efforts throughout the grant period. School E had a parent representative on their the local throughout the duration of the project.

**e. School Site E's Attitudes Toward CVCE Model**

The local team found CVCE's emphasis on the following very positive: skills-based approach, integration into instruction, community involvement, and student empowerment. There was less enthusiasm expressed for the ongoing evaluation and assessment of the program (i.e., lengthy surveys).

**f. School Site E's Record Keeping**

° Computer log of all CVCE activities at School E
° Family and Consumer Science classes assessments from Year 3 of the grant
° Ongoing disciplinary and attendance records

Additionally, in their third year with the project, 2001-2002, School E participated in limited pre- and post-testing: a teacher's observation checklist and a school-wide tolerance survey of their classrooms. In the fourth year the local team conducted comprehensive school-wide pre- and post-implementation surveys.

## g. School Site E's Progress Through CVCE Model

School E was unusual among our pilot schools as the only high school among them. The local team implemented in a variety of areas and in a variety of grade levels, though for the most part in grades higher than that of our other school partners. They implemented most comprehensively in 7th grade Family and Consumer Science (FACS). During two weeks of each quarter during the past three years, two of the FACS teachers implemented several activities related to selected subskills in each of the skill areas. School E was very cooperative in gathering data on the various scales developed by CVCE. Funds were spent to pay for teacher training sessions on character education, but not individual implementation.

The original focus of the local team was to expand to include the entire teaching staff. Eventually, with the help and encouragement of the administration, the local team was enlarged to include particular "sympathetic" faculty members who were enthusiastic about joining in implementation. This larger group went through the training between years three and four of the grant (summer, 2001).

While they have built on their original local team, they are also realistic about their hopes for expansion. Unfortunately, it appears that some subjects have faculty who are skeptical towards character education. Therefore, the local team started in 'friendlier' departments in their attempts to expand across the curriculum. It is their hope that the entire faculty will join "the team" as the success of the program becomes more evident throughout the school and faculty.

School E has successfully met all of the following of the CVCE grant's expectations:

1. Evidence that the local team completed worksheets
2. Evidence of community involvement
3. Completed vision timetable (9 months)
4. Scheduled participation in University's pre and post evaluations.

The hope of the local team is to move toward full implementation throughout the school within two years. They have been enthusiastically "on-board" since the outset of the project. Their local leader has been particularly strong and was a strong advocate for character education before implementing the CVCE project, having been involved in an earlier attempt at implementing in the School E school district. School E also has had terrific support from their (new) principal and an assistant principal, who attended one of our on-site meetings with the local team. She conveyed very enthusiastic support (and ideas) from the administration.

## h. School Site E's CVCE Implementation Approach

1. The local team consisted of 12 members on the Junior/Senior High level.
   A. Group attended training workshops offered by the University Design Team.
   B. The Character Education Implementation group met at least once each month.

C. Implementation covered grades 7-12, and covered the following subjects:

a. Art
b. Family and Consumer Sciences
c. Health/Physical Education
d. Language Arts
e. Mathematics
f. Science
g. Social Studies
h. Special Education
i. World Languages

D. Each local team member committed to implementing and evaluating a minimum of three CVCE lessons during 2001-2002.
E. Several other teachers expressed interest over time and were added to the local team and became involved in the staff development presentation in the Summer of 2001.
F. There was strong support from school administration.

---

**6. School Site F**

**a. School Site F's community context**

Population (2000 Census): Under 5, 000
Economic Overview:
Three rural communities with overwhelmingly agrarian economies.

**b. Details About School Site F's District**

- Several courses in vocational agriculture are offered at High School F.
- A gifted & talented program has recently been introduced in elementary classes.
- Students are grouped by multi-aged homerooms for social studies & science.
- Grades 1-4 are multi-aged with a primary unit and an intermediate unit.
- Future Farmers of America & Knowledge Bowl are activities available at High School F.
- High School F offers a lunch program to all students.
- A fully equipped computer lab and media center is available at High School F.
- A Post Secondary Options program is available to High School F students.
- The drama department at High School F performs two annual plays.
- High School band performs 2 annual concerts.
- High School F pep band has participated in many out-of-state competitions.
- High School F concert band traveled to California in 1998 to perform.
- The wrestling team at High School F recently competed at the state tournament.
- High School F boys' basketball competed at the state playoffs.
- High School F girls' basketball was state runner-up in the sub-section.
- Kindergarten is offered as a full day program.

**c. Previous and Existing Character Education Programs at School Site F**

The history of character education at School F involved a series of unrelated programs which addressed both individual and community development. School F makes frequent use of a local nature center as a means to build community among their student population. Originally this was conducted near the end of the year but recently it has been moved to the beginning of the year and includes grades 7-8 in hopes of building more cohesion in the school climate.

Prior to CVCE, there was little in the way of consistent instruction of character education at School F. According to anecdotal reports, earlier attempts at character education were effective but there was no comprehensive approach taken.

**d. Initial (and Adaptation of) School Site F's Goals for CVCE**

In addition to continuing the existing character events, School F hoped to incorporate the CVCE model into its curriculum and to implement service learning. Their three-year plan included the following:

1. Encourage community involvement – especially to establish links between the community (seniors, businesses) and the middle school. (Building a softball field was a joint project).
2. Build community of staff members by encouraging them to work together in implementing across the curriculum, and to find ways in which to make links between disciplines.
3. Motivate students to respect individual staff members for the work that they do and the positions they hold.
4. Encourage and support student leadership.

School F also hoped to use the advisory period as a time to build community. Additionally, they intended to hold character education days that focus on everyone's right to respect and dignity.

**e. School Site F's Attitudes Toward CVCE Model**

While the existing programs which supported the building of community and the development of character in their students continued, the infusion of the curriculum with character education lessons and activities is less evident.

**f. School Site F's Record Keeping**

In their fourth year with the project, 2001-2002, School F participated in limited pre-implementation testing (although they did not provide post-implementation data), and a school-wide tolerance survey of their classrooms.

**g. School Site F's Progress Through CVCE Model**

School F's efforts with regard to character education seemed to be an amalgam of a number of programs that have historically, and continue to, exist apart from CVCE's implementation model. Among these projects was a booklet created in a technology class in which students' pictures and a short biography were compiled as an aid to new students. CVCE grant monies were used to host a motivational speaker, a teachers' retreat, the purchase of games for advisory period, and attendance at the National Character Education Partnership Conference (which included the local leader and two other staff members).

School F has teamed with the community's summer recreation program to build a softball field as a means to promote character education. They have also created an artist-in-residence program; invited "Climb Theater" group to address teen sexuality, sexual harassment and teasing; and planned a character dance (although there was low participation due to scheduling conflicts). School F hosted a "Girls' Night Out" – an evening of events involving former students intended to help the girls feel connected to the school community. They are planning a "Boys' Night Out" in which they hope to have an athlete give a motivational talk, and/or conduct an inclusive tournament (perhaps using video games).

School F's focus has been primarily on climate. This is a fitting and potentially effective focus for them because they are a small school with fewer than 150 students. The lunch period can be used to highlight character events because the entire student population can be called to attention during that time for a brief lesson. The small size of the school has also allowed them to involve the local community in ways that many CVCE schools have found difficult. Student council members phone families once a month to get the word out on their character events, which requires only seven phone calls per student.

**h. School Site F's CVCE Implementation Approach**

- The local team at School F consisted of three people, including the school principal.
- CVCE was implemented, first during the advisory period, then expanded to grades 6-8.

---

**7. School Site G**

**a. School Site G's community context**

| | |
|---|---|
| Population (2000 Census): | Under 20,000 |
| Economic Overview: | |
| Largely lower income families with only 10% professionals | |
| Largely agrarian and blue collar families | |
| Free/reduced lunch students: | 30% |
| Cultural/Ethnic/Racial Diversity: | |
| Students of Color | 13% |
| [In order of occurrence: Hispanic, Asian Amer., African Amer., Amer. Indian] | |
| Caucasian | 87% |

**b. Details About School Site G's District**

- High School G students may compete in Knowledge Bowl.
- Future Farmers of America is available to High School G students.
- High School G students can earn credit from local community and technical colleges.
- High School G students participate in DECA, an association of marketing students.
- Grades K-5 receive music and art instruction.
- AFF brings in foreign students to High School G.
- Seventeen music courses are offered at High School G.
- Students in French may travel to France in the summer.
- Students in Spanish may travel to Spain in the summer.
- Drivers education is offered by a community organization in nearby city.
- Students at High School G can compete in marketing related competitions.
- Kindergarten is offered as a half-day program.
- The North Central Association of schools & Colleges accredits High School G.

**c. Previous and Existing Character Education Programs at School Site G**

The previous character education related programs included a "challenge course" for 8th graders. Initially, it was off-site, which proved costly and logistically difficult because of the large number of students involved. Eventually, a challenge course was created in the community and monthly "excursions" became part of the curriculum. Service learning and social skills development were part of the curriculum for a time but were eventually dropped for lack of local funding. School G has also received a First Amendment Schools Grant that they see as somewhat related to character education development. Also, materials from Project Wisdom was used in giving morning announcements, with sayings from the project binder used each morning. Finally, the Boys Town Social Skills Curriculum has been used at School G (and was paid for with CVCE character education funds), which they have found complements well their implementation of the CVCE project.

**d. Initial (and Adaptation of) School Site G's Goals for CVCE**

From the beginning, the local team's plan was to keep a once-a-month learning group (for Continuing Education credits) so that they could become experts and leaders**.** The original 5-year plan also included goals of parents in the building at all times, service learning embedded year round and advisory periods that provide an adult advocate for each child. Also hoped for was time to build social skills, a warm and welcoming climate, universal respect, cross-age connections, and "ambassadors" to acclimate new students. This plan was refined at a local team meeting in mid-year, 2000-2001. The intention was to implement across the curriculum with approximately ten teachers in a variety of subject areas. This breadth of experience could then be a source of mentoring for the rest of the faculty over time. They also intended to expand implementation to include the School Climate Committee and those responsible for discipline.

**e. School Site G's Attitudes Toward CVCE Model**

The best thing about CVCE, according to School G, was the accountability that it provided for them to stay on task. The statewide meetings hosted by CVCE proved to be "inspirations" to continue implementing character education.

**f. School Site G's Record Keeping**

In their third year with the project, 2001-2002, School G participated in limited pre- and post-testing: a teacher's observation checklist and a school-wide tolerance survey of their classrooms. In the fourth year they conducted school-wide pre- and post-test surveys.

**g. School Site G's Progress Through CVCE Model**

School G initially implemented CVCE during the advisory period and in school-wide projects. They chose to work with the skills Respect, Communicating Well, and Perspective Taking. They were also interested in, though not focusing on, working with group and interpersonal differences, peacemaking, and conflict resolution.

One of the school-wide projects related to respect and perspective taking used the student newspaper to facilitate community service. For example, elderly in the community were invited to advertise any odd jobs that they needed around their home. In a related project, students decorated bathroom stalls in the school with culturally sensitive artwork to preempt vandalism. School G met the expectations of CVCE in a timely manner. They participated in the evaluation surveys and in the semi-annual statewide meetings. They envision an ongoing maturation of their implementation, especially on the advisory level, over time.

School G was good at keeping in touch with the University Design Team, even as the leadership changed hands a couple times during the course of the grant. They used some of their funds to implement the Boys Town character education curriculum, and a Boys Town team visited with students, teachers, administration and parent groups from each grade level. They also observed classes and lunch periods, and conducted surveys of cross sections of students, all staff, administration and parents. The results of those efforts were not relayed to CVCE.

**h. School Site G's CVCE Implementation Approach**

- The local team consisted of eight members of the middle school staff with strong administrative support, with the principal as a member of the team.
- The group met infrequently, but when they did, they had an "eat and meet" session from 5-7 p.m.
- The local team had good energy, shared ideas, and encouraged each other in their efforts.
- During the course of the fourth year they sought out leaders among their teachers who might also increase the participation of other teachers.

**8. School Site H**

**a. School Site H's community context**

| | |
|---|---|
| Population (2000 Census): | Over 20,000 |
| Economic Overview: | |
| Largely "blue collar" middle class families. | |
| Free/reduced lunch students: | NA |
| Cultural/Ethnic/Racial Diversity: | |
| Very small minority representation | |

**b. Details About School Site H's District**

- After-school sports are available for high school students.
- Drama members compete in one-act plays.
- An indoor swimming pool is available at the high school.
- High School H performs three annual school concerts.
- High School H band and chorus participate annually in the Big 9 All School Concert.
- School District H has 6 fully equipped computer labs.
- An annual all-school musical audition is performed at High School H.
- The drama department at High School H performs an annual fall play.
- High School H geometry class is taught via interactive TV.
- A Post Secondary Options program is available to High School H students.
- School H sports include football, basketball, track & volleyball.
- Kindergarten is offered as a full day program.
- The North Central Association of Schools & Colleges accredits the high school.

