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Lesson planning is an essential component of high quality teaching. Rather than being regarded as a positive experience, all too often, teachers view the planning process as tedious and a drain on their time (Trimble, 2015). Using a conceptual model forged from observing the interactions of teachers and artists, this study allowed for an exploration of teachers’ individual and collaborative engagement. The purpose of this study was to evaluate how the aesthetic planning process impacted the teachers’ beliefs about collaborative planning.

This qualitative case study of middle school social studies teachers examined their application of Deweyian aesthetics within a collaborative lesson planning setting. The findings demonstrate that the use of perceptual planning enhanced the value and efficiency of the process. Moreover, the aesthetic model transformed collaborative planning into a meaningful and enjoyable experience.

INDEX WORDS: Dewey, Aesthetics, Perceptual lesson planning, Collaborative planning, CRISPA
PERCEPTUAL LESSON PLANNING IN MIDDLE SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES: AN APPLICATION OF DEWEYIAN AESTHETICS

by

FRANK W. JONES III

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the

Degree of

Doctor of Education

in

Curriculum and Instruction

in

Department of Middle and Secondary Education

in

the College of Education and Human Development

Georgia State University

Atlanta, GA
2017
DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my father, Frank W. Jones, Jr. He was a young teenager during the great depression and served in the U.S. military after being drafted during the Korean War.

Although he intended to, my father never graduated from college. However, it was his lifelong dream that I would do so. From my earliest memories, I can recall him repeating with confidence that I would go to college. I did. Thank you, Daddy.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is, of course, impossible to thank all those who helped me along this path, but I am obligated to try. First of all, thank you Jesus for your shining example of love that we all need so badly.

As a teacher, I see more clearly than ever the importance of a loving and supportive family. To my wife, Roxanne, you make my life complete. You are my strong foundation and I love you deeply. My other family members, especially my children, my mother, and all my loving and praying aunts deserve a word of appreciation as well.

For my colleagues at Central Middle School who graciously agreed to walk part of this journey with me. You have inspired me to be a better teacher.

Dr. Chara Bohan played a key role in convincing me that I might actually be able to do doctoral level work.

No doctoral candidate can succeed without tremendous help from their committee members. Dr. Caroline Sullivan was cheerleader and encourager-in-chief when I felt I was totally lost. Dr. Laura Meyers agreed to support me, sight unseen, and her enthusiasm for encouraging creativity in the classroom was a perfect match for this work.

Finally, to my chair, Dr. Joseph Feinberg, I am so pleased that I may now call you colleague. Our paths first crossed just over ten years ago while I was a pre-service teacher and I am thankful for the friendship that we have developed and maintained. You introduced me to CRISPA and gave me a research topic I could believe was worthwhile because it has the potential to radically change the classroom experience for teachers and students everywhere.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES ................................................................................................................................................... viii

LIST OF FIGURES .................................................................................................................................................... ix

Chapter 1 ................................................................................................................................................................. 1

Importance of lesson planning ............................................................................................................................ 4

Comparing the United States to other Countries ............................................................................................... 8

Benefits of collaboration ......................................................................................................................................... 9

Purpose of the Study ............................................................................................................................................... 10

Deweyian Aesthetics ............................................................................................................................................... 11

Theoretical Framework ......................................................................................................................................... 12

Epistemology .......................................................................................................................................................... 12

  Dewey’s Epistemology ......................................................................................................................................... 13

  Dewey’s View of Aesthetics .................................................................................................................................. 14

  The Deweyian aesthetic model ............................................................................................................................. 16

Perceptual Lesson Planning ................................................................................................................................... 18

Aesthetics ................................................................................................................................................................. 21

Lesson Planning ...................................................................................................................................................... 22

Lesson Planning Defined ......................................................................................................................................... 23

Research Question .................................................................................................................................................. 24

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy ............................................................................................................................... 24

Summary ................................................................................................................................................................. 25

Organization of the Study ....................................................................................................................................... 26

Chapter 2 ................................................................................................................................................................. 27
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson Planning Research</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson Planning: Product or Process?</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson Planning Summary</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research on Collaboration and Collaborative Planning</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Using Aesthetics</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRISPA</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRP Theory</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRP and CRISPA</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary of the Literature Review</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addressing the research question</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context for the Research Site</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Participants</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual Framework</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foundational Theory and Concept for this Research</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Method – Case Study</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Researcher Positionality</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Review Board (IRB)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual and Collaborative Planning Data Collection</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initial Participant Interviews ................................................................. 57
Introducing CRISPA to Participants ......................................................... 58
Professional Development Demonstrating CRISPA in Social Studies ........ 58
Collaborative Planning Sessions ............................................................... 59
Artifacts .................................................................................................... 59
Final Individual Interviews .......................................................................... 60
Data Security ............................................................................................. 60
Data Analysis ........................................................................................... 60
Data Reduction ......................................................................................... 61
Data Display ............................................................................................ 61
Conclusion Drawing and Verification ......................................................... 61
Significance of the Study ........................................................................... 62
Summary .................................................................................................... 65
Chapter 4 ................................................................................................. 66
Chapter Organization .................................................................................. 66
Delimitations and Limitations of this Study .............................................. 67
Role of the Researcher at CMS ................................................................. 68
Setting for Weekly Curriculum Meetings Known as “Tuesday Meetings” .... 69
Participant Information ............................................................................. 69
Participant Descriptions ........................................................................... 70
Special Context of the School Setting ....................................................... 72
Pre-Interviews ............................................................................................ 73
Setting for Pre-Interviews .......................................................................... 74
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience and Professional Development</th>
<th>104</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Aspects of CRISPA</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of CRISPA</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Relevant Pedagogy</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Summary</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of the Study</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context of the Study</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose Statement and Research Question</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of the Methodology</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Findings of this Study</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings in Relation to Existing Literature</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of CRISPA Within Participant Classrooms</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Case Supporting the Findings</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Further Research</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Summary of Participant Experience...............................................................72
Table 2 Display of First and Second Cycle Coding for Pre-Interviews.........................76
Table 3 Summary of Participant Identification of CRISPA........................................90
Table 4 Partial Transcript of Professional Development Posters..................................90
Table 5 Instances of CRISPA Discussed During Collaborative Planning.....................97
Table 6 Coding for Post-Interviews...........................................................................104
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. The Perceptual Lesson Planning CRISPA Model........................................19

Figure 2. Active Engagement Poster.................................................................89
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The act of teaching combines science and art. The science of the profession involves managing time, considering what must be and should be taught, understanding and managing children, along with many other tasks. The art of teaching is demonstrated when teachers stand before their students and encourage, motivate, and inspire them to explore new knowledge and make new meanings of their world. Lesson planning is a task common to all teachers, and should be the event that blends the science with the art. Within the current United States public school setting, extensive lists of state standards and myriad administrative demands on a teacher’s time combine to heighten the importance of lesson planning while at the same time, allowing less time to do so effectively. Given the middle school teaming model adopted within many districts, teachers in these settings often have schedules that are conducive to allowing collaborative planning to occur (Swick, Henley, Driggers, & Beasley, 1976).

When teachers do have time to plan together, it is important that they are effective and efficient. In an effort to promote collaborative planning as more enjoyable and educative in itself, Moroye and Uhrmacher (2009) suggested a perceptual planning model that uses a Deweyian perspective on aesthetics to offer an avenue toward enhancing the planning experience. This study seeks to explore the possibility that perceptual lesson planning might improve the quality of collaborative planning among social studies teachers, and in the process, make the planning itself an educative and enlightening pedagogical practice for the teachers involved.

John Dewey challenged the practices of educators almost 100 years ago. However, many of his key points still resonate today. In Experience and Education (1938), he argued that
teaching should not be a static process. Like Friere (1974), Dewey (1934) urged progressive minded teachers to constantly seek to depart from being mere transmitters of information, whereby they simply relay knowledge from one generation to the next. Instead, he believed teachers should consider the child’s social and environmental factors as they developed their teaching philosophy. He lamented that teachers tended to focus on providing an environment for learning, but in the process, “did not consider the other factor in creating an experience; namely, the powers and purposes of those taught” (p. 45). In other words, teachers tended to overlook the needs of their students and the context of the communities from which they originated.

In *Democracy and Education* (Dewey, 1916), Dewey furthered his argument against what he considered substandard teaching routines for his era. He lamented that “only in education, and never in the life of the farmer, sailor, merchant, physician, or laboratory experimenter, does knowledge mean primarily a store of information aloof from doing” (p. 103). He suggested that the student was both part and product of their environment and that these two factors should be considered together in order to create the most effective educative environment. Dewey challenged educators to bridge the gap between schools and communities. To address the failings of schools to connect to students and their community, Dewey essentially argued for a pedagogy of social constructivism.

Au (1998) described traits of social constructivism such as communities and individuals’ constructing knowledge. Constructivism is a student-centered approach to learning that focuses on building knowledge rather than simply reproducing knowledge (Maxim, 2006). Further, social constructivism includes face to face interaction and active engagement in the meaning making process. Garrison (1995) linked Dewey with Vygotsky’s (1986) social constructivism by pointing out that Dewey believed valuable educative meaning was found through connecting
a given experience with one’s surroundings. Through a lens of social constructivism, teachers may present students with opportunities to interact, react, and learn from their environment and information that is presented to them (Au, 1998; Liu & Chen, 2010). Dewey noted that the ability to respond to the environment and make meaning of events was unique to humans (Dewey, 1934; Garrison: 1995). This research study sought to encourage teachers to follow a constructivist approach to their lesson planning while following the perceptual planning model.

One might presume that educational philosophy written nearly 100 years ago is irrelevant. However, when comparing the experience of teachers in the early 1900’s to those of today, despite the many significant differences, Dewey’s (1934) challenge remains relevant. Nearly a century ago, public school teachers were just beginning to feel the impact of The Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies (National Education Association of the United States, 1894). In this early effort to coordinate and standardize the rapidly expanding public school systems in the United States, educational leaders sought to provide a basic outline of courses that would lead to secondary school graduation. Discerning contemporary educators can see the root of some of Dewey’s concerns about the uniform approach to education as noted in the report, "...every subject which is taught at all in a secondary school should be taught in the same way and to the same extent to every pupil so long as he pursues it, no matter what the probable destination of the pupil may be, or at what point his education is to cease" (Dewey, 1934, p. 17). This description of how to teach every child the same seems to parallel the modern scripting of lessons found in some schools today (Commeyras, 2007; Samson, Strykowski, Weinstein, & Walberg, 1987).

While the Report of the Committee of Ten sought to identify broad educational goals for districts across the nation, teachers today are faced with the advent and growth of very narrow
and specific performance standards that focus on individual course content that tends to constrain teachers (Glatthorn, 1999; Popham, 2004a). Egan (2001) described the dilemma of modern educators as being caught between ideal philosophical perspectives of identifying and seeking knowledge of real value versus an educational system that socially sorts and grades students based on various testing regiments. Teachers often feel trapped between the high ideals and demands of educational policy makers and the needs of the students they teach (Darling-Hammond, Wei, & Andree, 2010; Holt, 2002). Conflicting demands include: too many standards, too little time to teach them well, and the influence of high stakes testing (Brown, 2006; Popham, 2004; Ravitch, 2010). Given the range of tasks faced by teachers today in curriculum and instruction, achieving Dewey’s vision for teaching and learning to occur within the context of community and in a manner that is obviously relevant for the student seems more distant than ever.

In a climate that demands measured results from questionable testing practices and teacher evaluation systems that place more emphasis on testing than teaching, educators are more challenged than ever (Ravitch, 2010). Time constraints and myriad demands on a teacher’s time eat away at opportunities for professional collaboration and personal growth (Darling-Hammond et al., 2010). With this constraining environment as a backdrop, the focus of this research is to examine a means to make valuable lesson planning time more effective, more professionally rewarding, and an educative experience for the teacher in and of itself.

**Importance of lesson planning**

Every school day in the United States, over 49 million students and 3 million teachers enter United States K-12 public schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). Teachers are faced with the daunting task to instruct, motivate, assess, expand, and nurture
young minds. Lesson planning is the teacher’s road map of what needs to be taught, and how it will be done effectively (Milkova, 2012). While most teachers’ have a daily schedule that includes time for planning, that time is often encroached upon.

American teachers are often so overwhelmed by other daily tasks, such as meetings, data analysis, and parent conferences, that precious time for planning is eaten away and ultimately wasted (Canaday & Rottig, 1995). At the extreme, scholars such as Apple (1986) argued that there is actually a deliberate effort to undermine the authority and responsibilities traditionally retained by teachers and replace them with top-down management regimes. In this view, by overloading the teacher with tasks not directly related to instruction, administrators actually gain more control over individuals. In effect, the teachers are so busy, they do not have time to choose or direct their own actions or activities or those of their students. They are relegated to being reactive rather than proactive within their pedagogy.

The value of lesson planning for the student and teacher is supported by research (Anfara & Caskey, 2010; Darling-Hammond, et al., 2010; John, 2006; Mertens, Flowers, Cook, & Faulkner, 2010; Swicket et al., 1976). At the middle school level, common planning time is a feature of the day that is regularly wasted. The lack of planning meeting agendas, common focus, and lack of leadership often impede progress during this important time (Mertens et al., 2010). To improve their use of time, highly productive teacher communities regularly demonstrate traits of setting common goals, working together, and supporting one another (Darling-Hammond, 2009). Collaborative lesson planning offers an opportunity to address all of these positive traits simultaneously.

Yet, protecting time to plan lessons at school is challenging. In addition to instructing classes, the average teacher in the United States may sponsor a club, serve on various
committees within the school and district, be required to attend special meetings for designated students, or simply have planning time otherwise encroached upon by the administration (O’Neill, 1995). When there is time to plan, teachers are tasked with translating myriad lists of state standards into a digestible and understandable curriculum that will allow each learner to develop a range of cognitive and life skills. The advent and adoption of outcome based education models, the pressures on teachers’ time, and requirements to demonstrate objective effectiveness make for a demanding teaching environment (Glatthorn, 1993). More recently and within Race to the Top (RT3) initiatives from the federal Department of Education, teachers are under more scrutiny to demonstrate objective performance as measured by various testing regiments administered to their students (United States Department of Education, 2015).