**c. Previous and Existing Character Education Programs at School Site H**

Individual teachers who were interested in character education occasionally implement character education lessons, usually using worksheets. There was no ongoing cohesive program of character education.

Character education was implemented in a limited and haphazard fashion prior to CVCE. The level of assessment of previous programs was anecdotal at best. Typically, the students were asked how they liked it, and the response, "Oh, great!" often represented the level of reflection that went into the assessment process.

**d. Initial (and Adaptation of) School Site H's Goals for CVCE**

The intention in School H was to focus on two of the 8$^{th}$ grade "houses" which consist of clusters of ten teachers, one from each subject area. The plan was to train the teachers in CVCE implementation and integration into the curriculum and apply it across the curriculum. The local team was, therefore, made up of members who were not all equally enthusiastic about character education. Whether there were regular meetings planned for the local team was not clear; they had no formal meetings but "touched base" informally on the

progress of implementation. They also planned to structure their 12-minute home room period with the lessons being drawn from a manual created in advance by the members of the local team.

**e. School Site H's Attitudes Toward CVCE Model**

The school board, which has a reputation for being averse to character education generally, was receptive to CVCE when it was presented to them early in the project. Some teachers, however, had a difficult time with implementation. Described as a "struggle" by the local leader, there was resistance to the model and limited engagement in the respective classrooms. There was most resistance to administering the pre- and post-implementation student assessment surveys.

**f. School Site H's Record Keeping**

In their third year with the project, 2001-2002, School H participated in formative evaluation with pre- and post-testing, using a teacher's observation checklist and a school-wide tolerance survey. In the fourth year they conducted comprehensive school-wide pre- and post-implementation surveys.

**g. School Site H's Progress Through CVCE Model**

School H trained a select group within two houses in hopes of affecting the larger community, and attracting more teachers and houses, by their efforts. The CVCE bookmarks, which listed each of the 28 skills on one side, were used as aids in assisting students, who were asked to research role models of the skill areas in what was termed a "Positive Influences Unit." The students primarily used the internet and produced essays and posters with time lines. In another example, a conflict resolution unit has been developed using various works of literature to address the issue.

School H's CVCE funds were used to reimburse local team members for their time spent on developing character education plans. Their original objective was to implement across at least one house, possibly two. Though a strong implementation in the two 7$^{th}$ grade houses was desired, ultimately there was resistance from some of the house teachers. Although their own hopes for implementation were not realized, School H met all of the grant expectations.

**h. School Site H's CVCE Implementation Approach**

The local team consisted of about a dozen teachers in two "houses" which consisted of a teacher in each subject area. Infusion has been successful for those who have done it. Morning announcements included readings from the logbook, which has messages and quotations related to character development. In the future, the hope is to continue to share the materials and seek advice from other schools regarding the advisory group model and its implementation and effectiveness.

## 9. School Site I (CONTROL SCHOOL)

### A. School Site I's Community Context

| | |
|---|---|
| Population (2000 Census): | Under 5,000 |
| Economic Overview: | |
| Largely lower middle class families. | |
| Free/reduced lunch students: | 26% |
| Educational Attainment: | |
| High School: | 70% |
| Associate of Arts Degree: | 18% |
| Bachelors of Arts Degree: | 10% |
| Graduate Degree: | 2% |
| Cultural/Ethnic/Racial Diversity: | |
| Students of Color | 7% |
| Caucasian | 93% |
| Limited English Proficiency | 1% |

### B. Details About School I's District

- After-school sports are available at the elementary level for 4th to 6th graders.
- Elementary students may participate in an after-school chess enrichment program.
- A breakfast and lunch program is available.
- A new high-tech. lab opened in September 1996 at the high school.
- The high school has Interactive TV courses.
- Kindergarten is offered as a full day program.
- The high school choir has three annual concerts; drama dept. performs two annual plays.
- The drama department at the high school performs an all-school musical.
- Concurrent enrollment is available with Minnesota West Technical College.
- A Post Secondary Options program is available to High School I students.
- The high school has 3 computer labs.

## SECTION IV.
## PURPOSES AND DESIGN OF THE EVALUATION

### A. Accomplishment of Initial Goals

As noted earlier, there were seven goals for the project, modified slightly over the duration of the funding. Six of these goals were accomplished as part of the regular project activities.

Project goal 1. Develop a character education program for middle-level students (grades 6-8).
Project goal 5: Put together a framework for character development based on social science research that emphasizes ethical development and promotes emotional intelligence.
Project goal 3: Improve Student Achievement: Create a model that integrates character development into standards-based regular instruction.

We accomplished Goals 1, 3 and 5 by creating a new, research-based model for character education aimed at the middle school level that integrates character skill development into regular, standards-driven instruction. (For evidence, see Figure 1-1, Table 1-1, Appendix B and Appendix C).

Project goal 2. Assist classroom teachers in developing performance-based curriculum, instruction and assessment. (2A) Build a framework that uses an up-to-date pedagogy based on current understandings of human learning. (2B) Convey the constructing ethical expertise model to teachers in a usable way.
Project goal 4: Meet Minnesota Learning Standards
Project goal 6: Address community cultural contexts in the implementation of character education. (6A) Involve the community in designing and implementing the local program. (6B) Involve students in community learning

The accomplishment of Goals 2, 4 and 6 is evidenced by the teacher-created learning activities created from the model that teach both character skills and standards-based academics, and involve the students in community learning. Over 40 sets of learning activities were submitted to the University Design Team and CFL by participating teachers. The list of these lesson plans is available in Appendix D.

### B. Program Evaluation

The last project goal involved evaluating the project.

Project goal 7: Evaluate program effectiveness and potential to replicate. (7A) Use assessments that measure different levels of effectiveness: School climate, individual student development, instructional effects to improve student achievement. (7B) Develop a replicable approach to character education that can stand alone or can be integrated into other programs.

There were five parts to the evaluation of program effectiveness: (1) evaluation of the model and materials for teachers, (2) evaluation of program implementation, (3) development and validation of assessments for the measure of student effects, and (4) evaluation of climate and effects on students, (5) evaluating the replicability of the approach.

1. Evaluation Part One: School Implementation. The first part of the evaluation is the examination of the implementation of the model. We discuss each school's implementation to gauge how much and how well the model and materials were implemented.

2. Evaluation Part Two: Model and Materials. The second part of the evaluation addresses the main focus of the project—the effectiveness of the model and the supporting materials in guiding local teams of teachers as they incorporated character skill development into regular instruction. As described earlier, the model was comprised of presenting research-based guidelines for character education content and pedagogy to teams of teachers who adapted the guidelines and tailored an implementation according to local needs, vision, and structures.

3. Evaluation Part Three: Assessment Tools. The third part of the evaluation is the examination of the validity of assessment tools that were developed. We examined their reliability coefficients using a set of data not used in the final evaluation. Along with this, we examined the effects of project implementation on students using student pre- and post-testing of general ethical skills.

4. Evaluation Part Four: Climate and Effects on Students. The fourth part of the evaluation was to examine the effects on climate and student understanding.

Our knowledge of character development assessment led us to believe that it would be a challenge to find significant pre-post differences within one year's time. Furthermore, there was a great deal of variability across sites in terms of which skills were taught, how often, and how well. However, we believe that the main challenge to an accurate evaluation of effects was also the strongest feature of the program —local control of design, structure and implementation, in other words, the uniqueness of each implementation. Nevertheless, we designed self-report assessments of attitudes, knowledge and behavior and used them as pre and post tests in the final year of the project.

5. Evaluation Part Five: Replicability. The first four parts contribute to the fifth aspect of the evaluation: the replicability of the approach as a stand alone approach or as one that can be integrated into other programs.

## SECTION V. EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS, PART 1: EVALUATION OF SCHOOL IMPLEMENTATION

We evaluated effects on students and teachers using self-report questionnaires of perceptions, attitudes and behavior. The staff surveys are contained in Appendix F. The overall questions we addressed are listed in Table V-1.

**Table V-1. School Implementation Evaluation Framework**

| | QUANTITY | QUALITY |
|---|---|---|
| INPUT | 1. How much character skill instruction was delivered? | 2. How well was character skill instruction delivered? |
| OUTPUT | How many students & others were influenced by the implementation? | How good were the results of the implementation? |

First, we describe the subquestions for each main question. This is followed by a qualitative description of the sites in terms of each of these sets of questions.

### A. Depth of implementation

First, we wanted to gauge the depth or quantity of the input: How much character skill instruction was delivered? We call this variable "Depth of Implementation." The data collected are listed in Table V-2. The pertinent information for each school can be found in Section F: Qualitative Reports on School Implementation.

**Table V-2. Input Quantity: Depth of Implementation**

| | |
|---|---|
| What number of staff were engaged? | Local report, staff survey |
| How many skills were taught? | Local Leader Report, Staff Survey |
| In how many subjects were skills implemented? | Local Leader Report, Staff Survey |
| How frequently were skills taught? | Local Leader Report |
| What number of students were engaged? | Local Leader Report |
| What was the student's average exposure to skill lessons? | Computed from Local Leader Report |
| What is the students' demographic profile? | Enrollment / demographic data on participating students |

The CVCE approach is to train a local team of teachers and administrators from a participating school site in the CVCE model of character education and pedagogy (what character is and how it should be taught) and then to guide the local team in creating their strategic plan for implementing the model in a way suitable to their needs and circumstances.

As desired and anticipated, each of the school sites implemented the model in a fashion that best suited their respective circumstances. The school sites implemented character education

employing a variety of combinations of each of the three components listed below. We had wanted to create a "depth of implementation" variable using the listed categories, but the form of implementation was unique in every case. There were a maximum of two schools in each category, making it impossible to perform statistical analyses by depth of implementation. Here are the three categories, followed by a table indicating which schools included which type.

1. *Advisory implementation*: The local team developed character education lesson/unit plans for use by all teachers during their advisory periods.
2. *School-wide project*: The school site mounted a character education-related school-wide project (e.g., fund-raising for a local non-profit organization).
3. *Curricular infusion*: The local team infused character education into their regular academic curriculum and, over time, encouraged others to do the same.

**Table V-3. Type of Implementation**

| | School A | School B | School C | School D | School E | School F | School G | School H |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Advisory | X | X | | X | | | X | |
| School-wide project | X | | X | X | | X | | |
| Curricular infusion | X | | X | X | X | | | X |

## B. Quality of implementation

Second, we wanted to gauge the quality of program activities: How well was character skill instruction delivered? We call this variable "Quality of Implementation." The data collected are listed in Table V-4. Because the partners were 'in charge' of their own implementations, and favored independence, it was difficult for the Design Team to accurately gauge "quality" of any kind. Self-reports and questionnaires were used. The pertinent information for each school can be found in Section F: Qualitative Reports on School Implementation.

**Table V-4. Input Quality: Quality of Implementation**

| | |
|---|---|
| How well did the teachers implement? | Sample lessons, observations, perceptions |
| How satisfied was the staff with the local approach? | Staff survey |
| How effectively were students engaged in the activities? | Local Leader Report |
| How effectively was the community engaged? | Local Leader Report |

## C. Number affected

Third, we wanted to gauge the influence of program activities: How many students and staff were influenced by the implementation? We call this variable "Number affected" and list the questions in Table V-5. The surveys and reports indicated the number of students and teachers involved. Self-reports and questionnaires were used. The pertinent information for each school can be found in Section F: Qualitative Reports on School Implementation.

**Table V-5. Output Quantity: Number Affected**

| | |
|---|---|
| Did numbers of involved staff increase or decrease? | Local Leader report |
| How did local staff quantify its accomplishments? | Local Leader report |
| Frequency of character education team meetings | Local Leader report |
| Level of interest in the project from teachers not on the team | Local Leader report |

### D. Perceived Impact of implementation

We wanted to gauge the impact of the local implementation: How good were the results of the implementation? We call this variable "Impact of Implementation." The data collected for this question are listed in Table V-6. The pertinent information for each school can be found in Section F: Qualitative Reports on School Implementation.

**Table V-6. Output Quality: Impact of Implementation**

| | |
|---|---|
| Were staffs satisfied with their local approach | Local Leader report |
| Were there positive changes over time in student perceptions | Student Questionnaire |
| Of tolerance | Student Questionnaire |
| Of peers | Student Questionnaire |
| Of teachers | Student Questionnaire |
| Did students observe improvement in peers' skills? | Student Questionnaires |
| Were student perceptions of implementation positive | Indirectly from Student Questionnaires? |
| Overall impression of the CVCE project | Staff survey |
| Interest in having CVCE project continue at the school | Staff survey |
| Perception of School climate improvement | Staff survey |

### E. University team reflections

Finally, we included a section that provides the reflections of the University of Minnesota design team members about the implementation at each school site. The reflections offer an experiential perspective that takes into account the regular interaction with the local leader and the local team, as well as the general ethos and dynamics of each school site. The respective school sites are often spoken of in relation to the other sites with which we worked.

### F. Qualitative Reports on School Implementation

In the following sections we described each site's view of their implementation using the previously described categories: depth of implementation, quality of implementation, number affected and perceived impact of implementation. We follow this with the perspective of the university design team on the site's implementation.

**School Site A**

a. Depth of implementation. School A is a 5-12 building located in an agrarian, middle to lower-middle income region (34% are eligible for the Free and Reduced Lunch program). It was one of two schools among our pilot schools who implemented in all three areas: advisory, school-wide project(s), and curricular infusion. Character education lessons were incorporated into their seventh and eighth grade "Prime Time" advisory period each week. The students participated in a wide array of community service projects during the course of the school year. Finally, regarding curricular infusion, School A made a significant effort to implement across the curriculum in each of the middle school grades and beyond.

The local team was made up of fifteen teachers who were directly involved in planning and implementation. A year after the end of the funded project, all 27 K-6 staff members were implementing to some degree. All ten Junior High teachers implemented in their advisory group. Moreover, all ninth grade teachers implemented during their homeroom periods. School A reported that all 28 of the ethical skills were taught in some fashion in the following seven subjects: Science, Social Studies, Family and Consumer Science, Quest, Computer Applications, PE/Health, and ninth grade English.

According to the self-report, approximately 10% of instruction time was spent on character education-related materials. Ethical skills were taught daily in the fifth and sixth grades, and once per week in the Middle School. Additionally, skills were taught during the High School advisory period and in units across the curriculum. School A reported that approximately 250 students participated in at least one character education unit, with many of them engaging in more than one.

b. Quality of implementation. The teachers at School A implemented well. The local team was very engaged in the project and worked very hard to adapt it for their particular environs. School A involved a community member in some of the Prime Time planning and implementation for the Junior High students. They struggled to find effective ways to involve the community and ultimately self-reported community involvement as being "light," and their attempts at involving them as being "very ineffective." School A kept the community informed through occasional newspaper articles on their character education efforts.

c. Number affected. The number of staff involved in the program increased from five to thirty teachers during the three-year implementation period. The local team assessed its local accomplishments in the following ways: student journals, drawing, interviews, general staff observation and comments, and finally, with student input. The local team met once each month. Regarding the level of interest in the project from teachers not on the team, School A found that over time the interest increased through word-of-mouth and from teachers noticing student projects completed in the character education lessons/units.

d. Perceived impact of implementation. Student survey data indicated a slight decrease over time in student perceptions' of tolerance towards peers; and a slight decrease, as well, in

student perceptions of staff tolerance toward students (see Table VIII-23). As this is survey data, it is unclear whether this reflected an increase in intolerance (unlikely) or an increase in sensitivity to tolerance (more likely). However, School A students perceived an increase in the observed ethical behavior of peers.

The local team at School A was very satisfied with the local approach to the project. The flexibility of the project allowed for local adaptation and implementation. With each year investment in the project grew as the project activities corresponded to the needs of the local school and community. In a staff survey, teachers reported, on average, favorable impressions of the CVCE project (see Table VI-7). Asked if they wanted CVCE to continue in their school, School A teachers reported that it should be maintained, and even expanded (see Table VI-7).

We surveyed the local team about improvements in student behavior and school climate. According to the teachers, there was some improvement noted in school climate and some improvement noted as well in student behavior (see Table VIII-26).

e. University team reflections. School A was an exceptional partner school. The two respective local leaders, who headed up the implementation over four years, were responsive and engaged. The growth of the program, both in breadth of implementation and teacher involvement, was exceptional. This was evidenced in a variety of ways, most notably in the implementation of character education, in a variety of forms, in all the schools throughout the district. School A was efficient at supplying the requested student and teacher surveys, local leader reports, and so on, throughout the grant implementation period.

**School Site B**

a. Depth of implementation. School B is a Grade 5-8 building located in a small, largely agrarian, middle to lower-income, largely Caucasian region of the state. School B focused on a curricular infusion and advisory approach to implementation. They began with the seventh and eighth grade advisory level, and in seventh and eighth grade Health and English classes. The local team created a manual of character education lessons that were distributed to each of the seventh and eighth grade advisors. Along with the manual were several items intended to complement the lesson plans (e.g., project materials, markers, paints, etc.).

Twenty teachers were involved in implementation at School B, with the majority of them participating as implementers within their advisory groups. A total of 15 skills were taught during the course of the year in both advisory, and in curricular infusion in English and Health. According to the local leader, approximately 8% of total instruction time was devoted to character education. Ethical skills were taught two to four times per week during advisory period; and character education curriculum units lasting from 5-15 days were offered within the Health and English curricula. There were 290 students were directly involved in character education because of implementation within seventh and eighth grade advisories.

b. Quality of implementation. The teachers at School B covered the gamut in terms of their investment in the project. Their principal was supportive from the beginning and encouraged full participation. According to their self-evaluation, only about half of the advisors implemented in the way that the local team had hoped. The other half seemed resistant both at the CVCE workshop and throughout the period of implementation. In the self report, the teachers reported having implemented on average "adequately," and indicated a satisfaction level with their approach to implementation on average as "so-so." Community involvement was described on average as "adequate." A member of the school's parent advisory committee assisted in the planning of the CVCE implementation. The local school board was supportive, establishing a policy promoting character education, and inviting regular reports from the school planning committee for the project.

c. Number affected. The number of staff members involved reportedly increased during the course of implementation. Although the school gave no specific figures regarding the increase, they did report that 20 teachers were involved overall. The local team quantified its accomplishments using survey data collected by the University team. Judging from the number of surveys received from School B, approximately 185 students were affected in Year Four of the grant in the implementation of the project, though the school reported that 290 were affected directly. The local team reported meeting once per week to update materials and evaluate the ongoing success of implementation. Because all teachers were advisers, all of the school's teachers were on the full team, and interest varied widely among them, which would explain the apparent lack of investment described in section b above. Some maintained a high level of interest throughout the project while others did not. However, the majority of the local team had a moderate level of interest and participated actively in implementation.

d. Perceived impact of implementation. Student survey data indicated a slight decrease over time in student perceptions' of tolerance of peers; and a slight decrease, as well, in student perceptions of staff tolerance toward students (see Table VIII-23). However, School B students perceived an increase in the observed ethical behavior of peers.

The local team at School B was, for the most part and on average, satisfied with the local approach. The local leader reported that, although all of the school's teachers were on the team, interest varied among the team members. Some maintained a high level of interest throughout while others did not. In a staff survey, teachers' impressions of the CVCE project were quite diverse, ranging from unfavorable to favorable (see Table VI-7). Asked if they wanted CVCE to continue in their school, School B teachers covered the gamut, with some wanting an expansion of the program, while others expressed ambivalence (see Table VI-7).

We surveyed the local team about improvements in student behavior and school climate. There was some improvement noted in the school climate, according to the teachers, and slightly more improvement noted in student behavior (see Table VIII-26).

e. University team reflections. School B was in the top tier of implementing schools. The local leadership, largely due to the administration, was particularly influential at involving all of the teachers. This, unfortunately, led to some of their greatest challenges. The

unwillingness of some teachers to engage in the project made consistency and quality of implementation difficult. Those who did engage in the project were particularly impressive, creating a manual for use in the advisory periods, which provided materials and ideas for each advisor. School B was efficient at supplying the requested student and teacher surveys throughout implementation.

**School Site C**

a. Depth of implementation. School C is a Grade 8-9 alternative middle school located in a large urban center, with 85% on the Free or Reduced Lunch Program. Students are repeating an eighth grade curriculum due to academic and/or attendance issues. The student population is rich in cultural and racial diversity, and largely lower-income. The local team attempted to integrate the CVCE model into all classes. The nature of School C allowed for curricular infusion in five different self-contained classrooms, as well as implementation of a school-wide project related to character education. Six skills were incorporated in the Language Arts curriculum during the academic year. Ethical skills were also addressed in special breakout groups that addressed anger management and life skills. The frequency of character education lessons varied depending on the teacher.

All of the teachers (n=5), the school counselor, the curriculum coordinator, and the director were involved in the teacher training workshops and in the implementation of the CVCE project. Because of the self-contained nature of the classroom instruction, the consistency of reinforcement of character education throughout the curriculum was possible. All of the 65-75 students in the program (which fluctuates in number throughout the academic year) were affected by the implementation. The average exposure to character education as a percentage of total instruction time was estimated at 15%.

Community involvement in the project was described as “light.” The nature of the program, which draws students from all over a large urban center who only become known to the program at the beginning of the academic year, made parent involvement in planning the character education curriculum difficult.

b. Quality of implementation. The entire local team at School C engaged the project readily because of the nature of their student population and the goals they had generally for their students. During the staff training, there was an expressed appreciation for the need for enhanced Ethical Sensitivity, particularly, in their student population. It was six of these seven skills that the program focused on throughout implementation. Apart from the implementation that took place in each classroom, which was described as adequate to poor depending on the teacher, the school counselor made regular visits to each classroom to present on character education issues and conduct break out groups which focused on ethical skills training. The local team’s assessment of its own approach to implementation was self-described as “so-so.” Some of the classrooms were adequately engaged while other teachers appeared ineffective at engaging students on character issues.

c. Number affected. As part of the administrative structure, the staff met at the end of each day of instruction and addressed concerns they had regarding particular students and issues.

At least once a month, character education lesson planning and implementation was the topic of discussion. Since all of the teachers were involved from the outset, there was no increase in the number of teachers involved in implementation over time. According to the report of the local leader, there may have been a slight decrease since some of the teachers lost interest in incorporating character education into their respective curricula as the year progressed.

d. Perceived impact of implementation. Student survey data indicated a decrease over time in student perceptions' of tolerance of peers. School C students also perceived a decrease over time in the observed ethical behavior of peers. The decreases noted here may be explained by the heightened sensitivity to issues of respect and tolerance fostered by the implementation of the character education project. There was, however, a slight increase in students' perceptions of staff tolerance toward students (see Table VIII-23).

The local team at School C was ambivalent about its approach to the project, with the local leader responding "so-so" to the question: 'How satisfied was the staff with the local approach?' There was a great deal of excitement initially about implementation because of the obvious need for this particular population, but it waned as the rigors of a very challenging population taxed their energy and intentions. Because we did not receive the completed teacher surveys, we cannot comment here on School C's teacher satisfaction with the local approach, their perceptions of effects on students, nor on the teachers' impressions of the CVCE project locally.

e. University team reflections. School C was the most interesting of our implementing partners from the perspective of its student population. Because of the nature of the student body and the structure of the academic program and curriculum, we could assess the CVCE model in a different and perhaps challenging setting. Moreover, the student population was probably most in need of the character education intervention; and the teachers were the most excited, engaged, and grateful for our efforts on their behalf. Nevertheless, the nature of the student body provided many challenges for the teaching and administrative staff, and their implementation was remarkable in light of those challenges. We received student surveys and local leader reports in a timely fashion, but did not receive teacher survey data, thus the relative brevity of section d above.

**School Site D**

a. Depth of implementation. School D is a Grade 5-8 building located in a small, largely lower to middle-income, rural community. It was one of the two schools among our pilot schools who implemented in all three areas: advisory, school-wide project(s), and curricular infusion. There were fourteen teachers directly involved in the planning and implementation of the project at School D. It was also reported that 39 staff members were engaged on some level. The particular subjects in which implementation took place were not spelled out It was implied that implementation took place in all subject areas.

School D reported that all 28 of the ethical skills were taught during their implementation period, with an average student exposure to character education, as a percentage of

instruction time, at 30%. No estimate of the number of students directly involved was reported.

b. Quality of implementation. The local leader reported that the teachers implemented well, and that staff satisfaction with the local approach to character education could be characterized on average as "so-so." The staff surveys indicated a slightly higher degree of satisfaction (see paragraph 2 of section d. below). Students were engaged effectively in the character education activities; and the community was reported to have been engaged adequately well during planning, development, and implementation of the project at School D.

Regarding the quality of implementation, it should be noted that the School D district has had an impressive history of character education initiatives. Although the "add-on" nature of previous programs prevented their thriving, the district did implement the "Respect Initiative" on the K-4 level ten years ago. It was a program that was fit into the day whenever there was time available. In their third year of CVCE implementation, School D had a meeting with the RespecTeam, a District Wide initiative that has been in existence for several years that leans toward a character trait approach via weekly 40-minute lesson plans. "Stop and Think" and democratic classroom approaches were also used for a time during the 1990s. Finally, in recent years, a monthly trait/theme was promoted through posters, but not in curriculum.

c. Number affected. The number of staff involved in the project at School D was said to have increased during the four-year implementation period, although no figures were given. [Note that it was earlier reported that there were 14 local team members and 39 total staff members involved in implementation on some level.] The local team quantified its accomplishments through student surveys, class meetings, and anecdotal records, which were reviewed and shared at their monthly local team meetings. The local leader rated as "so-so" the level of interest expressed by those teachers who were not on the team.

d. Perceived impact of implementation. Student survey data indicated a decrease over time in student perceptions of tolerance among peers; and a decrease, as well, in student perceptions of staff tolerance toward students (see Table VIII-23). School D students perceived a slight increase in the observed ethical behavior of their peers.