Some relief from standardized testing is very likely on the horizon as a result of recent changes in federal education legislation. Notably, legislation signed by President Obama in December of 2015, titled the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), rolled back several of the most contentious components of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), also known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and RT3 guidelines (Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 2001; United States Department of Education, 2015). Under this new law, the federal government ceded much control back to the states for determining such issues as academic standards, mandated testing regimes, punitive measures for failing schools, and specific requirements for teacher evaluations. As of the time of this research, the state-level fallout from this new federal direction is uncertain, and NCLB and RT3 continue to drive education policy (Balingit & St. George, 2016; Camera, 2015). Until the new law begins to show its impact, local policies will continue to reflect an emphasis on teacher accountability measured through structured assessment and evaluation. Locally, the teacher evaluation places a
heavy emphasis on demonstrating evidence of lesson planning (State Department of Education, 2015).

Driven by RT3 initiatives, clear evidence of lesson planning is now a requirement in many state teacher evaluation programs. In accordance with the Teacher Keys Effectiveness System (TKES), public school teachers are now evaluated in ten specific areas. Four of these areas, or 40% of the total evaluation, relate directly to demonstrating evidence of planning and they include: instructional planning, instructional strategies, differentiated instruction, and providing an academically challenging environment (State Department of Education, 2015). In order to obtain the maximum rating of “exemplary” in these areas, the teacher must exhibit a consistent level of very high performance. Currently, administrators are required to visit teacher classrooms six times during the school year to observe and record evidence of these and other performance measures. In short, a significant portion of the TKES requires clear evidence of teacher lesson planning.

Recent state government action demonstrates the challenges related to protecting teacher planning time. The Governor appointed an education committee to explore various aspects of education reform. As a result of their investigation, the subcommittee on Teacher Recruitment, Retention and Compensation included a recommendation to the Governor that administrators be assessed within their annual climate survey on “how well (they) protect teacher planning time” (Meeting 9 Materials, 2015). This comment was provided specifically based on the panel’s interactions with, and input from, teachers who indicated that their planning time was regularly encroached upon by other tasks. Thus, the subcommittee report provides firm evidence of an ongoing struggle to preserve planning time for teachers. The difficulty that many teachers in the
United States face with lesson planning appears direr when compared with their counterparts in other nations.

**Comparing the United States to other Countries**

**United States.** Researchers recognize the value of good lesson planning (Cook & Faulker, 2010; Van Der Valk & Broekman, 1999). Lederman and Niess (2000) emphasized this point quite succinctly when they stated “teachers who plan are more effective, regardless of outcome measure, than teachers who do not plan” (p. 58). These studies show that when teachers are deliberate about planning lessons, their class time is more effective and objective measures confirm student learning.

While lesson planning could serve as an occasion for cooperative professional development, consultation, and dialogue among professionals, it is most often viewed by teachers as drudgery and a waste of time (Glatthorn, 1987; Lederman & Niess, 2000; Trimble, 2015). Furthermore, given the demands on teachers’ time, too often, the reality of lesson planning is more often viewed as “a list of activities, rather than a professional development experience” (Dorovolomo, Phan & Maubuta, 2010, p. 451). Collectively, these studies help demonstrate the dilemma facing teachers today. That is, teachers have less time to plan while facing lengthy lists of state driven learning objectives. Input from teachers shows that their planning time at school is often impeded upon; yet, they are expected to teach everything well. The situation is brought into sharper focus when viewed in the context of teaching and planning in other countries.

**Other Countries.** In comparison to the United States, Darling-Hammond, Wei, and Andree (2010), explored teacher experiences within countries that participate in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and Trends in International Mathematics and
Science Study (TIMSS). They noted that teachers in New Zealand and Singapore, for example, were given opportunities for professional learning that were scheduled within the school day. In these countries, teachers were often allotted 15-25 hours of planning time per week. Demir, Czerniak, and Hart (2013) pointed out that Japanese schools often release students up to two hours before the teacher work day ends. During these additional hours at school and without students present, teachers spent time in a cooperative environment, often conducting lesson planning.

In China, teachers routinely teach only a couple of hours each day and, by design, commit the remainder of their time to planning, coordinating, and sharing teaching experiences with colleagues (Shen, Poppin, Yunhou, & Fan, 2007). The time spent in these collaborative settings strengthens professional and personal relationships, while improving the teachers’ craft of planning and teaching (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Mertens et al., 2010). However, time spent in planning, particularly collaborative planning offers advantages as well.

**Benefits of collaboration**

The practice of planning lessons, particularly with other teachers, can benefit the teacher as well as her students. Teacher collaboration during the lesson planning process leads students to mastery learning and increases teacher expertise in his subject matter (Dorovolomo et al., 2010; Trimble, 2015). Rimpola’s (2014) conclusions supported the Chinese model when they demonstrated that “teachers who engage in collaborative work are able to learn from one another” and “teacher collaboration may improve a school’s ability to foster student achievement” (p. 42). Dorovolomo et al. (2010) found “a positive nexus between the quality of lesson planning and its implementation” (p. 451). Notably, this study is focused on the lesson planning process and excludes an examination of the delivery of those lessons. A plethora of
research addresses the issue of collaboration but there are scant examples of research that specifically explore collaborative planning in detail (Clark & Elmore, 1979; Clark & Yinger, 1979; Goddard & Goddard, 2007; Rimpola, 2014; Roskos & Neuman, 1995; Thousand, Villa & Nevin, 2006; Tschannen-Moran, Uline, Hoy & Mackley). Without collaboration, the teaching profession risks becoming an isolated and lonely field (Goddard & Goddard, 2007; Tschannen-Moran et al., 2000).

The information provided thus far suggests that American teachers are often challenged to find adequate time to plan effective lessons. Further, compared to their global peers, such as those in China and New Zealand, American teachers have much less time to plan in the first place and that time is often reduced by numerous other demands. Existing research studies indicate that when lesson planning is conducted effectively, it can become a valuable professional development experience that enhances individual and collaborative teacher growth (Clark & Elmore, 1979; Roskos & Neuman, 1995). Finally, the requirement to demonstrate lesson planning has garnered more attention with the advent of federal regulations such as RT3 that led to new teacher evaluation models such as the adopted TKES.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to examine how a group of eighth grade social studies teachers plan collaboratively while using a Deweyian aesthetic framework. The specific planning model employed is known as perceptual lesson planning and will be explained in detail later (Moroye & Uhrmacher, 2009). The researcher also sought to determine if the application of the perceptual planning model offered enhanced opportunities to facilitate discussions of culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) in the lesson planning process (Grant & Sleeter, 1989;
Ladson Billings, 1995a). Multiple data collection methods were utilized including: participant observation, field notes, artifacts, audio/video transcripts, and personal interview transcripts.

The challenge offered by Dewey (1916) almost 100 years ago was to have teachers seek the means to make teaching and learning relevant to their students. One means of addressing this challenge today is through collaboration. Common planning time and opportunities to plan collaboratively are particularly prevalent in the middle school setting (Cook & Faulker, 2010; Swick et al., 1976). The establishment of teacher teams and common daily schedules offer the best opportunity for teachers to meet regularly at the same time and place to discuss upcoming units and lessons (Carey, 1952; Kohm & Nance, 2009; Swick et al., 1976). As previously noted, the importance of lesson planning is further reflected within the current State Teacher Keys Effectiveness System (TKES) and this evaluation includes several specific categories directly related to planning. This research seeks to explore how to incorporate Dewey’s philosophy within the modern teaching context described thus far.

**Deweyian Aesthetics**

A unique aspect of this study involves combining Dewey’s challenge for teachers to seek methods that increase student engagement and interest in learning with the current climate of teacher and leader evaluations that emphasizes the importance of lesson planning. The aesthetic lens, described by Dewey in *Art as Experience* (1934) was intended to serve as a means to spark the teacher’s creativity as well as invigorate teacher collaboration. While many scholars have examined aesthetics in the classroom, the research is most often located within the area of science instruction (Girod & Wong, 2002; Jakobson & Wickman, 2008; Moroye & Uhrmacher, 2009; Pugh, 2002; Pugh & Girod, 2007; Wang, 2001). There is little evidence of exploring aesthetics within the social studies. One example relating to social studies involved the use of art,
music, and film, as a means to expand student historical understandings (Gabella, 1994). The combination of the aesthetic focus of collaborative planning for the social studies curriculum all combine to make this study unique. Uhrmacher, Conrad & Moroye (2013) suggested that this research was needed to further explore the concept of planning for applying an aesthetic approach in the classroom. Ultimately, the goal was to empower teachers with a new way to address Dewey’s (1934) observation of teachers failing to address their students’ needs.

**Theoretical Framework**

**Epistemology**

The epistemology for this study was founded in constructionism (Au, 1998; Cook & Faulkner, 2010; Garrison, 1995). Crotty (2013) suggested that within “meanings are constructed by human beings as they engage with the world they are interpreting.” (p. 42). Further, in accordance with constructionism, “we do not create meaning, rather, we construct meaning. We have something to work with and what we have to work with is the world and the objects in the world” (p. 43-44). The constructivist approach is aligned with Dewey’s (1934) urging to provide educative experiences within the context of the learner and their environment. The researcher for this study explored how a group of eighth grade social studies teachers interpreted and utilized perceptual lesson planning (defined below) in a collaborative setting. While the perceptual lesson plan model provides guidelines for its use, the words and actions of the members of the research group ultimately allowed the researcher to interpret the meaning of their work.

This study of collaborative research was informed by Dewey’s (1934) views of the aesthetic nature of learning. Further, Dewey’s description of aesthetics was more recently focused by the work of Uhrmacher et al. (2013). These modern researchers explored Dewey’s
foundational beliefs and identified what they consider to be critical components of aesthetics. Their research sought to inform and empower teachers to take the aesthetic idea and employ the concept in practical applications of planning and subsequently integrate within their classrooms. The following section will explain (a) Dewey’s epistemology (b) Dewey’s (1934) original vision and description of the aesthetic and (c) elaborate on the modern application by Uhrmacher et al. (2013).

**Dewey’s Epistemology**

John Dewey held to a pragmatist epistemology (Boyles, 2006). As elaborated upon by Hookway (2013), “pragmatism is a form of empiricism (and) our ability to think about external things and to steadily improve our understanding of them rests upon our experience” (p. 11). Dewey stated that “the continuity of experience means that every experience both takes up something from those which have gone before and modifies in some way the quality of those which come after” (1938, p. 35). This concept is clearly reflective of a constructivist approach to learning (Crotty, 2013; Lichtman, 2010; Suter, 2006). At least part of Dewey’s philosophical motivation was to challenge the status quo that was rooted in the teaching practices of his day, which he saw as disconnected from the community of the learner and “had no especial connection with any particular subject matter” (Dewey, 2011, p. 186). Through his pragmatist epistemology, Dewey sought to define meaningful learning and “emphasize that perfect knowledge would represent such a connection that any past experience would offer a point of advantage from which to get at the problem presented in a new experience” (p. 185). This explanation of a constructivist approach to learning coupled with the aesthetic element is one facet that makes this research study unique.
Dewey (1934) carefully considered the importance and value of aesthetic experiences. He espoused a belief that humans are in a constant state of learning, either formally or informally. Additionally, they are constantly influenced and stimulated by their environment. Exposure to sensory experiences such as: visual, taste, sight, and touch, provide the possibility for enjoyment as well as learning experiences. An educative experience leading toward knowledge may be interesting or informative, and something with aesthetic beauty might be enjoyed, but Dewey believed the melding of these two had the potential to create an educative experience that is wholly fulfilling.

Perhaps a concrete demonstration might be offered when one considers a rose. An observer might look at the petals, smell the aroma, touch the thorns on the stem, and appreciate the flower simply as an object of beauty. This aesthetic appreciation is a kind of knowing, but it is not complete. The science of the flower is another kind of knowledge. The ability to describe its reproduction, photosynthesis, and how it draws nutrients from the soil within which it is planted demonstrates another level of knowledge. Thus, the observation of the flower for its beauty, coupled with the science of its existence becomes a holistic educative experience that allows the student to arrive at new heights and possibilities of learning (Dewey, 1934).

**Dewey’s View of Aesthetics**

Aesthetics is defined as “the branch of philosophy that provides a theory of the beautiful and the fine arts” while aesthetic is defined as “pertaining to the sense of the beautiful” (The American Heritage Dictionary, 1981, p. 21). The term is most commonly associated with the appreciation of art. In *Art as Experience* (1934), Dewey sought to draw a philosophical connection between art, the appreciation of aesthetics, and learning. He observed that humans constantly make aesthetic judgments about the world around them and that by deliberately
applying aesthetics within educative experiences, the learning achieved by the student would be most comprehensive.

He also believed that learning occurred continuously over the life of the student. Dewey espoused this belief in other works such as *Experience and Education* (1938) and *Democracy and Education* (1916). He recognized that learning occurred in many environments, such as the workplace, during the play of a game, or even during casual conversation (Dewey, 1934). However, in *Art as Education* (1934), he posited that the deliberate inclusion of an aesthetic layer to education would enable the student to recognize that something unique had occurred in the learning process.

Dewey used the following example to illustrate this concept of aesthetics. If a student were asked to explain his or her concept of a severe storm, they could probably do so. Reasonably, he or she would draw on their understanding of storms, and very likely their personal experiences with bad weather. In this example, their existing knowledge provided considerable value and helpfulness toward their understanding of a severe storm. However, Dewey suggested, “then, there is that one storm one went through in crossing the Atlantic – the storm seemed in its fury, as it was experienced, to sum up in itself all that a storm can (Dewey, 1934, p. 37). In this case, the student could indeed explain their idea of a storm, but having experienced the storm on the Atlantic, at once, the idea became complete because it was “marked out from what went before and what came after” (p. 37). This example of a storm was certainly not an aesthetic event, as with examining a work of art, but Dewey focused on the tactile experience and suggested that it was a learning event in and of itself. Coupled with what the student knew before experiencing that great storm on the Atlantic, once it was encountered, the learning became whole. In this sense, the concept of aesthetics, when referred to in this
research is not limited to the field of art, but includes a tactile, sensory, and connective
experience, all at once.

This particular storm, for Dewey, represented an experience. “We have an experience
when the material experienced runs its course to fulfillment. Then and then only is it integrated
within and demarcated in the general stream of experience from other experiences” (Dewey,
1934, pp. 36-37). This learning experience is it contains certain qualities that set it aside and
make it particularly memorable and effective. Dewey recognized and described the part of
schools and education within the larger society. He clearly believed that schools should embrace
their role as helping students identify and fulfill their place as active citizens. To this end, the
teacher, as a member of the community, was “to select influences that shall affect the child to
assist him in properly responding to these influences” (Dewey, 1908/2013, p. 293). This concept
of an experience is the underpinning of the aesthetic. It represents the nexus of what educators
would generally consider traditional learning, a “just the facts ma’am” approach with the
inclusion of the aesthetic. Many researchers include a description of an experience in their
research articles (Augustine & Zoss, 2006; Girod, Rau & Schepige, 2003; Girod & Wong, 2002;
Jakobson & Wickman, 2007; Pugh, 2002).

This explanation of Dewey’s vision for applying the aesthetic in an educative experience
establishes the foundation for this research. Admittedly, Dewey’s description of the aesthetic is
vague and can be difficult to grasp (Conrad, Moroye, and Uhrmacher, 2015). Fortunately, recent
research offers a model within which to consider Dewey’s proposal for applying aesthetics.

The Deweyian aesthetic model

John Dewey placed experience at the heart of the educative process (Dewey, 1934). His
emphasis on educative experiences was aligned with his constructivist views on learning
Dewey described how the myriad encounters and experiences of daily life were often void of significant meaning. For example, the average morning routine and commute to work are events that many experience almost every day, but they are often drudgery and monotony without meaning in and of themselves. Dewey’s views on the aesthetic role within learning seek to bring the aesthetic out of the shadows and into the foreground of the educative experience, thereby creating a more complete learning experience.

Coupled with an aesthetic element, however, even seemingly insignificant events could turn into what Dewey referred to as “an experience” (p. 37). The historic source for describing Deweyian aesthetics is found in *Art as Experience* (1934). In this book, Dewey describes an experience. While acknowledging that human life is filled with thousands of everyday actions and interactions that, in themselves, carry no great significance, an experience is an event set aside.

We have an experience when the material experience runs its course…(it) is so rounded out that its close is a consummation and not a cessation. Such an experience is whole and carries with it its own individualizing quality and self-sufficiency. It is an experience. (Dewey, 1934, p. 36-37)

It is this particular focus on an experience that separates the Deweyian aesthetic from other pedagogy that might include music, artwork, or photographs (Foshay, 2000; Gabella, 1995; Jakobson & Wickman, 2007; Pugh & Girod, 2007; Uhrmacher, 2009). While pedagogical choices that include these items may indeed evoke an aesthetic response from students, unless the aesthetic is specifically sought and leveraged as part of the learning process, then these examples do not meet the context of Dewey’s theory. Dewey’s views on what constitutes meaningful educative experiences and his efforts to improve teacher pedagogy are perhaps his
best known philosophies (Dewey, 1938). On close reading, however, the importance he placed on the aesthetic aspect in learning becomes clear and, arguably, completes his vision for relevant teaching and learning.

For Dewey, "an experience has its own aesthetic quality” (p. 39). It differed from simply appreciating art as a material item, and was reflected in the example of the severe Atlantic storm mentioned earlier. He articulated that difference when he stated “no intellectual activity is an experience unless it is rounded out with this (aesthetic) quality. In short, esthetic cannot be sharply marked off from intellectual since the latter must bear an esthetic stamp to be itself complete” (p. 40). Considering the quantity of writing Dewey produced on educational philosophy, this is an amazing claim. It may be interpreted that this aesthetic layer is the last piece of the puzzle toward understanding of his views on learning. Given this basic understanding of where the aesthetic theme originated, it is vital to consider it within his beliefs about knowledge.

**Perceptual Lesson Planning**

Perceptual lesson planning closely connects with Dewey and is a relatively new concept outlined by Moroye and Uhrmacher (2009). In short, they described the process as “lesson planning that may be characterized as engaging teachers’ and students’ senses and creativity; as an artistic endeavor that is joyful in and of itself” (Moroye & Uhrmacher, 2009, p. 2). Perceptual lesson planning recognizes that lesson planning in modern public education has largely become a functional process whereby a teacher is meeting a directed requirement, for example, having a prepared lesson plan as directed by administration or driven by the local teacher evaluation systems. Perceptual lesson planning seeks to achieve the functional aspect of the planning

---

1 Dewey commonly spelled aesthetic without an “a”
process while engaging teacher creativity and improving student learning through more engaging lessons. Described in detail below, perceptual lesson planning builds on concepts espoused by Eisner (1967), Greene (1988), and Dewey (1934), and provides the everyday teacher a straightforward means to integrate aesthetics in everyday lesson planning.

The perceptual planning model is outlined by the acronym CRISPA which stands for:

- **Connections**: connect to the subject (connect through senses, emotions, knowledge, and people)
- **Risk-taking**: try something outside of your comfort zone
- **Imagination**: imagine possibilities – real and fantasy
- **Sensory experience**: explore with your senses – taste, touch, smell, sound, see
- **Perceptivity**: the more you look the more you see and know
- **Active engagement**: participate and enjoy the experience (Moroye & Uhrmacher, 2009, p. 86)

![Figure 1](image)

*The Perceptual Lesson Planning CRISPA Model*
As teachers plan, they are encouraged to deliberately seek ways to include as many of these aspects as possible within each lesson. In this way, the process itself becomes more creative and invigorating for the teachers and, ultimately, the students receive a better classroom experience that includes the same CRISPA components.

The focus of this research is not on the lesson planning product. Rather, this research will explore the collaborative lesson planning process as experienced by the participants, full time teachers. As described by Uhrmacher et al. (2013) the “functional way of writing a lesson plan rarely modulates an experience that inspires or enlivens the educational process” (p. 7). Therefore, written lesson plans are not the focus of this research. Through CRISPA, the researcher seeks to introduce and evaluate a new way to plan collaboratively by exploring the dynamics of how collaborative lesson planning was affected by the introduction of the aesthetic theme. The root of this research stems from findings originally summarized by Uhrmacher et al. (2013), who suggested that the aesthetic approach might ignite or reignite a passion for planning. The perceptual planning model offers opportunity for teachers to ask themselves “what inspires me about this topic, and how might I organize meaningful experiences that inspire students to reach learning goals?” (Uhrmacher et al., 2013, p. 9). This research was designed to examine this concept in action. Will the teachers involved collaborative planning be inspired to make the process meaningful and fulfilling?

In addition to exploring the use of CRISPA in a collaborative planning setting, this research provided an opportunity to explore how the CRISPA model might offer the opportunity to discuss culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) within the planning process (Ladson Billings, 1995a). Given Dewey’s (1934) views on the importance of linking student learning to their
home and community environment, the consideration of CRP (Ladson Billings, 1995a) is explored as a natural fit for CRISPA as well.

**Aesthetics**

When considering aesthetics, one normally thinks of artworks, beauty, or perhaps a memorable musical arrangement. Definitions of aesthetic or aesthetics often include terms such as; beautiful, love of beauty, and the philosophy of art and beauty (Agnes, 1995; Morris, 1981). Although not specified within routine definitions, aesthetics certainly implies the use of one or more of the senses such as sight, hearing, taste, or touch. These senses are necessary in order for humans to perceive what they are encountering when they have an aesthetic experience. For example, a masterpiece artwork, such as the statue of David, is generally admired for its visual appearance and quality of craftsmanship. Obviously, there is a highly subjective nature to definitions of beauty, quality, and taste and these determinations differ greatly between individual and cultures.

Aesthetic judgments are highly subjective. Consider the last wonderful meal you had, or your favorite musical artist or performance. Ask a dozen people to respond to these same questions and you are likely to get as many different responses. Further, one person’s favorite musical artist might be deplored by another. It is indeed a highly personal/individual aesthetic judgment that brings these specific examples to mind, and each instance has value and beauty in the eye of the beholder. Dewey (1934) pointed out that humans routinely make aesthetic judgments throughout their daily lives, most often, they are doing so without placing these decisions into an educative context. However, Dewey’s (1934) educational philosophy emphasized that the most complete learning experiences included an aesthetic element. The point of inclusion of the aesthetic element in this research is to bring what might otherwise be
Lesson Planning

Lesson planning is widely recognized as a necessary skill to build on content knowledge and prepare meaningful lessons (John, 2006; Kohm & Nance, 2009; Van Der Valk & Broekman, 1999). The lesson planning process involves complex decision making skills and pedagogical dynamics that translate standards into action in an often unpredictable classroom environment. While planning, the teacher anticipates a variety of outcomes for the lesson, including where students may have preconceived notions, existing knowledge, or encounter problems understanding new concepts and information (Aylett, 2015; Clark & Yinger, 1979; Goldston, Dantzler, Day, & Webb 2013; Lalik & Niles, 1990). The lesson planning process includes combining teachers’ content knowledge and pedagogical skills with their intimate knowledge of the students in their classroom. Thus, the time spent planning is vital to ensure the teacher is prepared and that students ultimately receive the best possible classroom experience.

Conrad (2011) described the lesson planning process as a sort of filter, through which teachers demonstrate their intentions and beliefs. No matter the curriculum or the knowledge or skill that is to be taught one should be able to follow a logical trail from the teacher’s intentions through their “motivation and efforts” to the planning process (p. 90). Conrad suggested that the teacher begin with some intention in mind, and that this intention stirs their motivation to see it implemented, and finally, applies these ingredients within their planning process. This study presumes that teachers undertake some form of lesson planning before they begin teaching. Using Conrad’s logic, studying and/or influencing teacher’s intentions should lead to observable...
behaviors within their lesson planning. However, before we can examine existing research that discusses lesson planning, an exploration of the definition of lesson planning itself is in order.

**Lesson Planning Defined**

Interestingly, many research studies on lesson planning do not provide a definition of planning (Clark & Elmore, 1979; Lalik & Niles, 1990; Thousand et al., 2006; Yinger, 1980). For those that do, quite a range of definitions exist. Roskos and Neuman (1995) posited that planning is “a course of action to achieve a desired goal” (p. 200). This definition actually suggests a focus on the lesson planning product rather than process. The course of action, in other words, the plan, would logically be the result of the process of planning. Milkova (2012) identified the lesson plan as “the instructor’s road map of what students need to learn and how it will be done effectively” (p. 1). Perhaps researchers are hesitant to give a clear definition of planning in order to avoid limiting the possibilities involved with lesson planning. For example, Clark and Yinger (1980) defined planning as anything that “aids in preparing a framework for guiding future action” (p. 6). This definition is almost too broad to be helpful and an attempt to examine teacher planning using this framework would be virtually impossible. A more restrictive example of defining planning was offered by Hill, Yinger, and Robins (1983) when they described planning as “any activity of a teacher that is concerned with organizing his or her school-related activities or the activities of students, other teachers…” (p. 182). In a final example that most closely reflects this research, Clark and Yinger (1979) defined planning as “a process of preparing a framework for guiding teacher action, a process strongly oriented toward particular action” (p. 9).

A modified version of Clark and Yinger’s (1979) definition of lesson planning is used for this research. Thus, the definition of lesson planning for this research is a collaborative process
among teachers of preparing a framework for guiding individual teacher action toward teaching a specific skill or standard. These modifications emphasize the collaborative nature of the planning observed within this research as well as the recognition that the individual teachers will go forward from the planning session to deliver their own instruction. The definition also reflects a recognition that collaborative planning effort is usually followed by the individual teacher acting to refine and develop their own lesson plan and then delivering the lesson.

Research Question

The primary question driving this study is: how do teachers in a collaborative setting respond to the implementation of a perceptual approach to lesson planning? Perceptual lesson planning calls on the teacher to explore their content matter in depth while seeking to draw themselves and the student into deeper meaning and connections. Current leaders in perceptual planning development and research, Uhrmacher et al. (2013) recommended that “it would be worthwhile to capture the experiences of the population of teachers who use perceptual planning, to see whether perceptual lesson planning offers the sorts of opportunities for rejuvenation” (p. 22). Based on their recommendation, this research fills a space where little research currently exists.

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy

Similar to Dewey’s era, the public school system within the United States today is undergoing tremendous change in the demographic profile of its students. Citing U.S. Department of Education statistics, as reported in the fall of 2014, “the percentage of students who are White would drop to 49.7%” in our nation’s public schools (Strauss, 2014). Given this demographic change, and future projections reflect a continued decline of White enrollment accompanied by increased enrollment of traditionally marginalized students, the concept of
culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson Billings, 1995a) assumes a prevalent, and perhaps more urgent, position within a range of pedagogical choices in order to better support the diverse group of students in schools today.

Abrahams and Troike (1972) provided the earliest foundations of what we now know as culturally relevant pedagogy. Ladson-Billings (1995) acknowledged the poor academic performance of marginalized students, but her work centered particularly on students of African-American descent. The glaring disparities between Whites, and other marginalized groups is telling. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics, as of the 2011-2012 SY, four-year high school graduation rates in the United States were as follows: Asian 93%, White 85%, Hispanic 76%, and Black 68% (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2015). The relatively low rates of high school graduation for many students, especially from marginalized groups, foretell challenging results for their future economic and social success. Without a high school diploma, quality job opportunities are limited and generational cycles of poverty may continue within families (Economic Policy Institute, 2014; Edelman, 2012).

Given the dynamics of an evolving public school population, this research provides an opportunity to explore if the perceptual planning model offers opportunities for teachers to open a dialogue on including CRP (Ladson Billings, 1995a) within their lesson planning. CRP supports teachers in placing an emphasis on honoring their students cultural backgrounds and leveraging their individual experiences in the classroom to support learning.

**Summary**

This chapter provided an overview of the research and its key question; how do teachers in a collaborative setting respond to the implementation of a perceptual approach to lesson planning? This overview included an exploration of key terms as well as an explanation of the
theoretical and conceptual frameworks. Founded by Dewey (1934), the theoretical framework is based upon his views of human aesthetic experience and its promise for fulfilling educative experiences. Moroye and Uhrmacher (2009) provided the conceptual framework for placing Dewey’s aesthetic ideals into a modern teaching setting. A broad overview of CRP (Ladson Billings, 1995a) was also offered in order to set the stage for another relevant aspect of this research.

Organization of the Study

The remainder of the study is organized into five chapters, references and appendices A-D, in the following manner. Chapter 2 contains the literature review for relevant research pertaining to the research subject. Chapter 3 provides the research design and methodology. Chapter 4 contains a summary of the research data and a discussion of the findings. Finally, Chapter 5 contains the study summary, findings, and recommendations for further research.
Chapter 2

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to understand the experience of eighth grade social studies teachers as they developed lessons collaboratively using the perceptual lesson planning model (Moroye & Uhrmacher, 2009). This model, also known as CRISPA, was developed specifically to support Dewey’s (1934) ideas concerning the deliberate inclusion of the aesthetic to enhance educative experiences (Conrad et al., 2015). This research also provides an opportunity to explore how the perceptual lesson planning model led to teacher discussions regarding CRP (Ladson-Billings, 1992; Ladson Billings, 1995a; Ladson Billings, 1995b). This chapter explores existing research that is related to this study. Summarized in this chapter is previous research on lesson planning, collaboration, Deweyian aesthetics, the perceptual lesson planning model, and culturally relevant pedagogy. Each of these topics was chosen as they represent key aspects of the research study.