The local team at School D was very satisfied with the local approach to the CVCE project. School D proved very innovative in the ways they used the language of character skill development, including it, for example, on their disciplinary referrals. With each year, investment in the project grew as it attended to the needs of the local school and community. In a staff survey, teachers reported, on average, favorable impressions of the CVCE project (see Table VI-7). Asked if they wanted CVCE to continue in their school, School D teachers' responses ranged from ambivalence to full support, with the majority favoring the latter (see Table VI-7).

We surveyed the local team about improvements in student behavior and school climate. There was considerable improvement noted in school climate, according to the teachers, and some improvement noted in student behavior over time (see Table VIII-26).

e. University team reflections. School D had a responsive and creative local leader who encouraged implementation beyond the curriculum into areas of administrative and school wide consideration. School D proved the most innovation at implementing beyond the classroom, even to the point of adapting the language used on disciplinary referral forms to encourage consideration of the ethical skills necessary to remedy unwanted behavior.

The teachers at School D were supportive of implementation and engaged throughout the years of involvement. Their reporting of 28 skills being taught refers, probably, to the inclusion of all of them on their disciplinary records. It is less clear how many were infused into particular subject areas, and into which ones. The local leader was efficient at supplying the requested student and teacher surveys throughout implementation.

**School Site E**

a. Depth of implementation. School E is a Grade 8-12 building located in a large urban area, made up of a largely blue-collar, middle class, Caucasian (90%) population. Implementation took place through curricular infusion by the local team from across the curriculum. Twenty teachers were involved in implementation over nine subjects: Spanish, eleventh grade Biology, English, ninth grade Family and Consumer Sciences, Art, Chemistry, Special Education, History, and a course called "Theory of Knowledge" (twelfth grade). Grades 9-12 special education teachers also implemented lessons using the project model. Eighteen ethical skills were taught during the three years of implementation.

The skills were taught three to six times per year by each of the twenty teachers involved in the project, and varied depending on the length and number of lessons/units the teachers chose to implement. School E reported that approximately 400 students participated in at least one character education unit, with many of them engaging in more than one. The students' average exposure to skill lessons varied from teacher to teacher, but was, on average, about 5% of instruction time in classes that participated.

b. Quality of implementation. School E went to great lengths to include the community in their planning and implementation. The community provided input via a Character Education Advisory Council during the early planning stages of implementation. A "parent advocate" from the Advisory Council was a member of the local team from the very beginning and assisted with the planning and implementation of the project. She also functioned as a sounding board throughout the process.

School E, though frustrated by their inability to do more, succeeded well at engaging the community and in drawing upon the input and assistance of their Advisory Council. Several current members are parents of children who attended school in the district; these parents regularly shaped the local team's discussions in ways that recognized the socio/economic realities of the community.

Earlier efforts at character education at School E probably enhanced the quality of their implementation of the CVCE model. They first looked at Character Education in 1995, when several staff members went to a National Character Education Conference. The conference engendered a great deal of immediate excitement and enthusiasm. A 30-member district and community advisory council was established and the school board passed a resolution in support of character education in the curriculum. The district developed a set of six core values/principles, and purchased the "Heartwood Ethical Stories" series in hopes of sustaining the implementation of character education. Citizenship and various civic virtues were held up as weekly or monthly themes. "Youth Frontiers" and a "Kindness Retreat" were used at the elementary level. The same leadership that oversaw some of these earlier initiatives also headed up School E's CVCE implementation.

c. Number affected. The number of teachers, approximately twenty, stayed fairly consistent throughout the three-year implementation period. The inevitable attrition and new hires contributed to a slight fluctuation. The student and teacher surveys developed by the University team provided the primary method of quantification for School E in assessing their implementation. The local team met once per month at the local community center. The level of interest among teachers not on the team was described as "mild."

d. Perceived impact of implementation. Student survey data indicated a slight decrease over time in student perceptions' of tolerance of peers; and a slight decrease, as well, in students' perceptions of staff tolerance toward students (see Table VIII-23). School E students perceived an increase in the observed ethical behavior of peers.

The local team at School E was satisfied with their local approach to the project. In the estimation of their local leader, those who implemented did so very well. The level of participation and engagement in staff character education workshops was impressive. In a staff survey, teachers reported, on average, favorable impressions of the CVCE project (see Table VI-7). Asked if they wanted CVCE to continue in their school, School E teachers responded on average that it should be maintained, and even expanded (see Table VI-7).

We surveyed the local team about improvements in student behavior and school climate. There was some improvement noted in school climate, according to the teachers, and some improvement noted as well in student behavior (see Table VIII-26).

e. University team reflections. The local leader at School E was the most well-versed in character education of any of our local leaders, having been a part of implementation of an earlier character education project (that ultimately faded from the scene) in the mid-90s. The school board, the parent advisory board, and the teachers were all engaged in the development of the project at School E. It was the most comprehensive local team of implementers among any of our partner schools. We received all of the teacher and student surveys that we requested of them.

Nonetheless, there were challenges for School E, particularly with regard to breadth of implementation. Being a large urban school, it was difficult to engage a majority of the

teachers, even though it was desired by the local team. It was difficult to break down some of the barriers that prevented wider implementation, most notably cynicism among some of the staff which had contributed to the earlier discontinuance of character education initiatives at School E. That being said, among our partner schools, School E appears most likely to succeed at maintaining character education within their curriculum. The dedication of their local team, and the support of their present administration, gives it great promise.

**School Site F**

a. Depth of implementation. School F is a Grade 5-8 building located in a rural, largely agrarian, lower middle to middle class region. It implemented both on the school-wide project level as well as in sixth through eighth grade advisory. The school-wide project, described as a means by which sportsmanship and character can be developed, was the building of a community softball field in partnership with local civic organizations.

There were ten teachers involved in implementation affecting roughly 110 students. School F reported that all 28 ethical skills were taught during the advisory period during Year 4 of the project. It was reported that the skills were taught in all subjects daily.

b. Quality of implementation. The teachers were described by the local leader as having implemented "adequately" well, and that the local team was satisfied with the local approach. School F reported that the students were 'effectively engaged' in the activities without further explanation. The community, though not involved in the planning, was involved as guests and participants at events and programs that were mounted as part of the character education curriculum.

c. Number affected. It was difficult to gauge the implementation quality for School F. The number of involved staff stayed the same throughout the duration of implementation. The local team reported quantifying its accomplishments with "daily observations." (The University Design Team did not receive any written records of these observations. They are presumed to have provided anecdotal evidence with regard to the ongoing success of the implementation.) The local team at School F reported meeting quarterly throughout the year, with the interest of those teachers not on the team described as "so-so."

d. Perceived impact of implementation. The local team at School F, though very small, appeared, on the whole, satisfied with their local approach to the project. In a staff survey, teachers' impressions of the CVCE project were quite diverse, ranging from unfavorable to favorable (see Table VI-7). Asked if they wanted CVCE to continue in their school, the majority of School F teacher survey respondents reported it should be maintained, and even expanded (see Table VI-7).

We surveyed the local team about improvements in student behavior and school climate. There was some improvement noted in school climate, according to the teachers, and some improvement noted as well in student behavior (see Table VIII-26).

We did not receive the post-implementation data from the student surveys for School F, and so were unable to assess the effectiveness of the program on student perceptions of the effectiveness of the implementation of the CVCE model.

e. University team reflections. Among our partner schools, School F had the weakest implementation of the CVCE model. While there was strong administrative support, there were never more than three teachers on the local team. Their reports, though timely, revealed a lack of attention to the details of implementing the project model and instead described more of a superficial, 'trait of the week' approach to character education. Though there was some evidence of attention to the importance of character education at School F, the self-assessments of their efforts focused on activities that, while effective at building community (e.g., retreats, the building of a community softball field, etc.), had little to do with the CVCE model of character education. When we inquired as to how many of the skills they had taught, their report of having taught all 28 skills is clearly a loose interpretation of what the skills are and what teaching them means. Although we did receive completed teacher surveys, there were only three respondents. Furthermore, we did not receive the post-implementation data from the student surveys, and so were unable to assess the effectiveness of the program to the degree that they did implement any of the CVCE model.

**School Site G**

a. Depth of implementation. School G is a Grade 5-8 building in a small city with a growing minority population, particularly Hispanic. School G has a 43% free and reduced lunch population and is largely composed of blue-collar families of low to middle income levels. Character education units were incorporated in their sixth grade advisory, seventh grade general Music class, and the sixth through eighth DCD (developmental cognitive delay) classroom.

The local team consisted of twelve teachers and eight other staff members, including the principal, directly involved in planning and implementing character education lessons/units. The entire implementation affected approximately 420 students. School G focused on five skills in six subjects. The frequency of implementation varied from class to class, as well as did the methods of incorporation into the curriculum. For each unit, the chosen skill was taught daily for 10-15 days. In some classes, "the vocabulary became something that was used daily or as needed to deal with 'teachable moments' in the curriculum or involving interactions between students."

b. Quality of implementation. School G assessed themselves as implementing well. This was evidenced by good attendance at after-school writing workshops that were conducted to give local team members' time and support to incorporate character education into their respective curricula. While School G reported that the students were effectively engaged in the activities related to character education, they admitted ineffective community engagement in the creation and implementation of their approach. The quality of implementation at School G was inevitably enhanced by a number of other related programs, some used in conjunction with the CVCE model. School G received a First

Amendment Schools Grant that they see as somewhat related to character education development. Also, Project Wisdom was used in giving morning announcements, with sayings from the project binder used each morning. Finally, the Boys Town Social Skills Curriculum has been used at School G (and was paid for with CVCE character education funds) which they have found complements well the work of the CVCE project.

c. Number affected. The number of staff involved in the program increased slowly over time, but not as quickly as those invested in the project would have liked. The local staff quantified its accomplishments by the number of lessons/units into which they were "purposefully" able to incorporate character education elements. The local team met once each month for a two-hour dinner meeting. Regarding the level of interest of teachers not on the team, School G reported that those not on the team would ask questions of the local team members. As interest grew, new members were invited to join the group. Personal invitations from local team members proved most effective in adding members to the local team.

d. Perceived impact of implementation. Regarding the local approach to the project, the local team was very satisfied with "the method of presentation to students," but dissatisfied with the difficulty of involving the rest of their colleagues. Twelve of eighty teachers participated in the development and implementation of the project. The hope is that more teachers will be engaged in the coming years. Because we did not receive the completed teacher surveys, nor the post-implementation student survey data, we cannot provide empirical evidence here of School G's teacher satisfaction with the local approach, the teachers' impressions of the CVCE project, nor on its affects on the local student population.

e. University team reflections. School G had some strong leadership and great administrative support. The local team was motivated and excited about implementation. Unfortunately, though their frequent reports to our statewide meetings revealed an appreciation for the intentions of the project and creative attempts at implementation, we did not receive from them the teacher surveys, which assessed the local implementation from their perspective; nor did we receive the post-implementation student survey data. Thus, an empirical assessment of the impact of their implementation (see Section d above) proved impossible.

**School Site H**

a. Depth of implementation. School H is a Grade 5-8 building in a medium-sized city with families ranging from lower to middle class income levels, with a 5% minority population (Hmong, African American, Latino). School H implemented across the curriculum in two eighth grade "houses," which were teams of teachers who taught all subjects to the same group of eighth grade students.