Lesson Planning Research

Lesson planning defined for this research. As described in Chapter 1, existing research contains a range of definitions for lesson planning. For purposes of this research, the modified definition of lesson planning is: a collaborative process among teachers of preparing a framework for guiding individual teacher action toward teaching a specific skill or standard (Clark & Yinger, 1979; 1980). The review of collaboration within this chapter will describe why a collaborative element within planning is important to teachers.

Lesson Planning: Product or Process?

Much of the existing research on lesson planning focuses on product instead of process (Milkova, 2012; Roskos & Neuman, 1995). Uhrmacher et al. (2009) outlined the basic
approaches to teaching as a conflict between the positivistic nature of behaviorists and the interpretive methods used by constructivists. Behaviorists generally place lesson planning in a teacher-centered framework and tend to view lesson planning as a linear process, beginning with objectives in mind and then proceeding to build a lesson (Hunter, 1983; Tyler, 1949). In contrast to behaviorists, constructivists begin with the student in mind, and while mindful of learning objectives, approach lesson planning as a means to help students make sense of their world with appropriate guidance from the teacher (Duckworth, 2006; Schmuck & Schmuck, 1988). The constructivist approach is in accordance with Dewey’s views on making educative experiences relevant (Dewey, 1934). With regard to this research, no specific lesson planning product is used or recommended. The CRISPA model for this study is properly utilized as a lens with which to approach whatever planning process the teachers choose to utilize. Further, by not favoring or requiring any particular product resulting from the lesson planning, the researcher defers to the individual experiences and preferences of the teachers involved in the research. While the collaborative planning process is intended to further the collegial environment, the intent is not to force any teacher into a particular pedagogical choice.

While this research does not prefer any particular planning product or lesson plan format, it is worth noting existing research that addresses this question. Researchers have theorized and proposed various models that focus on a common lesson plan outline and serve to guide the teacher through the planning process and culminate with a commonly organized product. The 5-E model, for example, suggests that a lesson must include: engagement, exploration, explanation, elaboration, and evaluation (Jackson, 2009). The Kodaly model, derived from his experience as a music instructor, calls for every lesson to include student preparation (this student preparation is part of the actual lesson, and should not be confused with the planning process itself),
presentation, and practice (Boshkoff, 1991). Despite the availability of models and structures for lesson planning, these choices are not examined or critiqued in this research. Instead, the focus is on individual and collective teacher responses to the perceptual planning model.

Along with examples of lesson planning products, various models exist to guide a teacher’s overarching pedagogy. These including Hunter’s (2004) mastery learning, Gagne and Briggs’s (1974) instructional design, and Slavin’s (2014) psychology of teaching. Wiggins and McTighe (2001) advocated for a backwards planning model that begins the planning process with the end in mind. No matter the choice for their pedagogy or content, teachers must plan lessons in order to create educative experiences. Ornstein (1997) compared these and other planning models and noted their similarities. Ornstein focused on the lesson plan output derived from these theorists and, with few exceptions, found that the content of the formats was common and included key elements such as: a brief review of earlier lessons, previewing the lesson content, presenting new material, practicing, and assessing for student knowledge. The various approaches and models to lesson planning are relevant because the product of lesson planning is a point of emphasis in current teacher evaluation systems as well as preservice teacher programs (State Department of Education; 2016; John, 2006; Wolcott, 1994). Previous research by Veenman, Denessen, Oord, and Naafs (2003) and Meyen and Greer (2009) confirm the relationship between lesson planning, quality instruction, and student achievement. While this study does not examine individual teacher lesson plan products, pedagogy, content, and choice of lesson format, individual teachers reasonably approach their lesson planning with some form in mind.

In another example of research regarding lesson planning processes, Zahorik (1975) surveyed teachers and asked them to rank the decisions that guided their planning. Teachers
prioritized activities, content, and objectives as key to lesson planning success. Interestingly, Zahorik noted that teachers often utilized a lesson plan format that they did not like. They were required to present lesson plans to placate their administrators, but not necessarily improve their students’ learning environment. As a result, “these pseudo plans are either ignored or new ones formulated that were heavily amended” (p. 135). This gloomy anecdote supports Apple’s (1986) claims about administration’s deliberate efforts to undermine teacher authority. However, CRISPA offers an opportunity to improve the planning process and invigorate teacher attitudes toward lesson planning procedures (Moroye & Uhrmacher, 2009).

Lesson Planning Summary

While suggestions for philosophical approaches to teaching (Duckworth, 2006; Hunter, 1983; Schmuck & Schmuck, 1988; Tyler, 1949) and the standardized formatting of the lesson plans (Boshkoff, 1991; Jackson, 2009) are certainly helpful, and they do provide some context for reference, they are not the focus of this research. The perceptual lesson planning model does not recommend any particular lesson plan format or approach. Within this research, the focus is on the processes of lesson planning, and more specifically, the dynamic of collaborative lesson planning using the Deweyian (1934) aesthetic concept. The differences between these approaches is significant as much of the lesson planning research is focused on a behaviorist approach that relies on linear, almost step by step processes, while the perceptual lesson planning model places an emphasis on “teacher creativity, meaning-making, and invigoration” (Uhrmacher et al., 2013, p. 3).

Research on Collaboration and Collaborative Planning

A discussion of research on collaboration is important as this study calls for teachers to work together while applying the CRISPA planning model. Research on teacher collaboration is
ubiquitous and summarized in the subsequent sections (Brophy, 1982; Brown, 1988; Lalik & Niles, 1990; Thousand et al., 2006; Tschannen-Moran et al., 2000). In this segment of the literature, the research based qualities of collaboration are reviewed. The lack of depth in collaborative planning is also explored. Collaboration between teachers can contribute to strong school cultures, teacher collegiality, and reinforcement of the professionalism of teachers (Kohm & Nance, 2009; Mertens et al., 2010). Notably, these features may also be byproducts of the perceptual planning process (Moroye & Uhrmacher, 2009).

Tschannen-Moran, Uline, Hoy, and Mackley (2000), epitomized the literature on collaboration in the field of education. Their research focused on an administrative effort to install one particular model of school improvement initiatives that focused on collaboration among faculty. Their analysis examined many categories of collaboration including mentoring new teachers, team teaching, and initiatives to foster better communication between administrators and teachers. However, Tschannen-Moran et al. (2000) did not address collaborative lesson planning in their research, which leaves a gap in the literature regarding planning.

In another study of collaboration, researchers conducted a quantitative analysis to explore the connection between teacher collaboration and school improvement (Goddard, Goddard, & Tschannen-Moran, 2007). In a six-item questionnaire, over 400 teachers at 47 schools responded to inquiries about their experience of collaboration. The forms of collaboration in this research ranged from simply talking about professional work to curriculum decisions, assessment, and student placement. This data was combined with student information such as free and reduced lunch participation, reading achievement, and proportions of minority students, in an attempt to discern whether there are correlations between teacher collaboration and student achievement.
These researchers recognized the relevance of collaborative planning as they asked teachers to evaluate their coordination regarding “selecting instructional methods and activities” (p. 893). Unfortunately, the data provided in the report did not indicate teacher responses to this specific question. Similar to the research summarized by Zahorik (1975), the brief focus on lesson planning by Goddard et al. (2007) evoked a behaviorist approach to planning without describing in the details of the planning process.

Goddard et al. (2007) stated that “collaboration can occur when teachers talk often about their professional work” (p. 880). This very broad definition of collaboration is valid, yet, this research seeks to place collaboration within the specific setting of lesson planning simultaneously between multiple teachers. Simply taking time to share the results of a recently taught class, discussing an upcoming assessment, or coordinating an upcoming parent meeting, all meet the intent of collaboration. In general, however, when it comes to collaborative planning, the research is less intentional and often lacks detail.

One of the most extensive accounts of teacher collaboration during planning was provided by Hill et al. (1983). Teachers in this study indicated that they appreciated the value of interacting with other practitioners and learning from others’ expertise and experience. This finding is corroborated by Darling-Hammond et al. (2010) and Van Der Valk and Broekman (1999). Routine collaborative planning was also viewed as a key to introducing new staff to procedures and practices. This finding echoes the conclusions of Wolcott (1994) and Kohm and Nance (2009), when they addressed the value of collaboration. The structures and demands of the modern classroom give propensity towards solitude – not a desirable situation. They assert that the risks of teaching becoming a solitary profession unless teachers are encouraged and enabled to work together. Unfortunately, the preceding examples are limited in that they do not
provide direct insights into the planning process itself. For example, Hill et al. (1983) reported that “staff members in each classroom planned collaboratively so that everyone shared authorship of plans and was familiar with the procedures to be carried out” (p. 183). Beyond this comment, there was no detail provided as to how the planning was conducted or the nature of the interactions between teachers. Given that Hill et al. (1983) conducted their research at a laboratory school, there was much discussion of how the preservice teachers were integrated and involved in planning, but there were no direct investigations into the process.

At best, the reported research generalized what happened during planning as a brief summary or passive formulation, rather than specific observations about how the planning occurred. The findings from Hill et al. (1983) are also limited because the teachers involved were situated in sheltered special education settings, so much of the coordination and collaboration occurred between teachers and paraprofessionals who were routinely located within the same classroom. This dynamic makes the findings somewhat unique, as this setting placed the teachers, co-teachers, and other adults in close proximity for most of the school day. Thus, the research setting explored by Hill et al. (1983) differed from this research as the teachers who participated in this study to plan are rarely located in one another’s classrooms.

In another example of collaborative planning in a unique teacher setting, Rimpola (2014) examined combined planning among high school math co-teachers. Rimpola found that a co-teaching environment “requires both co-teachers to plan a variety of ways to support all students” (p. 41). Importantly, Rimpola reported that simply providing the time for teachers to collaborate on planning did not ensure that the task would occur. In the co-teaching setting, he asserted that the planning requires “the professional commitment of both co-teachers to the process and consistent focus on students’ needs” (p. 43). The centrality of any teacher’s
willingness to commit to the planning process is noteworthy to make it productive and meaningful.

Thus far, this review has sought to establish the importance of lesson planning and collaboration within the field of teaching. This study explored both of these issues, but within the context of a unique perspective. That perspective, provided by Dewey (1934) involves the deliberate application of aesthetics. As previously established, Dewey believed that the inclusion of an aesthetic layer would make educative experiences the most complete and whole. This next segment of the literature review will explore how researchers have utilized Dewey’s (1934) ideas in practical settings.

**Research Using Aesthetics**

Research founded in Deweyian aesthetics is not uncommon (Girod, Rau, & Schepige, 2003; Jakobson & Wickman, 2007). Dewey’s (1934) ideas regarding the use of aesthetics are the theoretical underpinning for this research as well as the basis for the CRISPA model. As defined in Chapter 1, aesthetic or aesthetics often includes terms such as; beautiful, love of beauty, and the philosophy of art and beauty (Agnes, 1995). This segment of the literature review will examine prior research that sought to explore the use of Deweyian aesthetics in teaching situations. Although this study does not involve observation of teaching lessons, the existing research described in this section offers the best opportunity to explore the Deweyian ideal in action.

**Research using Deweyian Aesthetics**

Educational researchers such as Foshay (2000) and Greene (1977) added additional context to Dewey’s (1934) aesthetic ideas when they espoused the advantages of utilizing aesthetic concepts in the classroom. Foshay (2000) placed the aesthetic self within the context of
the exploration of the basis for curriculum. He acknowledged the observations of Dewey (1934) when stating that humans “report aesthetically almost constantly” (p. 32), meaning that we are almost constantly observing and experiencing the physical world around us. In the process of going about our daily routines, humans encounter objects that are deemed beautiful or ugly, or inspirational, or shocking. Foshay (2000) elaborated on the concept by highlighting his belief that, for example, “well written history, which has a good aesthetic quality, is likely to have a much greater impact on students than mere factual accounts” (p. 38). In making this claim, Foshay supported the imagination, sensory experience, and perceptivity traits of CRISPA. For example, while teaching a lesson on the sinking of the Lusitania, the teacher may choose to simply present the facts as they are known, and discuss the factual, who, what, where, when and why details of the event. By considering the CRISPA model, however, the teacher may also introduce the written account of a survivor, paintings or drawings of the sinking of the vessel, or lists of the names and ages of the victims. By adding these simple elements, the teacher is more likely to tap into the aesthetic judgments of her students and thereby lead them to a more fulfilling educative experience just as Dewey (1934) envisioned.

Researchers seeking to explore and evaluate the use of aesthetics in education are generally found in the content of science (Girod, Rau, & Schepige, 2003; Jakobson & Wickman, 2007; Moroye & Uhrmacher, 2009; Pugh, 2002). Having a majority of aesthetic research within the science curriculum may seem contradictory to the traditions of the field. As opposed to precise and measured observations, the whole idea of aesthetic observation or pleasure involves subjective and highly individualized perceptions. Wang (2001) addressed this seeming dichotomy when he described the nature of science as specifically seeking closure with the end of an experiment resulting in the confirmation of a hard set of facts. He contrasted this goal of
strict scientific conclusion with the highly subjective nature of the aesthetic when he wrote “whereas scientific inquiry gains its validity and claim to truth through the confirmation of experiences, the experience of art as a unique mode of knowing reaches truth through the unfolding and undergoing of an unfinished event” (p. 91). In fact, it is quite common for students in the science classroom to express aesthetic judgments. For example, while dissecting an animal, one would expect students to vocalize aesthetic judgments by pronouncing words such as “yeck, cute, nice, or disgusting” (Jakobson & Wickman, 2009, p. 57). These aesthetic observations are in absolute alignment with Dewey’s (1934) thoughts on the aesthetic role in learning. The mere dissection of the subject animal could, by itself, serve as a valuable learning experience, as the student observed organs and the arrangement of internal systems. However, by encouraging the student to observe and express aesthetic judgments based on sights, smells, and feel of the animal, and compare those aesthetic experiences to their existing knowledge adds another valuable layer to the learning opportunity. While inserting personal and subjective feelings into a scientific process may seem counter to the foundations of the field, these feelings add valuable experience to the experiment, and arguably take a step toward the holistic educative process that Dewey (1934) envisioned as he considered the aesthetic. This study allows an examination of how social studies teachers might achieve the same encouragement of aesthetic results within their curriculum area.