Eight core teachers were directly involved in planning and implementation. Three implemented with direct instruction, "but all of the eighth grade teachers supported it and referred to the skills in their own classes." Character education issues were taught weekly throughout the duration of the year. Approximately 5% of instruction time was devoted to

character education, and School H reported that 330 students were directly involved in such lessons/units.

b. Quality of implementation. The local leader's self-assessment of School H reported that the teachers implemented from adequately to well, and that the local team was satisfied, on the whole, with their local approach to character education. School H also reported that the students were effectively engaged in the character education activities; but admitted that the community was very ineffectively engaged in the planning, development and implementation of the project on the local level.

c. Number affected. The number of staff involved in the project increased over the four-year grant period. The local team quantified their accomplishments by observing student behavior and their ability to articulate the skills and the consequences of students' actions. The local team met once per month and the interest of those teachers who were not working on the project appeared high.

d. Perceived impact of implementation. The local team of School H struggled to involve teachers who did not partake in the teacher training. While there was a wide degree of contentment with the local approach, there was some resistance among those who were not on the local team. Thus, the implementation proved somewhat uneven between "Houses" and subjects. Because we did not receive the completed teacher surveys nor usable student post-test surveys, we cannot provide empirical evidence here of School H's teacher satisfaction with the local approach nor the teachers' impressions of the CVCE project. The effects on the local student population were not measurable because we could not match anonymous post tests with the pretests.

e. University team reflections. The local leader at School H was both responsive and creative. The innovative nature of School H's structure, that of "Houses," which "housed" the eighth graders with the same students and teachers during the course of each term, made it an ideal situation within which to implement the CVCE model. The implementation took the form of curricular infusion, although it was reported that there were teachers in each of the two houses who were resistant to doing the work required preparing and implementing the character education lessons/units. Unfortunately, this resistance within each of the two Houses made the consistency and depth of implementation uneven. We did not receive from School H the teacher surveys, which would have assessed the local implementation from their perspective. We received the post-test surveys but they were anonymous and unmatchable with the pre-test surveys. Thus, an empirical assessment of the impact of their implementation (see Section D above) proved impossible.

In summary, implementation approaches varied across the sties. Differences in local implementation design, leadership, stability of the core team, and demands on teachers, led to differences in depth and quality of implementation and how many were affected. Each of these variables led to differences in perceived impact of the implementation. In the following sections we provide the data for determining the effectiveness of various implementations.

# SECTION VI.
# EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS, PART 2:
# EVALUATION OF MODEL AND MATERIALS

## A. Framework

For this first goal, helping teachers implement character skill instruction in the academic curriculum, we discuss the success of the materials in supporting teachers to do this. We assessed the attainment of this goal with teacher and local leader surveys and reports. The staff surveys are contained in Appendix F. The summary of respondents is listed in Tables VI-1 and Chart VI-1.

In evaluating the materials, there were four aspects we measured, as depicted in Table VI-3 below.

**Table VI-3. Materials Evaluation Framework**

| | QUANTITY | QUALITY |
|---|---|---|
| INPUT | How often were the materials used? | How usable were the materials? |
| OUTPUT | How many used the materials? | Implementation, Effects |

TABLE VI-1 and Chart VI-1together on this page

### B. Input Quantity: Satisfaction with Materials

First, we wanted to gauge how often the materials were used. In order to do this we surveyed the staff at each site about how satisfied they were with the materials (input quantity). We called this variable "Satisfaction with Materials." The data we collected are listed in Table VI-4. The results are listed in Table VI-5.

**Table VI-4. Input Quantity: Satisfaction with Materials**

| | |
|---|---|
| Do the materials require little staff training? | Ease of first time use (Local Leader Report) |
| Are the materials user-friendly? | Number of teachers involved in implementation |
| Are the materials accessible to local school personnel | Number of skills integrated (Staff Survey #12) |
| | Number of classes involved (Staff Survey #13) |
| | Number of academic subjects involved (SS #14) |
| | Ease of use (Staff Survey #9) |

The first thing to notice in TableVI-5 is the variability among the sites. Some sites were more unified in their somewhat positive view of the usability of materials (e.g., Schools A, E, F), averaging between "so-so" and "easy". Schools B and C had more variability and as a group were closer to "so-so". The model is complicated and so we view these responses as an indication that the teacher materials are adequately satisfactory.

TABLE VI-5 on this page

## C. Input Quality: Satisfaction with Model

Second, we wanted to know how usable the materials were (input quality). We called this variable "Satisfaction with Model." Table VI-6 has the list of data collected. Table VI-7 lists the results.

**Table VI-6. Input Quality: Satisfaction with Model**

| | |
|---|---|
| Are the characteristics of the model appreciated? | Staff survey (Staff Survey #6 ) |
| How well characteristics of the model were implemented | Staff survey (Staff Survey #6) |
| Were all processes taught? | Staff survey (Staff Survey #11) |

As indicated in Table VI-7, the model characteristics were well appreciated. On a scale of 1-5, the means ranged from 3.52 - 4.58. However, the appreciation of model characteristics did not transfer directly to their implementation. When asked how well the model characteristics were implemented, scores were much lower, ranging from 2.57-3.71.

TABLE VI-7 on this page

**D. Output Quantity: Frequency of Use**

Third, we wanted to know how many teachers at a site used the materials (output quantity). We called this variable "Frequency of Use." The list of data collected can be seen in Table VI-8. Table VI-9 lists the results.

**Table VI-8. Output Quantity: Frequency of Use**

| | |
|---|---|
| Do the materials interest teachers? | Frequency of use/implementation (SS #10)<br>Plan to use in future (Staff Survey #15) |
| Do the materials interest administrators? | Staff Survey |

As indicated in Table VI-9, the average usage and standard deviation varied among the sites, suggesting that some teachers were using the materials once a week or more while others were using them only a few times a year. In regards to using the materials in the future, there was also variability among the sites. For example, at School A, the majority of respondents plan to use them while at School B, the majority had no plans to use them.

E. Output Quality: Implementation and Effects. Fourth, we wanted to know the quality of implementation and what kind of impact the materials had on students and on the perceptions of the staff. These questions are examined in parts 2 (Section V) and 4 (Section VIII) of the evaluation respectively.

In summary, the materials were considered on average useful across sites. Although the model was well appreciated, the teachers on average reported less satisfaction with their implementation of the model. There was wide variability across sites in plans to continue using the materials.

Table VI-9 on this page

## SECTION VII.
## EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS, PART 3:
## ASSESSMENT TOOLS

CVCE is a skills-based program. As such, proper assessments should be tailored to the particular skills the teacher addresses in instruction and, because each teacher delivers unique instruction, most assessments should be conducted by the teacher at the time instruction is delivered. Each assessment should match the goals of the lessons and be given before and after instruction. The CVCE team was available to help teachers design activity-specific assessments. However, these were not assessed in the final evaluation.

We developed two sets of general tools, one measuring climate and the other measuring general understanding of the processes of ethical sensitivity, judgment, motivation and action. These were created based on theory and prior research, without knowledge of exactly how and what teachers would be teaching.

### A. Variables Measuring Climate

The fourth year was strictly an implementation year during which school site participants implemented their programs and general ethical skill pre and post test data were collected. The CVCE Design Team conducted two types of general assessments.

One type of assessment measured perceptions of school climate in terms of tolerance towards differences, teacher behavior and attitudes, student connection to school and student perceptions of other students' behavior. The full set of variables related to climate are listed below. The items for each scale are listed in Appendix G.[1]

**(1) <u>Observed Ethical Behavior in Peers.</u>** This scale measures student perceptions of their peers' ethical behaviors. Pretest and posttest scores can range from 200 to 40. Gain scores can range from -160 to 160. Higher scores indicate that students are observing more ethical behaviors in their peers. A separate data set from students not used in the pre-post analysis indicated a Cronbach alpha of .95 (n=412). The pretest data indicated a Cronbach's alpha of .95. There are four general areas of ethical behaviors. In a factor analysis that included all test items, these four areas hung together as one factor:

a. Sensitivity behaviors (scale/index from 11 items)
b. Judgment behaviors (from 8 items)
c. Motivation behaviors (from 12 items)
d. Action behaviors (from 9 items)

**(2) <u>Student Feelings toward and Perceptions of Teachers and School</u>.** This is a 15-item scale that measures a student's perception of and feelings toward the teacher's behavior in the classroom. Pretest and posttest scores can range from 15 to 75. Gain scores range from -60 to 60. Higher scores indicate a greater perception of an ethical classroom according to our criteria. A separate data set from students not used in the pre-post analysis indicated a

[1] The Ethical Sensitivity Scale, a new scale, was also included in the test packet, as can be seen in Appendix G. However, most students did so poorly on this measure that we do not include it in the descriptions or analyses.

Cronbach alpha of .88 (n=412). Pretest Cronbach's alpha = .88. Questions on the scale ask about 4 general areas:

a. Teacher expectations for student behavior
b. Teacher openness
c. Student connectedness to school
d. Student perceptions of teacher's connectedness to student

**(3) <u>Perceived Tolerance of Staff</u>**. This 8-item scale measures how fairly the students think the staff at their school treats the following groups of people.

a. Intolerance toward boys
b. Intolerance toward girls
c. Intolerance toward different races
d. Intolerance toward different cultures
e. Intolerance toward disabilities
f. Intolerance toward different religions
g. Intolerance toward students who are overweight
h. Intolerance toward students who look different

Pretest and post-test scores range from 8 to 24. Gain scores range from -16 to 16. Higher scores indicate student perception of greater fairness in how groups of students are treated by school staff. A separate data set from students not used in the pre-post analysis indicated a Cronbach alpha of .91 (n=412). Pretest Cronbach's alpha =. 92.

**(4) <u>Perceived Tolerance of Students</u>.** This 8-item scale measures how fairly the students think other students at their school treats the following groups of people:

a. Intolerance toward boys
b. Intolerance toward girls
c. Intolerance toward different races
d. Intolerance toward different cultures
e. Intolerance toward disabilities
f. Intolerance toward different religions
g. Intolerance toward students who are overweight
h. Intolerance toward students who look different

Pretest and post-test scores range from 8 to 24. Gain scores range from -16 to 16. Higher scores indicate student perception of greater fairness in how groups of students are treated by other students. A separate data set from students not used in the pre-post analysis indicated a Cronbach alpha of .89 (n=412). Pretest Cronbach's alpha = .88.

## B. Variables Measuring Effects on Students

The second type of general assessment was of student attitudes and self-reported behaviors that we believe should be affected by successful character education programs generally. We knew that each school site was adapting and implementing the CVCE model in a unique fashion. We knew that it would be difficult to find effects because of the variability in implementation. We did not tell them what they had to teach, how often, or how much.

These were local decisions. Nevertheless, we tested for global effects on students. The list of variables tested are listed and then described below, along with reliability estimates.

**(1) Ethical Sensitivity**.

**a. Concern for Others.** This 10-item scale from the Child Development Project measures student caring for others and their desire to help others. Items include "When I see someone having a problem, I want to help" and "When I hear about people who are sad and lonely, I want to do something to help." Pretest and post-test scores can range from 10 to 50. Gain scores can range from -40 to 40. Previous reliability estimates range from .74 to .81 (Developmental Studies Center, 1996). A separate data set from students not used in the pre-post analysis indicated a Cronbach alpha of .81 (n=412). Pretest Cronbach's alpha = .83.

**Concern for Others Scale**

I care about my family and my friends; other people can take care of themselves.
Problems in other parts of the world are no concern of mine.
People should work out their own problems by themselves.
When I hear about people who are sad or lonely, I want to do something to help.
Most people who ask for help are just being lazy.
When I see someone having a problem, I want to help.
I should just take care of myself and let others take care of themselves.
Everybody has enough problems of their own without worrying about other people's problems.
A student has enough schoolwork to do without worrying about other students' work.
People should look after themselves and not try to solve other people's problems.

**b. Interpersonal Knowledge.** A separate data set from students not used in the pre-post analysis indicated a Cronbach alpha of .09 (n=412). Pretest Chronbach alpha = .069. Because the alpha was so low, we did not use this scale in the evaluation of effects.

**Interpersonal Knowledge Scale**

People express emotions the same way.
You should say exactly what you feel.
If there is a conflict, you should try to hear everyone's side of the story.
A person's cultural background affects the way they notice things.
Every person can identify with many different cultures.
Our community has lots of diversity.
There is usually one right way to resolve a conflict between two people.
Most actions have both short-term and long-term consequences.

## (2) Ethical Reasoning

**a. Global Judgment.** Global Judgment measures moral reasoning. This measure is based on the Defining Issues Test (Rest, 1979) and Defining Issues Test-2 (Rest & Narvaez, 1998). The participant first reads a short moral dilemma. The participant is then asked to state what the person in the dilemma should do. Next, five reasoning statements are presented, which are of different developmental levels (ranging from an egocentric perspective, "are you willing to take the risk?" to a society-wide perspective, "should you follow the law?"). The participant is asked to (1) rate how important each of these reasoning statements are in making their decision about what to do and (2) rank the two most important statements in making their decision. A scoring system was devised that gives more weight to ranking of the society-wide reasoning statements and less weight to the egocentric reasoning statements. Pretest and post-test scores can range from 3 to 8. Gain scores can range from -5 to 5. Though it is not possible to measure internal reliability with this measure, we can measure test-retest reliability of the two different forms used, one form was used for pretest and the other for post-test. A correlation between the two forms in a sample of 34 college students was .76.

## (3) Ethical Motivation and Identity

**a. Citizenship.** This 12-item scale measures one factor we call citizenship. It is a student self-report on issues of honesty, trustworthiness, rule following, conscientiousness. Items include: “You should be on time to school or appointment” and “It is important to support those who are following the rules.” Pretest and post-test scores range from 12 to 60. Gain scores range from -48 to 48. Previous research with high school and college students has found reliability of .93. For our pilot study (n=78), we found a Cronbach alpha of .89. A separate data set from students not used in the pre-post analysis indicated a Cronbach alpha of .92 (n=412). The pretest Cronbach's alpha = .92.