Another example of the aesthetic enriching the science curriculum was demonstrated by Girod and Wong (2002). In a fourth grade science unit on geology, the teacher deliberately employed aesthetic themes during lesson presentation. Students were specifically encouraged to develop stories to explore different types of rock such as sandstone or granite. Describing a
student who fully embraced the aesthetic process, the researchers quoted a young girl when she stated,

“I think about the rocks I have differently now than I did before. Now, when I don’t have anything to do, I look at my rock and try to tell its story. I think about where it came from, where it formed, where it’s been, and what its name is.” (Girod & Wong, 2002, p. 211)

This example is an intensely successful demonstration of Dewey’s vision that the educational process is not one of finally learning a concept and then being satisfied that the learning process has ended. Rather, as this student confirmed, she learned new facts about rocks in an unusual and interesting way and she learned to translate her learning into story telling about inanimate objects. Further, her learning and interest did not end at the classroom doorway. She actually began to re-envision her own rock collection using this newfound learning to explore her rock collection at home. The learning shown here is a classic example of an experience which Dewey (1934) described. As with the example of the sinking of the Lusitania offered earlier, this science teacher took what could otherwise have been a mundane explanation of various rock types and their formations and, by applying the aesthetic concept, produced a deeper educative event that, as demonstrated, followed students beyond their classroom experience. This is an excellent example of what can be achieved through use of the CRISPA model.

Linked to his views on aesthetics, Dewey (1934) described the epitome of an educative experience as one that was transformative for the student. The transformative experience is believed to lead the learner to see the world in a new way. Pugh (2002) conducted research seeking to validate a teacher’s ability to scaffold students toward achieving what Dewey (1934) referred to as a transformative experience. A transformative experience is “an expansion of
perception and value resulting from active use of a concept” (Pugh, 2002, p. 1101). Pugh used a teaching approach that encouraged students to look at endangered species in new ways. Using metaphors such as comparing human feet and shoes to animal mobility characteristics allowed the students to begin to view animals differently. Echoing Girod and Wong (2002), Pugh (2002) deliberately encouraged aesthetic utterances such as “look, this is cool” (p. 1111) with his control group to encourage the students to make similar aesthetic judgments. While Pugh’s (2002) results did not show dramatic differences between his two study groups, he did find that using aesthetic means did somewhat increase student concept knowledge.

Exploration of aesthetic ideas is not limited to the K-12 environment. In another interpretation of the aesthetic, Czikszentmihalyi (1990) developed a concept known as the flow experience. The flow experience is “a subjective state that people report when they are completely involved in something to the point of losing track of time and of being unaware of fatigue and of everything else but the activity itself” (Augustine & Zoss, 2006, p. 75). Augustine and Zoss (2006) explored aesthetics in preservice language arts teachers but through the lens of the flow experience. The researchers also stated that the flow experience was the “simultaneous engagement of body, mind, and emotion” (p. 76). A concrete demonstration of the flow idea might be found in a high school biology class. Picture the image of a student bending over with a scalpel in his hand, dissecting a frog. Certainly the student’s body, mind, and reasonably, their emotions are fully engaged. Imagine aesthetic judgments about the frog and its organs as they are peeled apart and assessed. The organs are colorful, soft or hard, gross or beautiful.

After explaining the concept of the flow experience, Augustine and Zoss (2006) revealed that as the student teachers considered certain moments in their memory, they were able to relate them as flow experiences. Some examples included visiting the grave of a recently deceased
friend, or being emotionally overtaken during a high school band performance. In both
instances, these students were totally immersed in the event at hand and felt that the criteria for
flow were met. By working with young adults in their research, Augustine and Zoss demonstrate
the applicability of variations on the aesthetic concept and their use among varying age ranges.
While the flow experience described by Cziksentmihalyi (1990) differs from the aesthetic
component defined by Dewey (1934), they share similar emotional and subjective aspects. As
this research on flow is founded in Dewey’s aesthetic beliefs, the conceptual model for its design
also utilized his idea of the aesthetic. Augustine and Zoss’ (2006) examination of the aesthetic in
a setting with college students helps support the idea that Dewey’s theory is applicable across
age and content ranges and spans beyond the K-12 learning environment.

CRISPA

The origins of the CRISPA conceptual model are founded in Dewey’s (1934) articulation
of applying the aesthetic in educative settings. The model itself originated in Colorado and was
the work of several researchers who support and advise the Aesthetic Institute of Colorado.
Located at the University of Denver, the institute facilitates the collaboration of artists and
teachers. By regularly hosting seminars involving these two seemingly disparate groups, the
teachers are given opportunities to broaden their perspective on lesson planning through
exposure to various artists and their work. During their time together, the teachers consider new
influences on their lesson planning while the artists are able to share their craft with fresh
audiences in a unique setting. Over time, the researchers associated with the institute began to
observe and record the characteristics of aesthetics as they were applied by the teachers. Thus,
the concept of CRISPA originated from research and extended observation of teachers (Conrad,
et al., 2015).
A powerful example of seeking and achieving aesthetic learning through the CRISPA model was provided by Moroye and Uhrmacher (2009). In an elementary science classroom, they observed an experienced teacher apply aesthetic principles to lesson planning and delivery. The unit of study for the students focused on outer space. Notably, the teacher involved in this research had attended the Aesthetic Institute program and was well versed in CRISPA. The space unit was one that the teacher had taught previously for several years. However, aspects of aesthetics such as creativity, imagination, and sensory experiences were added to the lessons as a result of her application of CRISPA. To introduce the space unit to her class, the teacher told the students that they were taking a field trip to the media center. Once there, the lights were darkened, and colorful displays of photographs of space were viewed. Along with the viewing, the teacher actually played a piano accompaniment. Further, prior to the field trip, she encouraged the students to “quietly oh and ah” (p. 90). The researchers observed one student performing a modified tai chi exercise at the rear of the group as the pictures were shown. The students responded positively to this experience and consistently voiced their pleasure and enjoyment at what they were seeing. This research demonstrated the relative ease of applying the CRISPA model. This teacher had previously used the pictures as her unit opener. However, by rethinking this class with element of CRISPA, she added imagination and active engagement by creating a ‘field trip’ to the media center. Further, she made the opener a heightened sensory experience with the addition of the music. Thus, the teacher was able to transform what would have otherwise been a routine unit introduction into memorable and engaging visual and auditory experience.

Moroye and Uhrmacher (2009) suggested that imagination is an important component of an aesthetic experience. The teacher introduced imagination to the space unit when she had the
students construct models of the planets in our solar system. She gave the students minimal instructions, such as about how large to make each sphere, but did not tell them they were actually making planets. Then, she observed and listened as the students began to speculate as to what they were actually doing. Eventually the students figured out they were making models of planets and according to the teacher, she felt it was empowering for the students to explore and question until they discerned their purpose (Moroye & Uhrmacher, 2009).

The existing research that most closely aligned with this study was conducted by Conrad, et al. (2015) among a varied group of elementary, middle, and high school teachers. During a one-day workshop, the participants were asked to view one of their existing lesson plans through the lens of CRISPA. This was an extension of the research conducted with the elementary science teacher’s space unit as describe above (Moroye & Uhrmacher, 2009). The researchers introduced the CRISPA principles and asked the teachers to re-envision their existing lessons using the model. For this study, the participants were introduced to the CRISPA model by reading Moroye and Uhrmacher’s (2009) study of the science teacher’s application of the aesthetic concept. While the teachers participating in the research were from a variety of grade levels and curriculum areas, they were encouraged to help each other envision how they might improve their lessons using the perceptual approach. Following the data collection, transcripts of focus group discussions and interactions were coded to identify the themes of CRISPA as articulated by the teachers. In summary, the findings of the research indicated that the teachers all agreed that CRISPA enhanced their creativity. The experience was best summed up by one teacher, in particular, who self-identified as non-creative,
…but having these tools presented to me, it all just sort of came together. And it’s not about me being creative but it’s about creating spaces for my kids to be creative. So that was really a perception shift for me today (Conrad et al., 2015, p. 13).

As a relatively new concept, research using the CRISPA model is limited, however, results such as these do point to the prospect of offering a new and invigorated planning experience for teachers as well as their students.

**CRP Theory**

Parallel to exploring the application of aesthetics during planning, the researcher in this study used the experience of collaborative lesson planning to leverage discussion on CRP (Ladson Billings, 1995a). Ladson-Billings (1995a) is credited with coining the term. Ladson-Billings’ work followed that of others, including Coleman et al. (1966), whose research revealed that “the achievement of black children was lower than that of White children” (Brown-Jeffy & Cooper, 2011, p. 65). In the years following the Coleman et al. (1966) research, various gaps in performance between White and some marginalized children continued to grow and were regularly documented.

Within this context of achievement and opportunity gaps (Carter & Welner, 2013), researchers revealed various disconnects between the cultural environments of the home and school for other communities, such as Native American and Hawaiian children (e.g., Carter & Welner, 2013; Ladson Billings, 1995a). Further, these same groups often suffer from lack of opportunities for enrichment and extension activities. Ladson-Billings’ research efforts began to focus on specific actions that teachers could take to address the cultural disconnects between African-American children’s homes and the schools they attended. Ladson-Billings (1995a) research of teachers who were recognized as highly successful with African-American students
revealed several key actions, including consistently demonstrating the belief that all students were capable of academic success. Other traits of these teachers include their view of pedagogy as a form of art that was always evolving. They viewed themselves as members of the community and that teaching was a way to give back to the community (Ladson Billings, 1995a).

After synthesizing her research, Ladson-Billings (1995a) identified three key criteria that are crucial to successful CRP pedagogy. First, teachers must develop students academically. Any pedagogy that fails at this task is a failed pedagogy. Second, teachers must demonstrate a “willingness to nurture and support cultural competence” (p. 483). And finally, successful CRP (Ladson Billings, 1995a) must contribute to the development of a critical consciousness for the students. In this final criterion, students are led to engage in critical thought about their surroundings and perhaps take action to challenge the status quo (Ladson Billings, 1995a).

**CRP and CRISPA**

Coupling the use of CRP within the CRISPA planning model is unique and not found in the literature. The aim in this research is to leverage the process of the CRISPA model to segue into a discourse involving CRP (Ladson Billings, 1995a). There is urgency to addressing the needs of all students, and provide them with their rightful education while simultaneously honoring their individual context and culture. Educators are morally and ethically responsible for ensuring educational access for all students.

Changes in the demographics of America’s public schools show a need to explore effective multicultural education to engage all students. Measurable gaps between Whites and marginalized students appear in many areas including: lower scores on standardized tests; overall lower performance in math; the percentage of families living below the poverty level; graduation rates; and significant gaps in overall future income (Gollnick & Chinn, 1990; National Center for
Education Statistics, 2014). Current high school graduation rates, a key indicator of future economic independence and success are particularly alarming. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, as of the 2011-2012 SY, four-year high school graduation rates in the United States were as follows: Asian 93%, White 85%, Hispanic 76% and Black 68% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). It seems logical that if CRISPA has the potential to increase teacher enthusiasm and make the lesson planning experience more meaningful, then at the same time, it might provide opportunities for teachers to engage in CRP to support all students learning in the classroom (Ladson Billings, 1995a). Existing research studies demonstrate how teachers account for CRP in their planning and inform this research. For example, when considering the incorporation of a sensory experience, teachers may select a piece of art or segment of music that is tied to the students’ culture, such as a mural by Diego Rivera or music from an African American like John Coltrane.

Researchers who have explored how teachers utilized CRP in the classroom include Hefflin (2002), Howard (2003), Villegas and Lucas (2008). Each of these researchers offered insights into how inservice teachers might apply CRP (Ladson Billings, 1995a). Echoing Ladson-Billings (1995a), Villegas and Lucas (2008) asserted that by employing a constructivist approach to teaching, students were automatically considered capable of absorbing new information and turning it into meaningful educative experiences. Ladson-Billings (1995a) made it clear that first and foremost any pedagogy must lead to student success or it should not be utilized. Further, by approaching all students as capable learners, teachers avoid falling into what is known as the trap of the deficit syndrome or effect (Howard, 2003). Within the deficit model, teachers cast prejudgments on individual students based on perceived deficits frequently attributed to race, ethnicity, or socio economic status. The deficit model posits that before
knowing the children, the teacher presumes they will have difficulty behaving or learning. Teachers “expect students to be high or low achievers (and) they will act in ways that cause this to happen” (p. 57), thus enacting a self-fulfilling prophecy and reinforcing deficit thinking.

Howard (2003) and Briggs (2014) suggested that individual teacher reflection is an important ingredient toward building CRP skills (Ladson Billings, 1995a). This study leveraged previous findings to encourage the participants to explore CRP in their own pedagogy. An example study that applies this process is found in Briggs (2014). While teaching a group of all-White preservice teachers in Illinois, Briggs (2014) sought opportunities to immerse her students into communities with large majority-minority populations. Various field experiences ranged from student teaching in schools, local community centers, and having lunch with students within the neighborhoods where they lived. The teacher candidates provided powerful and candid comments within journals. One of the teachers revealed feeling conscientious of race because of “the 307 students and teachers, we were the only White people in the classrooms” (Briggs, 2014, p. 6). Another student teacher demonstrated deficit model thinking when sharing their expectations of a school visit that would have “a run-down art program with unruly students…doing boring projects because of poor art teachers” (Briggs, 2014, p. 6). In contrast to preconceived notions, this student-teacher found a thriving art department full of caring teachers and well-behaved students. In both of these instances, the preservice teachers had powerful moments of insight when the reality of their surroundings became apparent. These examples simultaneously show the potential and challenges of CRP for teachers, particularly White teachers, such as those within this case study, when they conduct reflection and gain new self-awareness (Ladson Billings, 1995a).
Several research examples offer insight into how inservice teachers successfully applied CRP to improve educative outcomes (Hefflin, 2002; Howard 2001; Ladson Billings, 1995a; Sheets, 1995; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Sheets (1995) was a participant researcher in a longitudinal study of Hispanic students who were identified as limited English proficient (LEP) becoming exceptional students who succeeded in Advanced Placement (AP) classes. As a teacher and researcher, she saw the potential of several students who spoke Spanish, but could neither read nor write the language. Following Ladson-Billings’ (1995a) guidance to seek to challenge minority students, Sheets (1995) convinced several of these students to enroll in AP Spanish classes. She believed in their potential to succeed and utilized their spoken fluency to enhance the class for those students who were less fluent Spanish language learners. The integration of the native speakers provided a boost for the other students and simultaneously gave the native speaking students a sense of self-worth and educational prowess that they had never before experienced. Seeking grant money to pay for the national AP exams, all of the native Spanish speaking students passed their tests and eventually moved into the AP Spanish Literature course. By applying CRP, particularly the aspect of valuing the student’s home culture, Sheets (1995) helped build self-esteem and confidence within her students. Her efforts culminated when several of her students took the AP Spanish Literature exam. Within a national pool of only 3,146 students who took this exam in the year of the study, her students were the only students in the entire state of Washington to take the test, and they all achieved passing scores.

Summary of the Literature Review

Several research areas relative to this study include: lesson planning pedagogies, collaboration, aesthetics, CRISPA (Uhrmacher & Moroye, 2009) and CRP (Ladson Billings,
The modified definition of lesson planning for this project is a collaborative process among teachers of preparing a framework for guiding individual teacher action toward teaching a specific skill or standard. This definition was derived from components of previous research projects (Clark & Yinger, 1979, Clark & Yinger, 1980).

Although teachers apply a wide range of planning practices, these are generally divided into two camps which are either teacher centered or student centered. While the application of the CRISPA model does not favor one teaching philosophy over another, the differences between behaviorists, such as Tyler (1949) and Hunter (1983), and constructivists, such as Schmuck and Schmuck (1988) and Duckworth (2006), CRISPA (Uhrmacher & Moroye, 2009). helps establish context for the major schools of thought regarding lesson planning that the teachers may choose during their planning.

Further support for the practice of lesson planning was provided within several studies exploring how teachers went about planning while emphasizing the importance of using a particular format for the lesson plan itself (Clark & Yinger, 1979; Milkova, 2012; Roskos & Neuman, 1995; Zahorik, 1975). As confirmed by John (2006), most teacher training programs spend considerable time teaching students how to prepare lesson plans. Even though specific teacher lesson plans will not be evaluated as part of this project, these researchers provided insight into how teachers typically approach the planning. In this study, each participating teacher utilized their preferred method for preparing their individual lesson planning product during and after the collaborative work. While exploring the literature on lesson planning, the theme of teacher collaboration emerged and led to consideration of its importance not only to lesson planning, but as an important facet of the teaching profession.
The participating teachers worked collaboratively for this research. The review of existing research on collaboration within the field of education revealed many perspectives on the concept with very broad definitions (Brophy, 1982; Brown, 1988; Lalik & Niles, 1990; Thousand et al., 2006; Tschannen-Moran et al., 2000). Collaborative planning, however, was rarely mentioned in the literature and details were scant when it was found (Goddard, Goddard, & Tschannen-Moran, 2007). Based on the research reviewed within this chapter, this project provides details on collaborative planning and thereby fills a gap in the existing literature on this topic.

This literature review also revealed the origins of the CRISPA model (Uhrmacher & Moroye, 2009) within research observations of artists and teachers working together to enhance the teachers’ lesson planning experience (Conrad et al. 2015). By observing interactions and outcomes of collaborative seminars, several key themes emerged as the teachers applied aesthetics to their own lesson planning. Thus, the CRISPA model of perceptual lesson planning was developed. Multiple studies included within this literature review help to validate the CRISPA model even though these researchers did not utilize the tenets. In the case of storytelling using rocks, (Girod & Wong, 2002) the premise of imagination was employed. By encouraging students to voice aesthetic judgments during science experiments, Girod and Wong (2002) and Pugh (2002) demonstrated the value of sensory experiences. The inclusion of these elements, particularly by researchers who did not develop the CRISPA model provides validation of the concept.

Finally, the review of research involving teacher application of CRP informed this study and provided insight into engaging teachers in CRP discussions during planning (Howard, 2003; Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Hefflin, 2002). Given changes within the demographics of the United
States public school system over the last few decades, as well as forecasts for the future, implementation of CRP provides opportunity to address the needs of all learners and work to mitigate disparate educational outcomes.

The next chapter contains an overview of the research methodology, methods, potential participants, setting, and data collection.
Chapter 3

Introduction

The research question driving this study is as follows: How do teachers in a collaborative setting respond to the implementation of a perceptual approach to lesson planning? The goal of this research is to explore how a group of eighth grade social studies teachers plan collaboratively while applying the perceptual lesson planning model also known as CRISPA. After providing a brief review of the theoretical framework for the study, this chapter provides a definition of qualitative research and describes why it is the best design choice for this study. Further, the choice of a case study is outlined and explained. This chapter also contains a detailed explanation of how the research was conducted including: the context of the research site and participants; positionality of the researcher; data collection and analysis methods, and the timeline of the study.

Addressing the research question

The researcher, positioned as an observer-participant, gathered data from a variety of sources as the group of participating teachers worked together to plan lessons. The label observer-participant is intentionally reversed to accurately describe the researcher’s position throughout the study which will be detailed later in this chapter. Data sources for this question included: observation and field notes, audio/video recording of the planning sessions, collection of artifacts such as, brainstorming notes and charts, pre-and post planning individual interviews (Dewalt & Dewalt, 2011; Merrian, 2002; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Context for the Research Site

A middle school in a large Southeastern United States urban area provides the setting for this study. Central Middle School (CMS) is located within the Southeastern School District
SSD is a large school district, currently serving more than 100,000 students. Individual schools within SSD vary greatly in diversity. Some SSD schools are demographically homogenous while others are diverse in their student population.

The CMS student body is comprised as follows: 33% African-American/Black; 48% White; 4% Asian; 11% Hispanic and 3% multiracial (Southeastern School District annual report, 2014). Current enrollment at CMS is approximately 1,600 pupils. Students are served in the full range of special education, regular education and gifted education classes. Approximately 20% of the students are designated as gifted while another 20% receive special education services. 40% of the students participated in the free and reduced lunch program as of the 2012-2013 school year. The daily average attendance rate is 97%. The overall graduation rate for the high school that CMS feeds is 90%, placing it well above the national average of 80% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2014; Southeastern School District annual report, 2014).

The school provides a full range of fine arts classes including band, orchestra, guitar, music technology, and theater. CMS also provides a high school biology class for eighth graders that meets the hour before the regular school day begins. Students in this setting, as well as in accelerated math and science classes, take end of course tests in eighth grade to earn high school credits at the end of middle school. While this summary describes the entirety of CMS, the scope of this research is limited to the eighth grade social studies teachers.

Research Participants

The participants for this study were the six eighth grade social studies teachers at CMS. This pool included the researcher as a participant. These teachers ranged in overall experience from one to eighteen years. The participants teach students in regular, gifted, collaborative

---

2 Central Middle School (CMS) and the Southeastern School District (SSD) are pseudonyms for the actual school and district in order to protect anonymity of the study results.
special education, and self-contained special education classroom settings. Within the eighth grade content area specifically, their experience ranges from one to twelve years. The teachers represent a convenience or captive sample (Creswell, 2014; Suter, 2006). That is to say, in this case, the teachers who participate are only located within one school and at one grade level. Once they agreed to participate in the study, teachers were provided a questionnaire for the compilation of routine demographic and other pertinent information.

The researcher is sensitive to the time commitment required for each participant. The estimated time for participant engagement is between six and 10 hours. A detailed list of participant time commitment is located at Appendix A. All of the interview activities occurred during normal duty hours at CMS. Interviews were conducted at a time and place of convenience for each participant.

**Conceptual Framework**

**Foundational Theory and Concept for this Research**

The conceptual framework for this research follows the CRISPA model suggested by Moroye and Uhrmacher (2009). This model was derived from an exploration of Dewey’s (1934) thoughts on using aesthetic understandings to enhance educative experiences. The roots of CRISPA can be traced to the Aesthetic Education Institute of Colorado (AEIC) which hosts regular professional development seminars involving artists and teachers. The institute provides a venue for those engaged in traditional teaching roles to interact and collaborate with artists from a variety of fields including dance, music, and painting. Through these seminars, teachers are inspired to consider the aesthetic nature of their work and employ aesthetic themes in their lesson planning and, thereby, in practice, their lesson delivery. By observing the interactions of participants at these joint professional development sessions, researchers identified key traits of
experiences that were most likely to evoke an aesthetic experience (Conrad et al., 2015). The planning approach offered by CRISPA (Uhrmacher & Moroye, 2009) is revitalizing in that, rather than concentrating on testing outcomes, teachers were “invited to focus on the experiences created for students” (p. 3). Existing research results using the CRISPA model indicate opportunities for a refreshed approach to lesson planning and, therefore, a better classroom experience for students as well (Moroye & Uhrmacher, 2009).

Research Design

The research question for this study determined that a qualitative approach was most appropriate. Qualitative research seeks to determine the meaning of events within the context of their occurrence (Merriam, 1998; Sherman & Webb, 1988). Through observation and collection of various data, qualitative research seeks new insights and often explores the actions and activities of participants to discover new perspectives (Lichtman, 2010). Finally, as explained by Merriam (1998), “qualitative researchers are interested in understanding the meaning people have constructed” (p. 6). In short, qualitative researchers are seeking to tell a story based on their data collection. Qualitative data are subjective in nature, and the researcher relies on a variety of data collection methods to improve support for findings.

Other researchers such as Denzin and Lincoln (2011), Yin (2016), and Creswell (2013) also provide support for the qualitative methodology. Denzin and Lincoln (2011) described qualitative research as:

…a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to the self…This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to
make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meaning people bring to them….

(Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 3)

Yin (2016) lists five characteristics of qualitative research:

(a) Studying the meaning of people’s lives, in their real-world roles
(b) Representing the views and perspectives of the people (participants) in a study
(c) Explicitly attending to and accounting for real-world contextual conditions
(d) Contributing insights from existing or new concepts that may help to explain social behavior and thinking
(e) Acknowledging the potential relevance of multiple sources of evidence rather than relying on a single source alone (Yin, 2016, p. 9)

Yin’s description of qualitative research provides further support for this particular choice of research methodology.

Finally, Creswell (2013) asserted that qualitative research uses “the collection of data in a natural setting, sensitive to the people and places under study, and data analysis that is both inductive and deductive and establishes patterns or themes…” (p. 44). The alignment of these expert definitions of qualitative research provided support for this choice of research design. Given these descriptions of qualitative research, the nature of the questions posed within this research, and the setting of this study, qualitative research was the logical choice and is supported by existing research norms.

This segment of the chapter has outlined the case to support a qualitative study. Because the research question seeks to explain the participants’ reaction to utilization of the CRISPA model, a qualitative approach was appropriate. Importantly, the method also reflects the epistemology of Dewey (1934) and the researcher. Dewey argued for a constructivist approach
to learning whereby the student builds on existing knowledge and places new information within the context of their life and society. CRISPA provides a lens for viewing lesson planning which is also constructivist in nature (Moroye & Uhrmacher, 2009). In effect, the elements of this research from the underlying aesthetic theory to the perceptual planning construct to the research question are nested and complement one another (Alvarez & Gowin, 2010). The next step in describing this study is to examine the research method.

**Research Method – Case Study**

Several reasons support the case study decision. First, Merriam (1998) suggested that the defining factor for a case study is the bounded system within which the study is conducted. She suggested that the case is “the thing, a single entity; a unit around which there are boundaries” (p. 27). Second, Creswell (2013) defined a case study as “research involving the study of a case within a real-life, contemporary context or setting” (p. 97). Further, Creswell (2013) explained that time and place often define the bounded system. Lastly, Yin (2016) submitted that “the value of the case study approach is that it deals with the individual case in its actual context” (p. 68). The eighth grade teachers for this study formed a clear bounded group.

**Researcher Positionality**

Qualitative studies acknowledge that there are inherent biases in the research process. These biases may or may not interfere with the inquiry process, but should rightly be acknowledged in order to support ethical practices (Glesne, 2016). This explanation of the researcher’s positionality is included to give context to the researcher within the study process. The researcher for this project is in his tenth year as a teacher. The previous nine years were all spent teaching eighth grade social studies at CMS. In this role, the researcher is a peer and colleague to the research participants. For three years, the researcher served as the department
chair for eighth grade social studies and now serves as the coordinator for gifted services at CMS. The researcher has known most of the participants for almost nine years and has worked directly with most of them for five or more years. Such intimate relationships and close working proximity can create challenges for the researcher’s position. Chapters four and five were shared with the participants for member checking (Conrad & Serlin, 2011; Creswell, 2014; Yin, 2016) and confirmation. The next section of this chapter outlines the data collection plan and this begins with an introduction of CRISPA to the participants.

The researcher believes in the promise of CRISPA as a means to enhance the collaborative planning process on many levels. Data were gathered from a variety of means and coding results were compared between sources to accomplish the triangulation of data. This triangulation was sought through observation, individual interviews, artifact collection, and member checking, and comparing results to existing research (Creswell, 2013). The researcher also reported on themes that repeated themselves instead of lone instances of feedback. Thorough content analysis and cross checking of data also provided support for eventual findings and claims (Vogt, Gardner, & Haeffele, 2012).

**Institutional Review Board (IRB)**

Prior to beginning any data collection, the researcher obtained formal approval from the local school district and the university in accordance with recognized IRB principles (Creswell, 2013; Creswell, 2014; Roberts, 2010). Given that this research does not involve the engagement of students, or use of student records of any type, the local school board grants approving authority for this research to the local school principal. The local school approval documentation was submitted to the university IRB for consideration. A generic timeline of collecting and analyzing data is located at Appendix B.
After obtaining IRB approval, the researcher obtained the proper individual informed consent forms from those teachers who agreed to participate in the study. The consent forms were provided to each teacher asking them to consider participating in the research. They had two to three days to consider the request to join the study. Participation was voluntary and the researcher was available to answer any questions from the teachers.

**Data Collection**

**Individual and Collaborative Planning Data Collection**

One of the goals for collecting qualitative data is to provide enough data points so that findings may achieve triangulation (Cresswell, 2013). Data for this study was collected in two distinct settings within CMS. One setting involved individual teacher interviews which occurred as the first and last steps of data collection. The second setting was within a collaborative planning environment.