**Citizenship Scale**

You should be on time to school or appointments**.**
It is important to support those who are following the rules.
You should think of the consequences of your actions before you do something.
It is important for you to warn people when things are broken.
It is important for you to be honest with teachers.
It is important for you to return things you borrow.
You should work hard to reach your goals.
It is important to do what your teachers expect of you.
You should participate in your class activities.
It is important for you to help the homeless.
It is important to encourage others to do their share of work.
You should report crime to an adult.

**b. Community Bonding.** This 14-item scale measures one factor we call community bonding. It is a student self-report on issues of feeling care from and feeling close to political-social groups such as the city and neighborhood (not family or friends). Items include" "People in my city care about me" and "I feel close to people in my country." Pretest and post-test scores can range from 14 to 70. Gain scores can range from -56 to 56. In previous research, students with high scores were less likely to engage in risky behaviors (Narvaez, Gardner, & Mitchell, 2000). Previous research has found reliability of .93 with high school and college students. A separate data set from students not used in the pre-post analysis indicated a Cronbach alpha of .91 (n=412). Pretest Cronbach's alpha = .92.

**Community Bonding Scale**

1. My community needs me
2. I feel close to people in my school.
3. I feel close to people in my neighborhood.
4. I feel close to people in my city.
5. I feel close to people in my state.
6. I feel close to people in my country.
7. I feel close to people of my sex.
8. I feel close to my age group.
9. All kinds of people care about me.
10. People in my School Care about me
11. People in my neighborhood care about me.
12. People in my city care about me.
13. People in my state care about me.
14. People in my country care about me.

**c. Ethical Identity.** This 15-item scale measures two factors, responsibility and commitment to goodness. It is a student self-report on issues of being a good person and taking responsibility. Items include: "It doesn't matter whether you are good or bad" and "Being a good person at school is important to me." Pretest and post-test scores can range from 15 to 75. Gain scores can range from -60 to 60. Previous research has found an alpha reliability of .95 with high school and college students. In our pilot study (n=73), we found a Cronbach alpha of .83. A separate data set from students not used in the pre-post analysis indicated a Cronbach alpha of .87 (n=412). The pretest data showed Cronbach's alpha to be .86.

**Ethical Identity Scale**

Being a good person at school is important to me.
People at school think I'm a good person.
Being a good person at home is important to me.
People at home think I am a good person.
I know what it means to be a good person at home.
I am a good person at home.
I am a good person with my friends.
I agree with most of my friends on what it is to be a good person.
It doesn't matter whether you are good or bad.
I do what my friends do.
I have rules for myself that I follow.
I behave badly.
When things go wrong, it's other people's fault.
How often do you do a good job on your homework?
How often do you tell the truth?

**(4) Ethical Action**

**a. Assertiveness.** This scale consists of 10 items that measure assertive behaviors that the student engages in. Items include "For the good of the group I speak up" and "When friends ask me to do something wrong, I say no." Pretest and post-test scores can range from 10 to 50. Gain scores can range from -40 to 40. A separate data set from students not used in the pre-post analysis indicated a Cronbach alpha of .75 (n=412). Pretest Cronbach's alpha = .75.

**Assertiveness Scale**

I let other people my age make decisions for me.
If someone my age takes something that is mine, I let them keep it.
If someone my age makes fun of me, I let them.
I go along with the stuff my friends do, even if I know it's wrong.
I give in to what other people my age want.
I express my opinions about what is fair.
For the good of the group, I speak up.
If someone my age tells me I'm dumb, I tell them to stop it.
I don't let people my age push me around.
When I make a mistake, I say so.

**b. Peer Refusal.** These items measure the individual's assertiveness in the face of peer pressure. The scale consists of 2 items: "When friends ask me to do something wrong, I say no" and "I go along with the stuff my friends do even if I know it's wrong." In our pilot

study we found a Cronbach alpha of .83. However, a separate data set from students not used in the pre-post analysis indicated a Cronbach alpha of .49 (n=412). Furthermore in the pretest, Cronbach alpha was only .47. Because the alpha was so low, we did not use this scale in the evaluation of effects.

**Peer Refusal**

When friends ask me to do something wrong, I say no.
I go along with the stuff my friends do even if I know it's wrong.

**c. Prosocial Responsibility.** This 11-item scale measures one factor we call prosocial responsibility. The scale is a student self-report on issues of relating to others in a non-self-centered, considerate way. Items include "You should lie to your friends" and "You should speak badly of people who are different from you." Pretest and post-test scores range from 11 to 55. Gain scores range from -44 to 44. Previous research has found reliability of .97. A separate data set from students not used in the pre-post analysis indicated a Cronbach alpha of .93 (n=412). Pretest Cronbach alpha = .93. However, it turned out to be difficult to determine how sincere the students were in completing this scale, as it sometimes looked as if the students were being silly or smart alecky in their answers. As a result, we decided not to include this scale in the final analysis.

**Prosocial Responsibility Scale**

You should take things that belong to others.
You should lie to your friends.
It is important to take up other people's time for what you want.
You should eat more food than your share.
You should speak badly of people who are different from you.
You should speak badly of friends behind their backs.
You should hit people when they bother you.
You should be noisy while your family is sleeping.
You should make fun of your friends when they make mistakes.
You should give up when a problem is hard to solve.
You should take as much as you want even if it is more than your share.

**d. Prosocial Risk-Taking.** This scale measures the willingness of the individual to take a risk to help someone else. The two items are: "I risk getting hurt in order to help someone I don't know" and "I will risk getting hurt in order to help a friend." In our pilot study (n=78), we found a Cronbach alpha of .72. However, a separate data set from students not used in the pre-post analysis indicated a Cronbach alpha of .34 (n=412). Furthermore, the pretest data indicated a Cronbach alpha of .34. Because the alpha was so low, we did not use this scale in the evaluation of effects.

**Prosocial Risk-Taking**

I risk getting hurt in order to help someone I don't know.
I will risk getting hurt in order to help a friend.
I am afraid to be the only one who does something.

## SECTION VIII. EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS, PART 4: STATISTICAL ANALYSES OF PERCEPTIONS OF CLIMATE AND EFFECTS ON STUDENTS

### A. Participants

The **experimental group** consisted of 5 schools that used the CVCE model and materials to teach character education in their school. See Table VIII-1.

**Table VIII-1. Number of Participants with Complete Survey Data by School[1] (N=276)**

| | School A | School B | School C | School D | School E |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of participants | 69 | 110 | 18 | 60 | 19 |
| Grade-levels of participants | 7, 8, 9 | 7, 8 | 8 | 6, 7, 8 | 9 |

[1] Schools F, G, and H did not submit complete pre-post tests.

Note: We were able to obtain only five fairly complete sets of pre- and post-tests from five partnership schools. The schools with incomplete sets had shifts in leadership, introducing a lack of oversight in ensuring matched pre- and post-tests.

The **control group** (School I) consisted of staff who did not receive training in nor use the CVCE framework before or during data collection (N=125, grades 6, 7, 8).

### B. Preliminary Analyses

The set of schools in our project, including the control group, were volunteers so we had no control over preexisting baseline differences. As we expected differences, we tested for baseline differences among our experimental and control sites. Analysis of baseline scores revealed school differences. As a result we followed Weinfurt (2000) who, for quasi-experimental designs with baseline group differences, recommends using gain score analyses. Thus, we examined differences in gain scores between the experimental and control groups. Gain scores were computed by subtracting the pre-test scores from the post-test scores. Hence, positive scores indicate a gain in the dependent measure, and negative scores indicate a decrease in the dependent measure.

Multivariate analyses (MANOVA) were used to compare the experimental and control groups' gain scores. MANOVAs have two advantages. First, they take into account correlations among the school climate and individual student variables (see Tables VIII-2 and VIII-3 below), significant correlations are indeed present among many of the variables. Second, multivariate analyses control for Type I error *when there is no significant multivariate effect present* (Weinfurt, 1995). If there is a significant multivariate effect present, it is recommended that Bonferroni corrections are used in tests of the individual dependent variables to adjust for inflated Type I error (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001; Weinfurt, 1995).

**Table VIII-2. Correlations among the School climate variables from pretest data (N=500)**

| | Staff Tolerance | Student Tolerance | Observed Ethical Behavior | Student Feelings |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Staff Tolerance | 1.000 | .473** | .242** | .272** |
| Student Tolerance | | 1.000 | .313** | .180** |
| Observed Ethical Behavior | | | 1.000 | .383** |
| Student Feelings | | | | 1.000 |

** Correlation is significant at the p<.01 level (2-tailed).

**Table VIII-3. Correlations among the individual student variables from pretest data (N=470).**

| | Moral Reasoning | Concern for Others | Community Bonding | Citizenship | Prosocial Responsibility | Assertiveness | Ethical Identity |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Moral Reasoning | 1.000 | .010 | -.018 | -.056 | -.004 | .000 | -.023 |
| Concern for Others | | 1.000 | .270** | .373** | .398** | .341** | .391** |
| Community Bonding | | | 1.000 | .493** | .198** | .281** | .444** |
| Citizenship | | | | 1.000 | .564** | .508** | .669** |
| Assertiveness | | | | | 1.000 | .592** | |
| Ethical Identity | | | | | | 1.000 | |

** Correlation is significant at the p<.01 level (2-tailed).

For each planned analysis, the multivariate test results were examined. If the MANOVA had a non-significant overall effect, t-tests with a significance level of p<.10 were employed for follow-up comparisons of each dependent variable. If the MANOVA had a significant overall effect (p<.05), individual t-tests with Bonferroni corrections (p<.10/(# of tests)) were employed. For all of the follow-up comparisons of the dependent variables, one-tail tests were used due to the fact that we expect only one of the group (the experimental) to have increases in their gain scores. Thus, a significance level of p<.10 was used versus the standard two-tailed significant level of p<.05 (except in those cases with Bonferroni corrections).

The results are presented below in two sections: (1) results across schools, merging the experimental groups and comparing it to the control group, and (2) results by each school, comparing each experimental school to the control school. Two MANOVAs were conducted for the analyses across schools and the analyses by school. One MANOVA included the School climate variables: Perceived Tolerance of Staff, Perceived Tolerance of Students, Observed Ethical Behavior in Peers, and Student Feelings Toward and Perceptions of Teachers & Students. The second MANOVA included the individual student variables: Global Judgment, Concern for Others, Community Bonding, Citizenship, Assertiveness, and Ethical Identity.

## C. Results Across Schools

The school climate and individual student variables were analyzed across schools, with experimental/control group as the independent variable. Neither MANOVA test, shown in Table VIII-4, was statistically significant. Tables VIII-5 and VIII-6 show the results of the t-tests. One variable was significant: Perceived Tolerance of Students, t(1,433) = -2.151, p<.05 (eta squared=.011). The means and standard deviations for Perceived Tolerance of Students were -.838 (4.598) for the experimental group and .1769 (4.276) for the control group. The experimental group showed a decrease in their perception of student tolerance, with the control group showing an increase. A possible interpretation of this finding may be that increased sensitivity of intolerance for the experimental group may lead the students to reporting lower levels of tolerance in the post-test than the pre-test.

**Table VIII-4. MANOVA results across schools for school climate variables and for individual student variables using Hotelling's Trace F statistic.**

| | Hotelling's Trace F |
|---|---|
| School climate variables | 1.846 |
| Individual student variables | 1.488 |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, ***p<.01, ****p<.001

**Table VIII-5. T-test results for each school climate variable across schools: Dependent variables with t statistic.**

| School climate Variables | t |
|---|---|
| Perceived Tolerance of Staff | -1.395 |
| Perceived Tolerance of Students | -2.151** |
| Observed Ethical Behavior in Peers | .850 |
| Student Feelings Toward and Perceptions of Teachers and Students | -.469 |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, ***p<.01, ****p<.001

**Table VIII-6. T-test results for each student variable across schools: Dependent variables with t statistic.**

| Individual Student Variables | t |
|---|---|
| Global Judgment | -.522 |
| Concern for Others | 1.394 |
| Community Bonding | 1.221 |
| Citizenship | .032 |
| Assertiveness | -1.109 |
| Ethical Identity | -.726 |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, ***p<.01, ****p<.001

## D. Results by School

The following results are of the analyses conducted for each school, in which each experimental school was compared with the control school. Results from the MANOVAs and follow-up comparisons of the dependent variables are provided in the following five sections.

### School A (experimental) and School I (control)

The results of the MANOVAs are shown in Table VIII-7. One MANOVA was statistically significant: Individual student variables, $F(7,172) = 3.157$, $p<.01$. Thus, a Bonferroni correction ($p<.014$) was used for the planned comparisons of each student variable. The results of the t-tests are shown in Tables VIII-8 and VIII-9. Two variables were statistically significant: Student Feelings Toward and Perceptions of Teachers & Students, $t(1,199) = 1.771$, $p<.10$ (eta squared=.017); Concern for Others, $t(1,192) = 3.794$, $p<.001$ (eta squared=.097). For Student Feelings Toward and Perceptions of Teachers & Students, the means and standard deviations of the experimental and control group were 6.815 (16.522) and 3.242 (10.797) respectively. Both groups showed gains; however, the experimental group showed a significantly larger gain. For Concern for Others, the means and standard deviations of the experimental and control groups were 1.300 (7.099) and -2.648 (7.235) respectively. The experimental group showed gains for this variable with the control group showing decreases.

**Table VIII-7. MANOVA results of School A and I for school climate variables and for individual student variables using Hotelling's Trace F statistic.**

| | Hotelling's Trace F |
|---|---|
| School climate variables | 1.480 |
| Individual student variables | 3.157*** |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, ***p<.01, ****p<.001

**Table VIII-8. T-test results of School A and I for school climate variables: Dependent variables with t statistic.**

| School climate Variables | t |
|---|---|
| Perceived Tolerance of Staff | -.993 |
| Perceived Tolerance of Students | -1.094 |
| Observed Ethical Behavior in Peers | .681 |
| Student Feelings Toward and Perceptions of Teachers and Students | 1.771** |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, ***p<.01, ****p<.001

**Table VIII-9. T-test results of School A and I for student variables: Dependent variables with t statistic.**

| Individual Student Variables | t |
|---|---|
| Global Judgment | -.818 |
| Concern for Others | 3.795**** |
| Community Bonding | 1.663 |
| Citizenship | 1.213 |
| Assertiveness | .029 |
| Ethical Identity | 1.183 |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, ***p<.01, ****p<.001

School A reported teaching all ethical skills both in advisory periods and in academic units across the curriculum. One would expect to see more significant gains in comparison to the control group for all variables than what was found here. Nonetheless, the significant gains shown in the two variables, Concern for Others and For Student Feelings Toward and Perceptions of Teachers & Students, indicate that School A's implementation of the CVCE model had a positive effect on students.

## School B (experimental) and School I (control)

The MANOVA test results are shown in Table VIII-10. One MANOVA was significant, the Individual student variables F(7,211) = 2,899, p<.01. Thus, the planned comparisons for these variables used a Bonferroni correction of p<.014. The results of the individual t-tests are shown in Tables VIII-11 and VIII-12. One variable was statistically significant: Assertiveness, t (1,234) = -2.506, p<.01 (eta squared = .04). The means and standard deviations for the experimental and control groups were -2.032 (7.895) and -4.505 (7.177) respectively. Both groups showed decreases. However, the experimental group had a smaller decrease than the control group.

**Table VIII-10. MANOVA results of School B and I for school climate variables and individual student variables using Hotelling's Trace F statistic.**

| | Hotelling's Trace F |
|---|---|
| School climate variables | 2.206 |
| Individual student variables | 2.899*** |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, ***p<.01, ****p<.001

**Table VIII-11. T-test results of School B and I for each school climate variable: Dependent variables with t statistic.**

| School climate Variables | t |
|---|---|
| Perceived Tolerance of Staff | -1.094 |
| Perceived Tolerance of Students | -.959 |
| Observed Ethical Behavior in Peers | 1.427 |
| Student Feelings Toward and Perceptions of Teachers and Students | -1.199 |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, ***p<.01, ****p<.001

**Table VIII-12. T-test results of School B and I for each student variable: Dependent variables with t statistic.**

| Individual Student Variables | t |
|---|---|
| Global Judgment | .134 |
| Concern for Others | -1.050 |
| Community Bonding | .604 |
| Citizenship | -.846 |
| Assertiveness | -2.506*** |
| Ethical Identity | -1.701 |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, ***p<.01, ****p<.001

School B reported teaching 15 different ethical skills, covering some from each ethical process. The skills were taught mostly in advisory, with some being taught in English and Health classes. The results from the student questionnaires described above indicate that some skills may have been negatively affected (i.e., assertiveness). We know from teacher surveys that there was considerable resistance to implementing character education as the local team designed (see Section V discussion).

## School C (experimental) and School I (control)

The MANOVA results are shown in Table VIII-13. Both tests were significantly significant: school climate variables, $F(4,142) = 2.939$, $p<.05$; Individual student variables, $F(7,129) = 2.092$, $p<.05$. Hence, Bonferroni corrections were used for both sets of follow-up comparisons of the dependent variables. The results of the individual t-tests are shown in Tables VIII-14 and VIII-15. Two variables were significantly significant: Perceived Tolerance of Students, $t(1,147) = -2.869$, $p<.10$ (eta squared = .051) and Concern for Others, $t(1,145) = 3.107$, $p<.10$ (eta squared = .064). For Perceived Tolerance of Students, the means and standard deviations of the experimental group were -2.895 (4.909). The means and standard deviations of the control group were .177 (4.276). The experimental group showed decreases in Perceived Tolerance of Students with the control group showing gains. A possible interpretation of this finding may be that increased sensitivity of intolerance for the experimental group may lead the students to reporting lower levels of tolerance in the post-test than the pre-test. For Concern for Others, the means and standard deviations of the experimental and control group were 2.737 (5.566) and -2.648 (7.235) respectively. The experimental group showed increases in Concern for Others whereas the control group showed decreases.

**Table VIII-13. MANOVA results of School C and I for school climate variables and for individual student variables using Hotelling's Trace F statistic.**

| | Hotelling's Trace F |
|---|---|
| School climate variables | 2.939** |
| Individual student variables | 2.092** |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, ***p<.01, ****p<.001

**Table VIII-14. T-test results of School C and I for each school climate variable: Dependent variables with t statistic.**

| School climate Variables | t |
|---|---|
| Perceived Tolerance of Staff | .036 |
| Perceived Tolerance of Students | -2.869* |
| Observed Ethical Behavior in Peers | -1.160 |
| Student Feelings Toward and Perceptions of Teachers and Students | 1.069 |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, ***p<.01, ****p<.001

**Table VIII-15. T-test results of School C and I for each student variable: Dependent variables with t statistic.**

| Individual Student Variables | t |
|---|---|
| Global Judgment | -.924 |
| Concern for Others | 3.107* |
| Community Bonding | 1.906 |
| Citizenship | 1.431 |
| Assertiveness | 1.964 |
| Ethical Identity | .931 |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, ***p<.01, ****p<.001

School C's implementation of the CVCE model emphasized ethical sensitivity. Of the seven skills that were taught, six were within the ethical sensitivity process. The significant results described above for Concern for Others indicate that the school's work in ethical sensitivity had a positive effect on students.

## School D (experimental) and School I (control)

The results of the MANOVA tests are shown in Table VIII-16. One test was significantly significant: school climate variables, $F(4,182) = 2.908$, $p<.05$. Thus, Bonferroni corrections were used for these variables in the follow-up comparisons. The individual t-test results are shown in Tables VIII-17 and VIII-18. Only one variable was statistically significant: Perceived Tolerance of Students, $t(1,199) = -2.604$, $p<.01$ (eta squared = .035). The means and standard deviations for the experimental and control groups were -1.633 (4.819) and .177 (4.276) respectively. The control group showed a slight gain in Perceived Tolerance of Students with the experimental group showing decreases. A possible interpretation of this finding may be that increased sensitivity of intolerance for the experimental group may lead the students to reporting lower levels of tolerance in the post-test than the pre-test.

**Table VIII-16. MANOVA results of School D and I for school climate variables and for individual student variables using Hotelling's Trace F statistic.**

| | Hotelling's Trace F |
|---|---|
| School climate variables | 2.908** |
| Individual student variables | .924 |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, ***p<.01, ****p<.001

**Table VIII-17. T-test results of School D and I for each school climate variable: Dependent variables with t statistic.**

| School climate Variables | t |
|---|---|
| Perceived Tolerance of Staff | -1.782 |
| Perceived Tolerance of Students | -2.604*** |
| Observed Ethical Behavior in Peers | .047 |
| Student Feelings Toward and Perceptions of Teachers and Students | -2.008 |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, ***p<.01, ****p<.001

**Table VIII-18. T-test results of School D and I for each student variable: Dependent variables with t statistic.**

| Individual Student Variables | t |
|---|---|
| Global Judgment | -.634 |
| Concern for Others | .433 |
| Community Bonding | .301 |
| Citizenship | -.569 |
| Assertiveness | -.710 |
| Ethical Identity | -1.567 |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, ***p<.01, ****p<.001

School D reported teaching all ethical skills in advisory periods and in academic units across the curriculum. One would expect to see more significant gains in comparison to the control group for all variables than what was found here. Nonetheless, the significant results found for Perceived Tolerance of students may indicate that School D's implementation of the CVCE model had a positive effect on students in some manner.

## School E (experimental) and School I (control)

Neither MANOVA test, shown in Table VIII-19, were statistically significant. Tables VIII-20 and VIII-21 show the results of the t-tests. Only one variable was statistically significant, Student Feelings Toward and Perceptions of Teachers and Students, $t(1,145) = -1.988$, $p<.05$ (eta squared=.027). The means and standard deviations were -1.895 (8.178) for the experimental group and 3.242 (10.797) for the control group. The experimental group showed a decrease, with the control group showing an increase in feelings towards teachers and students.

**Table VIII-19. MANOVA results of School E and I for school climate variables and for individual student variables using Hotelling's Trace F statistic.**

| | Hotelling's Trace F |
|---|---|
| School climate variables | 1.405 |
| Individual student variables | .187 |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, ***p<.01, ****p<.001

**Table VIII-20. T-test results of School E and I for each school climate variable: Dependent variables with t statistic.**

| School climate Variables | t |
|---|---|
| Perceived Tolerance of Staff | -.475 |
| Perceived Tolerance of Students | -1.077 |
| Observed Ethical Behavior in Peers | .369 |
| Student Feelings Toward and Perceptions of Teachers and Students | -1.988** |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, ***p<.01, ****p<.001

**Table VIII-21. T-test results of School E and I for each student variable: Dependent variables with t statistic.**

| Individual Student Variables | t |
|---|---|
| Global Judgment | -.204 |
| Concern for Others | .484 |
| Community Bonding | -.026 |
| Citizenship | .142 |
| Assertiveness | -.038 |
| Ethical Identity | -.027 |

* p<.10, ** p<.05, ***p<.01, ****p<.001

According to their report, teachers at School E taught eighteen ethical skills, which were covered in eight different academic classes. The results from the student questionnaires described above do not indicate that the skills they reportedly taught had any effect.

## E. Perceived Impact of Implementation

The perceived impact of implementation was measured with the data that we collected from both the students and staff.

**Student survey**. Student perceptions of tolerance of their peers and tolerance of staff were measured by gain scores from the student questionnaire (pre-test score subtracted from the post-test score). In Table VIII-22, tolerance of peers as perceived by students, averaged across schools, decreased slightly. Tolerance of staff across schools also decreased slightly. In Table VIII-23, the averaged perceived tolerance of students and perceived tolerance of staff for each school all showed decreases with the exception of School C for tolerance of staff, showing a very slight increase. A possible interpretation of the negative gain scores may be that increased sensitivity towards intolerance may lead the students to report lower levels of tolerance in the post-test than the pre-test.

Table VIII-22 here

Table VIII-23 here

**Staff survey**. The impact of implementation as perceived by the school staff was measured with data from the staff survey. Table VIII-24 describes the staff survey participation data. In Table VIII-25, the staff, averaged across all schools, perceived "a little" or "some" improvement in both the school climate and in student behavior. Looking at each school's perceptions in Table VIII-26, there is some variability among the sites. Schools A, B, E, and F averaged between "a little" and "some" perceived improvement in climate. School D perceived more improvement in climate than the other schools, averaging between "some" and "a little." For improvement in student behavior, all schools had an average at or close to "some" improvement. Looking at the variability of responses within schools, the staff at School B had the most varied responses for perceived improvement in student behavior, ranging from "not at all" to "a lot."

Table VIII-24 here

Table VIII-25 here

Table VIII-26 here

**Staff perceptions of effects on climate and students.** The staff's perception of specific effects on climate and student behavior across schools, shown in Table VIII-27, varied quite a bit. The specific effect that most staff perceived (50%) was on improved discipline policies. Between 30% and 40% of the staff across schools reported improved student and teacher attitudes toward school, increased sense of community and school pride, wider community involvement, and decreased student misbehavior in class. The specific effects that not many staff perceived (20% or less) included decreased detentions, suspensions, student and teacher absenteeism and increased student volunteerism and parent involvement.

Looking at staff perceptions of specific effects on climate and student behavior by site in Table VIII-28, similar patterns as those described across schools hold for Schools B, D, E, and F.