**Initial Participant Interviews**

One of the hallmarks of qualitative data is the collection of spoken words within various settings. Detailed analysis and comparison of participant descriptions between data sources allowed the researcher to identify themes and suggest findings derived from the records (Lofland, Snow, Anderson, & Lofland, 2006). Individual interviews conducted by the researcher began the data collection process. The overall intent of the first interview was to establish an initial understanding of teacher attitudes and opinions toward collaborative planning. These semi-structured interviews lasted approximately thirty to forty-five minutes. A list of pre-and post-interview semi-structured interview questions is located at Appendix C. Interviews took place at CMS at a time convenient for each participant. The researcher transcribed each interview to prepare them for coding and analysis. The researcher also took field notes during
the interviews to enhance details and capture reflections (Glesne, 2016). The next phase of research entailed collaborative planning.

**Introducing CRISPA to Participants**

While existing studies involving inservice teachers using CRISPA have the benefit of the study participants having attended the AEIC, the participants in this study do not have that opportunity (Conrad, et al., 2015). After the initial interviews were completed, the participants were provided a copy of Moroye & Uhrmacher’s (2009) research, described earlier, involving the elementary science teacher who used the CRISPA model to modify her existing lesson plans on the space unit. This article is easily accessible for those unfamiliar with Deweyian aesthetics or the CRISPA model. Further, this article provided a concrete example of how applying the CRISPA lens to an existing lesson can achieve an aesthetic experience. Participants were asked to read the article prior to the first focus group meeting. For a detailed schedule of events and data collection for this study, see Appendix D.

**Professional Development Demonstrating CRISPA in Social Studies**

The professional development for the study occurred during one of the curriculum groups’ weekly meetings. CMS administrators set aside approximately one hour per week for these meetings. During the professional development, the researcher facilitated the group discussion of the Moroye and Uhrmacher (2009) article. After this discussion, the researcher also facilitated a professional development exercise demonstrating the CRISPA model in a social studies context. The specific lesson for this demonstration involved using reproduction Native American artifacts that were constructed by former CMS students representing local tribes. The intent of this lesson modeling was to give the participants a concrete experience and demonstrate how application of the CRISPA lens does not necessarily entail total restructuring of a lesson
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that they have already planned. The researcher felt that this was significant given the daily environment faced by teachers. As outlined in the literature review, teachers are already overwhelmed with daily tasks, and presenting them with a lesson planning task that would require them to start from scratch would be an immediate detriment to implementing the planning model.

**Collaborative Planning Sessions**

Following the professional development session, the participants requested that the group be allowed to implement CRISPA during the all-day planning meeting scheduled for the fall. The administration at CMS provides two all-day planning sessions during the school year and provides resources to cover substitute teachers for one full day each semester. Bobby, the department chair for eighth grade social studies approached the administrative team with this idea and was given permission to focus the agenda on perceptual planning. The researcher utilized audio recordings, field notes, and artifacts to collect data. As with the initial interviews, this data was transcribed for coding and analysis.

**Artifacts**

The all-day planning meeting occurred within CMS in a room that is set aside for the social studies department. During the planning session, the teachers had access to markers, butcher paper charts, textbooks, and other resources. Butcher paper charts were utilized to collect specific comments on CRISPA. These posters were photographed for digital storage (Glesne, 2016). During collaborative planning, photographs or still images from the video also captured part of the array of artifacts.
Final Individual Interviews

After completion of all the collaborative planning sessions, the researcher conducted post planning interviews. These semi-structured individual interviews were intended to last approximately 30-60 minutes. The researcher compared the pre-and post-interview transcripts to gauge changes in interest or attitudes toward collaborative lesson planning as well as the CRISPA model itself.

Data Security

In order to protect the identity of the participating teachers, pseudonyms were assigned to each person. The identity of the school and district are also protected by pseudonym. Hard copy documents such as field notes and artifacts from the planning sessions were secured by the researcher after every meeting. As appropriate, they were scanned or digitally photographed for easier storage and originals were destroyed. Any audio or video recordings were stored on the researcher’s laptop computer and on a cloud-based storage system, both with password protected security systems. No more than three years after publication of the dissertation, all digital documentation will be deleted, leaving the dissertation as the final record of the research.

Data Analysis

Data analysis is the process of “organizing what you have seen, heard, and read so you can figure out what you have learned and make sense of what you have experienced” (Glesne, 2016, p. 183). The researcher followed Miles and Huberman’s (1994) recommendations for analysis of the data collected during the study. This model entails a three-step process involving (a) data reduction, (b) data display, and (c) conclusion drawing and verification.
Data Reduction

Per the data collection plan, the analysis process involved examining pre-and post-interview transcripts, collaborative planning session audio/visual recording transcripts, artifacts collected during collaborative planning, and researcher field notes (Emerson, Fretz & Shaw, 2011). Miles and Huberman (1994) acknowledge that “data collection is an inescapably selective process, that you cannot and do not get it all, even though you might think you can and are” (p. 55-56).

Data Display

Data display is the organization and compression of the collected data. In this study, the data display consisted of the transcripts of interviews and collaborative planning sessions, as well as information drawn from artifacts. The researcher coded the data using a content model. According to Ezzy (2002), content analysis begins with predefined categories. In this study, the categories related to the CRISPA model. Initially, comments that were specific to CRISPA elements and collaborative planning were identified. The researcher was aware that unexpected themes might emerge as the data was scrutinized and categories of coding were added as they were identified. Over time, as themes began to crystalize, Miles and Huberman (1994) recommend that the researcher prepare a visual data display in the form of charts or matrices. The model of data display is summarized in the next chapter.

Conclusion Drawing and Verification

As the data display process unfolds, the researcher began to note regularities, patterns, and possible explanations for events (Miles & Huberman, 1994). As these emerged, the researcher began to fit the pieces together to offer conclusions. The value of qualitative research lies in the researcher’s ability to demonstrate trustworthiness of findings and conclusions (Ezzy,
One way this can be accomplished is through triangulation of conclusions as compared between various data sources (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005). This study offers a variety of data collection methods with the hope of identifying consistent themes between sources. Glesne (2016) asserts that “the qualitative researcher seeks to provide enough detail and description that readers can enter into the work and find resonance with their own lives or develop empathy for and new understandings about the lives of others” (p. 153). By adhering to this three-phase model, the researcher aimed to identify conclusions that were supportable through rigorous data collection, recording, and display thus supporting trustworthiness of the data and resulting findings.

**Significance of the Study**

The results of this study of how eighth grade social studies teachers planned collaboratively using an aesthetic model are significant to several groups. This section will identify those groups and explain the significance to each one. The groups are: (a) classroom teachers, (b) school administrators, (c) teacher educators, (d) other researchers interested in collaborative planning and/or aesthetic applications, and (e) teachers and researchers interested in the pedagogy of CRP.

First, this study informs classroom teachers. By exploring how this group of teachers interacted and worked together during lesson planning, other teachers might learn from the process. Teachers may be hesitant to freely participate in collaborative planning. Perhaps they believe their content knowledge is weak, or they do not have anything meaningful to contribute. By exploring how a group of their contemporaries approached the task, these teachers might feel less inhibited on these matters. By reading an account of how others engaged in the process, they may feel confident and emboldened. Finally, by understanding and employing the concept
of CRISPA, teachers might sense a refreshing way to approach planning that might otherwise be viewed as a mundane and even an unnecessary task. Properly applied, the perceptual planning model may provide an achievable link between Dewey’s vision for relevant teaching and demands that might otherwise distract teachers from quality lesson planning (Moroye & Uhrmacher, 2009; Uhrmacher, 2009).

Second, school administrators may appreciate the opportunity to explore the experiences of this group of educators. The state evaluation system for administrators, known as the Leader Keys Effectiveness System (LKES), specifically demands that administrators facilitate collaborative planning. Scant evidence is available that details what that process looks like in practice. The details provided from these planning experiences may give administrators a true glimpse of collaborative planning in action. Whether their teachers employ the aesthetic theme or not, the planning process, in itself, provided an opportunity to gather and apply lessons learned from this particular process. As with the teachers, however, an administrator who might sense that their teachers are tired or lack enthusiasm about the planning process can learn from the application of the CRISPA principles. These principles might provide a catalyst for reenergizing and adding excitement to the planning process.

Researchers may potentially find the combination of collaborative planning and aesthetic application interesting, as well. While the breadth of research on collaboration is wide, the amount of planning focused on what happens during collaborative planning is not. This research provided a detailed look inside the room while inservice teachers tackled real life planning tasks. Research based documentation of this perspective is unusual and should be helpful to researchers interested in collaboration or, more specifically, collaborative planning. The results of this research offer a unique perspective and fill an identified gap, that being the exploration of
CRISPA within a group setting. Most research in aesthetics is found in the area of science (Girod & Wong, 2002; Jakobson & Wickman, 2008; Moroye & Uhrmacher, 2009; Pugh, 2002; Pugh & Girod, 2007; Wang, 2001). The perspective on aesthetics in a middle school setting is elusive and CRISPA research within the social studies is absent.

Teacher educators should find the focus on inservice collaborative planning helpful as they prepare new teachers for the work force. Collaboration is often hailed as a 21st century job skill and employers lament that lack of employee ability or willingness to collaborate or work on a team (Brophy, 1982; Brown, 1988; Lalik & Niles, 1990; Thousand et al., 2006). Within the field of education, the risk of isolation is well noted and as with almost any worthwhile undertaking, participating as a member of a team is often more effective, meaningful, and productive (Tschannen-Moran et al., 2000). As preservice teachers look ahead to their future employment conditions, there is a clear expectation for collaboration and effective planning. In the current state teacher evaluation system, 40% is based on demonstration of effective planning. Teacher educators would do well by their students to acknowledge this fact and take steps to prepare their own students to step into the role of team-member, contributor, and eventually, leaders of small curriculum groups. This research can also help prepare preservice teachers for the conditions they will encounter, once they are employed.

The discussion of CRP within the perceptual planning framework is unique. There are no existing CRISPA research results that address the inclusion of CRP. In this respect, this study may attract the interest of researchers and practitioners who seek to integrate CRP to their work. Ladson-Billings (1995a) acknowledged that many teachers respond to the CRP model by declaring, “that is just good teaching” (p. 159). CRP does incorporate pedagogy that equates to good teaching within the classroom, it necessarily includes a specific cultural component, as well
as the development of the students’ critical consciousness. These traits set CRP apart and as other studies of teachers learning to implement CRP in their classrooms (Briggs, 2014; Santamaria, 2009; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

Summary

This chapter outlined the methodology of the research study. The choices of methodology and method were explained, supported, and defended. A description of the setting for the research as well as the selection of participants was also provided. The various means of collection of data and analysis were also described. Researcher position and methods to clarify and support these positions were provided. In summary, the entirety of the case study approach was explained in detail. The next chapter describes the results of data collection and analysis and establishes the case for the research findings.
Chapter 4

Chapter Organization

This chapter provides the results of this study of how eighth grade social studies teachers responded to the perceptual lesson planning process in a collaborative setting. The focus of data collection and analysis was oriented toward the research question of how the application of the perceptual planning process impacted teachers’ attitudes toward collaborative planning. As the analysis unfolded, several major themes emerged including: participant beliefs about collaborative planning; teacher response to professional development, and the role of the agenda for Tuesday meetings. Along with other themes, the data analysis led to several key findings listed below. As previously noted, the definition of collaborative lesson planning for this study was a process among teachers of preparing a framework for guiding individual teacher action toward teaching a specific skill or standard (Clark & Elmore, 1979; Lalik & Niles, 1990; Thousand, Villa, & Nevin, 1990; Yinger, 1980).

As this chapter will allude to, there are four findings associated with this research. First, the participants valued the opportunity to plan together and secondly, they felt those opportunities were often hindered. Thirdly, the application of CRISPA allowed for a creative and meaningful collaborative planning experience. Finally, the application of CRISPA may aid with the implementation of CRP. The collection of data was divided into four distinct and chronological processes.

First, the researcher conducted pre-interviews in order to establish a base-line of participant teacher attitudes and thoughts regarding collaborative planning. Data collected in this phase consisted of interview transcripts and researcher notes. In the second phase of data collection, the researcher led a professional development session oriented toward introducing the
participants to the perceptual planning model and allowed them to evaluate a social studies lesson that incorporated the concept. During the professional development, data collection included audio recordings, artifacts, and researcher notes. Next, the participants engaged in a day-long collaborative planning session where principles of perceptual planning were applied and evaluated while the group prepared for one unit of study in eighth grade social studies. The researcher also made audio recordings of post-interviews in order to gauge the impact of the application of the model on collaborative planning attitudes. Finally, the results include a discussion of how the perceptual planning process might lead to the utilization of culturally relevant pedagogy during the planning process.

**Delimitations and Limitations of this Study**

No study can address the full scope of influences and phenomenon that surround a given research question (Glesne, 2016). In order to aid in trustworthiness of data and findings, it is advisable to state delimits and limits of the study. While delimitations are typically defined by the parameters of the research design and reflect deliberate decisions within the control of the researcher, limitations represent those things that the researcher cannot influence (Glesne, 2016). To this end, key delimitations for this research include a decision not to examine lesson plans or observe the delivery of lessons that were developed during the collaborative planning session. With regard to asking teachers to share their written lesson plans, the researcher believed that this task would have a negative impact on those wishing to participate, because CMS does not currently require teachers to produce individual written plans. Thus, asking teachers to conduct extra work may have quelled their desire to participate. In addition, the researcher initially considered visiting individual participant classrooms in order to observe lessons that were developed as part of the perceptual planning process. This possibility was determined to be
impractical due to time constraints on data collection and teaching responsibilities of the researcher.

A key limitation for this study was that the researcher did not attend the Aesthetic Education Institute of Colorado AEIC (Uhrmacher & Moroye, 2007). Scheduling conflicts and travel requirements for attending the institute were not manageable. Instead, the researcher deeply read the literature on perceptual lesson planning theory and its application. Further, given time constraints of the research window, the participants were allowed relatively little time to contemplate or reflect on the practice of applying CRISPA. The preceding delimitations and limitations of are relevant to critically reviewing and understanding the results of this study.