School A showed a slightly different pattern. More staff at School A perceived an increased sense of community (83%), improvement in student and teacher attitudes toward school (67% and 50% respectively), increased student volunteerism (50%) and wider community involvement (50%).

Table VIII-27 here

Table VIII-28 here

# SECTION IX.
# EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS,
# PART 5: REPLICABILITY

A simple definition of replicability is "successful implementation in more than one school" (from the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration). Such a definition assumes that what is being implemented is and must be identical across sites. This is contrary to the approach taken in our project. Instead, the emphasis here was on local control and local adaptation of the research-based model of character and pedagogy. Replicability here does not refer to identical implementation but instead to the replicability of the process and the general features of the model. The CVCE model provides a roadmap of character and a developmentally-oriented pedagogy. The local team is at liberty to follow the roadmap in a way that is suitable to the local situation.

Instead of addressing a simple view of replicability, we ask questions like: Was the model communicable (clearly laid out, understandable by teachers, and grasped as intended)? Did teachers find the materials useful? Were teachers able to teach character skills during standards-driven academic instruction? Was it possible for teachers to implement the model and materials with minimal supervision? Was the model adaptable to local needs and circumstances? Could local teams involve community members in implementation? Were schools able to match their efforts with successful implementation? Was the model followed? And we ask broader questions like: What are the costs and benefits of the CVCE model? Is the model sustainable?

## A. Was the model communicable (clearly laid out, understandable by teachers, and grasped as intended)?

Yes, based on the successful implementation of the model at several schools, we think the model was clearly communicated. Although one local team seemed not to grasp the differences between the CVCE model and trait approaches to character education, this was the exception, and appeared to be related to local circumstances rather than to the model itself. Second, teachers indicated in the staff surveys an appreciation of the model. Third, the teacher-created lesson plans indicated an understanding of the intentions of the model.

## B. Did teachers find the materials useful?

Yes, according to the staff surveys, the materials were considered user-friendly and helpful in facilitating the teaching of character development. Moreover, throughout the course of the project, the local teams expressed appreciation for the evolution in clarity and organization of the materials, and for the degree to which they felt well heard throughout that process.

**C. Were teachers able to integrate character skills into standards-driven academic instruction?**

Yes, based on the lesson plans teachers created in virtually every subject matter area (Appendix D), we think that teachers were able to integrate character skills development into standards-driven academic instruction.

**D. Was it possible for teachers to implement the model and materials with minimal supervision?**

Yes, based on the teacher-created lesson plans, the local team and local leader reports, we believe it was possible in general.

**E. Was the model adaptable to local needs and circumstances?**

Yes, all sites adapted the model to local conditions. The model was replicated across sites to different degrees and in different manners. As mentioned previously, there were three types of implementation: teaching skills during advisory period, teaching skills during academic courses, and teaching skills through school-wide projects. Each site selected its own combinatorial approach.

**F. Could local teams involve community members in implementation?**

Yes, several teams did involve community members. But this was a challenge for many teams and may require more guidance.

**G. Were schools able to match their efforts with successful implementation?**

Yes, several schools were able to match their efforts with successful implementation. Overall however, according to self-reports, while local teams were satisfied with the model they were less satisfied with their implementations. It is not clear why their enthusiasm was greater than their implementations but we can surmise that time was a factor in the ability to make the adaptations necessary for infusion into academic instruction. Also, like any new program, the initial excitement did not always lead to the hard work of a robust implementation.

**H. Was the model followed?**

Yes, the key features of the model were largely followed by most sites. Most teams viewed character as a set of ethical skills derived from four processes. According to the lesson plans teachers devised, most sites did use a novice-to-expert approach to teach character skills. Most sites at least attempted to involve the community in planning and implementation in one way or another, although outcomes were mixed. It is not clear how empowered the students felt as we did not ask this question. Yet, many sites posted the posters that contained the key question for students: “Who should I be?”

**I. What are the costs and benefits of the CVCE model?**

There are monetary costs and time costs. There are time costs to the school day and time costs to the teacher. First, minimal training was needed for local teams (we gave one or two-day workshops, on average), which kept monetary and time costs down. (Although some teams may have benefited from more training, they were not always proactive in asking for help even though the University Design Team made itself available for assistance throughout the project.)

Second, unlike other programs, the CVCE model is not an add-on program that must be fit into the jam-packed school day. So there was minimal cost to the school day. Instead, the skills are taught during academic instruction by adjusting lessons to emphasize one or more character skills.

Third, local teams had to spend time figuring out how they were going to integrate character skill instruction into their teaching. This was a time cost. The materials developed by the University Design Team offered many ideas that made this exercise more manageable. However, the local team members were required to take the time to flesh out the ideas that fit into their regular academic lessons and then implement the revised lessons.

**J. Is the model sustainable?**

Yes, many teachers are likely to continue teaching character skills in their regular classrooms. Sustainability involves the actions of the teacher—what is he or she likely to do in the future—and the model's relation to other character education approaches. First, one of the reasons the CVCE model is designed as it is was to avoid the shelving problem (teachers using an add-on curriculum once or twice then putting it on the shelf to collect dust). Instead, CVCE focused on altering the teacher's approach to his or her curriculum in a permanent way. According to this approach, once the teacher adjusts her own teaching to incorporate character skill development, future teaching is affected. As a result, teaching character skills is infused into what is regularly taught. Many teachers indicated in the staff survey that they definitely plan to use the materials in the future, providing evidence that our approach of permanent change is sustainable.

Second, the model easily integrates and broadens other character education approaches. Several sites used other character education curricula in conjunction with the CVCE implementation. Several school partners used the CVCE model along with other programs, for example, the Boys Town Social Skills Curriculum (now called the "Girls and Boys Town Education Model"), the "Respect Initiative", "Stop and Think", and other national and local character education programs. Also, various school projects and breakout initiatives, such as retreats and rallies, can be integrated into the CVCE model. (See a description at: http://fairmontsentinel.com/news/stories/060801a.html).

**K. Advantages of the CVCE model.**

There are several advantages to the model that must be pointed out. First, the implementation is locally controlled. This allows for adaptations that are unforeseeable by a curriculum writer and for maximum flexibility.

Second, there are multiple ways to implement the model; it is not a recipe per se. The CVCE approach is not a program that is imposed on the teacher. Rather, the CVCE approach provides a framework within which a teacher can work, offering a way for the teacher, in the context of a local team, to structure the teaching of character without having to think it all up herself. Throughout the duration of the project, the model was implemented in multiple ways across multiple sites.

Third, as mentioned above, the CVCE model can be integrated with other character education approaches and programs. It can be implemented as a stand-alone approach, as some partners did, or it can be integrated with other approaches to character development. In fact, the CVCE model provides an integrative framework for all other approaches that we have seen.

# SECTION X.
# RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE IMPLEMENTATIONS OF THE CVCE MODEL

We have several recommendations for future implementations of the CVCE model. These recommendations fall into two types: implementation issues and assessment issues.

## A. Implementation Issues

The CVCE model is effective in enhancing character skill development in middle school students. Some of the strengths of the model is its comprehensive approach to character development, its easy adaptability to local circumstances and needs, its focus on concrete ethical skills that can be taught and assessed, its empowerment of teacher creativity in building character skills, and the involvement of the community in implementation.

In future implementations of the CVCE model, we recommend that there be more emphasis on the following:

- Gathering a local team of committed teachers to learn the model
- Local teams creating a testable strategic plan.
- Implementing instructional assessments of teacher lessons.
- Teachers working on climate issues in the classroom and throughout the school.
- Teachers encouraging/facilitating student empowerment.

## B. Assessment and Evaluation Issues

We recommend that the assessment and evaluation be modified in the following ways.

First, the pre-post student and staff assessments should be constructed or selected in collaboration with each local team, basing the selection on the specific aspects of what the local team wants to improve at the school and what kind of impact they want to have. To make this possible, one must have an assessment "tool box" of measures that are reliable and valid from which a local team can select.

Second, measures of implementation need to be included, such as: (a) What developmental skill-based levels of pedagogy are used by the teacher, and (b) How well do teachers embed character skills in academics on a regular basis.

Third, more qualitative measures of outcomes should be included. For example, the student assessments should include qualitative measures because of the unique implementation at each site.

Generally, implementations were difficult to assess because each one was unique in focus and structure, making comparisons next to impossible. The depth and quality of each implementation was unique as well, not allowing for comparisons across sites.

Although one of the strengths of the CVCE model is local control and local adaptation, this strength makes it very difficult to assess effects of implementation because of the unique approach at each site. Some happy medium is required in which local control is maximized while reliable assessment is conducted pre and post. Our suggestions may facilitate this process.

## SECTION XI.
## REFERENCES

Anderson, L.M. (1989). Learners and learning. In M.C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Blasi, A. (1990). How should psychologists define morality? or The negative side effects of philosophy's influence on psychology. In T.E. Wren (Ed.), *The Moral domain* (pp. 38-70). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cogan, J. (1997). *Multicultural Citizenship: Educational Policy for the 21st century*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota.

Davidson, A. (2000). Fractured Identities: Citizenship in a Global World. In E. Vasta (Ed.), *Citizenship, Community, and Democracy* (pp. 3-21).

Developmental Studies Center. (1996, January). *Student Questionnaire Psychometrics (1991-1995)*. Oakland, CA: Author.

Ericsson, K. A., & Smith, J. (1991). *Toward a general theory of expertise*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Etzioni, A. (1996). *The new golden rule.* New York: Basic Books.

Marshall, S.P. (1995). *Schemas in problem solving*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McKinnon, C. (1999). *Character, virtue theories, and the vices.* Toronto: Broadview Press.

Narvaez, D. (2002). Does Reading Moral Stories Build Character? *Educational Psychology Review 14*(2), 155-171.

Narvaez, D., & Endicott, L. (in press). *EthEx: Nurturing Character in the Classroom. Book One: Ethical Sensitivity.* Chapel Hill, NC: Character Development Publishing.

Narvaez, D. & Bock, T. (in press). *EthEx: Nurturing Character in the Classroom. Book Two: Ethical Judgment.* Chapel Hill, NC: Character Development Publishing.

Narvaez, D. & Lies, J. (in press). *EthEx: Nurturing Character in the Classroom. Book Three: Ethical Motivation.* Chapel Hill, NC: Character Development Publishing.

Narvaez, D. (in press). *EthEx: Nurturing Character in the Classroom. Book Four: Ethical Action*. Chapel Hill, NC: Character Development Publishing.

Narvaez, Mitchell, C., Endicott, L. & Bock, T. (1999). *Nurturing character in the middle School Classroom: A guidebook for teachers*. St. Paul: Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning.

Narvaez, D. & Rest, J. (1995). The four components of acting morally. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Moral behavior and moral development: An introduction* (pp. 385-400). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Piaget, J. (1932/1965). *The Moral Judgment of the Child* (M. Gabain, Trans.). New York: Free Press.

Piaget, J. (1952). The origin of intelligence in children. New York: International University Press.

Piaget, J. (1970). *Genetic Epistemology* (E. Duckworth, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Rest, J. (1983). Morality. In P.H. Mussen (Series Ed.) & J. Flavell & E. Markman (Vol. Eds) *Handbook of Child Psychology: Vol. 3, Cognitive Development*, 4th ed. (pp. 556-629). New York, Wiley.

Rest, J.R. & Narvaez, D. (Eds.) (1994). *Moral development in the professions: Psychology and applied ethics.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sternberg, R. J. (1999). Intelligence as developing expertise. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 24*(4) 359-375.

Sternberg, R. (1998). Abilities and expertise. *Educational Researcher, April*, 10-37.

Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (2001). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Weinfurt, K.P. (2000). Repeated Measures Analysis. In L.G. Grimm & P.R. Yarnold (Eds.) Reading and Understanding More Multivariate Statistics, pp. 317-362.

Weinfurt, K.P. (1995). Multivariate Analysis of Variance. In L.G. Grimm and P.R. Yarnold (Eds.) Reading and Understanding Multivariate Statistics, pp. 245-276.

Whitehead, A.N. (1929). *The aims of education and other essays*. New York: Macmillan.

Wing-on, L. & Sai-wing, L. (2001). Institutional Constraints on Promoting Civic Education in Hong Kong Secondary School: Insights from International Educational Achievement Data. In L.J. Limage (Ed.), *Democratizing Education and Educating Democratic Citizens: International and Historical Perspectives* (pp. 267-290). London: Routledge Falmer.

## SECTION XII.
## APPENDICES

Appendix A: 2001 Workshop Evaluations
Appendix B: Character Skills and Subskills
Appendix C: List of Materials Produced
Appendix D: List of Teacher-prepared Materials
Appendix E: Descriptions of School Partners from Previous Years
Appendix F: Staff Survey
Appendix G: Student Surveys