**Role of the Researcher at CMS**

The teachers who were invited to participate in this research were eighth grade social studies teachers at one urban public school in the Southeastern United States. The researcher is also an eighth grade teacher at this school and was involved with data collection as an observer-participant (DeWalt & DeWalt, 2011). This situation called for a delicate balancing act on behalf of the researcher. On the one hand, as a member of this curriculum team, he was obligated to contribute to discussions of content and classroom strategies. On the other, as his peers discussed CRISPA and its application, he sought to minimize his voice as he observed and recorded participant responses and meaning-making for the perceptual planning process. Therefore, after providing the initial introduction and professional development for the perceptual planning process, the researcher gradually assumed a less active role in the planning process and primarily focused on his role as observer.
Setting for Weekly Curriculum Meetings Known as “Tuesday Meetings”

During various phases of data collection, participants often referred to the curriculum meeting. A detailed description of that meeting is necessary in order to appreciate its context for the participants. The curriculum meetings for eighth grade social studies are held almost every Tuesday throughout the school year. This time is well protected by the administration and they do not allow, for example, special education teachers to schedule Individualized Education Programs (IEP) reviews or other parent conferences during this time. However, it is also notable that the meeting is titled as a curriculum meeting and not a planning meeting. This is the only regularly scheduled weekly time where an administrator is likely to see an entire curriculum group at once. As such, this is a good opportunity to share important instructions for upcoming events such as standardized testing, or other information that teachers need to hear directly from administrators. The meeting is held during the grade level planning period, which coincides with the last period of the day for eighth grade teachers. One hour is allotted for this meeting and attendance counts toward the annual Professional Learning Unit (PLU) requirements which contribute to maintaining teacher certification. It is important to recognize, however, that the given title for the weekly meeting is “curriculum meeting,” and it is not entitled “curriculum planning meeting.” While planning might occur as a function of the meeting, it is not the primary goal of the meeting.

Participant Information

While chapter three offered a broad context for the school setting and the participant pool, the information in this section provides greater detail of the teachers who agreed to participate and additional description of the setting within CMS. Excluding the researcher, there were five eighth grade social studies teachers at CMS. Every eighth grade social studies teacher
was invited to participate and all accepted the offer. The five participants represented a wide range of teaching experience and they reflected a variety of classroom learning settings from regular education, gifted, and collaborative special education. Descriptions of the experience and teaching assignment for each participant are provided next in order to give context to the individuals involved in this study.

**Participant Descriptions**

The information in this section is intended to provide details regarding the breadth of experience and teaching backgrounds of the participants. Ernie is a white male with 20 years of teaching experience and 14 of those teaching eighth grade social studies. In addition to 6-12 social studies certification, he is fully qualified to teach advanced placement U.S. history, high school world geography, and political science. Ernie’s classroom setting this school year includes regular and gifted education students. His collaborative planning experience is spread between two middle schools, including CMS. At his first school, when collaborative planning occurred, it was rare and always the result of teachers taking the initiative to meet. While at CMS, he has always participated in the weekly curriculum meetings and, in recent years, the all-day planning meetings in fall and spring.

Ginger is an African-American female with 18 years of teaching experience. However, this is her first year teaching eighth grade social studies. Ginger’s educational experience is also unique because she has spent most of her teaching assignments in self-contained special education classrooms with children identified with Exceptional Behavioral Disorders (EBD). During her tenure as a teacher, she has taught every core curriculum area across all middle school grade levels. During her pre-interview, she lamented not only her lack of collaborative planning experience, but her overall lack of contact with other teachers in general. She discussed
how her previous placements as a self-contained teacher had isolated her from curriculum groups and other teachers overall. She expressed great relief and excitement about her teaching assignment this year, which includes collaborative and resource special education classroom settings (August 22, 2016).

Traci is a white female with 16 years of total experience including two years in eighth grade social studies. Her first teaching position was in a private high school where she taught for one year. In addition to her 6-12 social studies certification, she holds English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) and gifted education certifications. Her classroom settings this year include collaborative, English Language Learner (ELL), and regular education.

Bobby is a white male with eight years of teaching experience. He has taught at CMS for two full years following six years of experience in two other mid-Atlantic states. Bobby serves as the department chair for eighth grade social studies and in this capacity is responsible for communicating activities between the administration and teachers in the department. He coordinates the weekly curriculum meeting agenda and helps set the tone for collaboration. Bobby is certified in 6-12 social studies and also holds certification for gifted education. Bobby’s classroom settings currently include regular education and collaborative special education.

The fifth participant was Oscar, a white male in his first full-time teaching position. He has one previous year of long-term substitute teaching divided between middle and high school. Oscar holds a master’s degree in education with certification in history, economics, and government. Table 1, Summary of Participant Experience, provides a summary of each participant’s overall teaching experience, years at CMS, certification level, and their particular classroom setting during the research.
Table 1

Summary of Participant Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years Teaching</th>
<th>Years at Current School</th>
<th>Years teaching eighth grade Social Studies</th>
<th>Degree and Certification(s)</th>
<th>Teaching Setting this year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ernie</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Gifted, Regular ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>Special ed. Resource and Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traci</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Collaborative, ELL, Regular ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobby</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Regular ed. Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Regular ed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special Context of the School Setting

While chapter three provided a broad overview of the school setting, including demographic and various academic information, there was a unique aspect to CMS during the 2016-2017 school year. Beginning this school year, coincidental to the collection of data, CMS was placed on a “targeted school” list for the district. This special classification was due to the relatively low performance of CMS based on the 2014-2015 state school rating scale. Ratings are determined in part by using state test results. Previously, CMS routinely placed in the top third of all middle schools within the district based on state assessment results. For the 2014-2015 school year, however, the performance rating for CMS dropped unexpectedly to the bottom third of all middle schools in the district. In particular, CMS ratings in math, science, and social studies all dropped during the 2014-2015 school year, and contributed to the lower rating.
Given the poorer assessment results, CMS was placed on the targeted school list by the district, and as such, earned special attention throughout the school year. The targeted school list is an internal procedure utilized by the district and intended to identify needs and provide proactive assistance to schools before they become perennially low performing. As an example of the measures taken by the district for targeted schools, CMS received regular visits from administrative supervisors as well as various support staff from the district office, such as teaching coaches, for each of the curriculum areas previously mentioned.

The only time district personnel interacted with the social studies teachers was during the pre-planning week prior to the beginning of the school year. During that time, a district instructional coach shared various social studies lesson strategies at a professional development session. Regardless of any direct impact on teachers or administrators at CMS, the targeted label is worth noting because it was an unusual part of the school climate during data collection. Within this context of the study setting, the researcher began to collect data during the 2016-2017 school year.

Pre-Interviews

The researcher received IRB approval the week before classes began in the fall of 2016. The local school district had already granted approval for the research, so the researcher began to discuss the opportunity to participate in the research with each eighth grade social studies teacher. Due to unexpected personnel moves over the summer, two new faculty members, Ginger and Oscar, joined the curriculum group in the fall. The addition of these new members also provided a broader perspective as one of them was a first year teacher and the second was a veteran special education educator. However, the disadvantage of having these two new members was their lack of historic or institutional knowledge regarding previous collaborative
planning efforts in eighth grade social studies. As already noted, every member of the group agreed to participate in the study so each social studies team member contributed to the data collected through interviews, the professional development, and the collaborative planning effort.

**Setting for Pre-Interviews**

In compliance with the IRB for this study, pre-interviews were arranged by the researcher at the convenience of each individual participant. In accordance with the research design, the teacher participants only knew that the research was going to focus on collaborative planning without an explanation of the details of the perceptual planning process prior to the interviews. The purpose of this design was not deceptive; rather it was intended to allow for open and honest interviews regarding collaborative planning prior to the introduction and application of the perceptual planning process. The pre-interviews were particularly important in establishing a preliminary understanding of participant thoughts and beliefs about collaborative planning in general. The information garnered during these pre-interviews was vital to establishing a point of reference for comparison once the perceptual planning model was introduced and utilized.

Pre-interviews were conducted during normal work hours at CMS. They were completed at a time convenient to the teachers and, in most cases, occurred in the afternoon. The interview timing coincided with the eighth grade teachers’ daily planning period during the last segment of the daily schedule. Only the teacher and researcher were present in the room during interviews and the researcher utilized a semi-structured interview model, which gave each individual the flexibility to discuss their views of collaborative lesson planning. The length of commitment for pre-interviews was 30 minutes with the typical pre-interview lasting for approximately 20 minutes. Given the focus on participant views toward collaborative planning, and the
researcher’s relative familiarity with the individuals as colleagues, this was sufficient to establish rapport and have the participants remain comfortable with the process. Interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed by the researcher, usually the same evening as they were recorded. Pre-interviews were completed over an 11-day period, and after compilation of the transcripts, the researcher began the coding process.

**Coding of Pre-Interviews**

The process of data analysis applied in this study consisted of data condensation, data display, and drawing conclusions, as described by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014). In the first step of data condensation, the researcher used multiple readings of the pre-interview transcripts to identify themes and categories within and between the various transcripts. The coding process for data followed Saldaña’s (2013) recommendation for a two-cycle process. In the first cycle, major themes were identified using descriptive, In Vivo and process coding. In the second coding cycle, the first set of codes was divided into a smaller number of categories with some original themes lumped under larger themes.

Table 2, Display of First and Second Cycle Coding for Pre-Interviews (below), shows the first and second cycle codes that were developed in the analysis process (Miles, et al., 2014). The left hand column in the first cycle code shows how the major themes emerged based on reading of the pre-interviews. The second column in the first cycle code box shows how the researcher began to consolidate and organize the themes. Lastly, the column labeled second cycle codes shows the final condensation of themes.

In short, the second cycle coding may be summarized as follows. Through the course of the pre-interviews, each participant identified their beliefs regarding the advantages and disadvantages of collaborative planning. Notably, Ginger and Oscar, each with virtually no
collaborative planning experience, did not identify any potential negative aspects of collaborative planning (August 22, 2016; August 19, 2016). Second, each participant discussed their beliefs regarding the role of administration with regard to collaborative planning. Closely tied to this theme was the issue of managing the agenda. Again, the two new members of the group did not have any historic context within which to comment on this matter. However, the experienced members of the group harbored very clear opinions on this topic. Specifically, they all agreed that the administration held more control of the agenda than the teachers. As seen below in Table 2, control of the agenda was a major theme from the interviews. Finally, each participant was able to describe their individual experience and training with collaborative planning. A more detailed description of each of these four areas is contained in the next segment of this chapter.

Table 2

Display of First and Second Cycle Coding for Pre-Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Cycle Codes (Major Themes)</th>
<th>Second Cycle Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Pros</td>
<td>-Pros/ Cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Cons</td>
<td>-Role of Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Role of Admin.</td>
<td>-Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Differentiated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Agenda</td>
<td>-Experience/Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Wasted Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not a good use of time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focused Purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Role of Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceived Advantages of Collaborative Planning

The researcher began each interview by asking the participants to talk about how they felt about collaborative planning. The participants were unanimous in their belief that collaborative planning is a worthy and important undertaking. Bobby expressed that collaborative planning offered a great opportunity for teachers to “share ideas and what they considered best practices” (August 11, 2016). Traci echoed Bobby when she said that “it was nice to get ideas flowing” (August 22, 2016). Ernie said that he loves collaborative planning and felt that it “opens your mind.” Further, he shared that “collaboration gives you that well rounded feeling (August 12, 2016)”

Even the two newest members of the group expressed high expectations about collaboration. Oscar said that collaboration made the most sense when there was feedback. He also explained that it “helped identify the best practices and what worked for teachers” (August 19, 2016). Ginger said that collaborative planning was very beneficial and that teachers “draw from each other” while they are planning together (August 22, 2016).

Perceived Disadvantages of Collaborative Planning

During each pre-interview, the participants offered their hopes and expectations for what they would glean from collaborative planning experiences. However, the interviews revealed that the realities of their collaborative planning experiences were often disconnected from those expectations. On the one hand, they each believed that collaborative planning would yield helpful outcomes. While on the other hand, they had not experienced any collaborative planning that they considered successful.
Bobby, Traci, and Ernie, the three members of the group who had previously taught at CMS, also shared their frustrations about how collaborative planning efforts often fell short. Bobby explained that “as far as actually sitting down and planning together…I do not feel like we have done that.” He admitted that we could do a better job and, in his experience, the group seemed to just “meet and share” (August 11, 2016). Ernie said that he valued collaborative planning if it is done correctly. Under the current circumstances, he felt that “we are just getting regurgitation from the admin” (August 11, 2016). The group participants with more than one year on the grade level consistently expressed frustration between issues of administrative guidance and goals versus the participants’ hopes for planning sessions. Traci said that meetings where we tried to collaboratively plan were “quite often unproductive” (August 22, 2016).

Given their recent joining of the curriculum group, neither Oscar nor Ginger was able to offer an institutional perspective on how the group planned together.

Based on their thoughts on collaborative planning, the interviews showed these teachers valued the idea of collaborative planning. They had expectations that it would help them make better decisions and ultimately, deliver better lessons. However, the experienced members of the group voiced disappointment with previous collaborative planning efforts (August 11, 2016; August 12, 2016; August 22, 2016). Participants were also asked during the pre-interviews how they viewed previous practice and training regarding collaborative planning.

Experience and Training

Bobby had previously worked in a charter school that implemented a collaborative classroom teaching model where teachers of multiple curriculum areas stayed in the same classroom. Each teacher provided instruction in their own area of expertise. Bobby said that other social studies teachers in the school “met about once a month” to discuss the curriculum
but there was rarely anything he would consider collaborative planning of lessons (August 11, 2016). Ernie had teaching experience at another middle school in the same district as CMS, but collaborative planning there was “not as organized as here and it was totally informal” (August 12, 2016). Ernie occasionally met with one or two other teachers to discuss lessons, but at times and places that they independently organized as a group. Traci stated that when she taught at the high school level, “there was zero collaboration” among the teachers (August 22, 2016).

Ginger’s situation was unique in that she had 18 years of teaching experience but had few opportunities to plan collaboratively prior to this school year. Given that she was placed in EBD settings during those years, she often found herself simultaneously teaching multiple grade levels and curriculum areas. According to Ginger, “for the first 9 years of my teaching career, I had no chance to plan collaboratively” (August 22, 2016). Only recently she was given the opportunity to attend grade level curriculum meetings at CMS. She expressed that the other teachers seemed to come to the curriculum meetings “with their minds made up” about their lessons and there was really no effort to discuss or share (August 22, 2016). As a first year teacher, Oscar, understandably, had the least opportunity for collaboration prior to the research. However, when he was a student-teacher at the high school level, Oscar spent time with his mentor teacher sharing and “bouncing ideas off each other” on a very regular basis (August 11, 2016). In short, none of the participants could identify a time in their careers or training when collaborative planning was a priority.

The information gleaned from the pre-interviews demonstrated that all of the participants desired the opportunity to plan collaboratively and have expectations that in doing so, they will create better lessons. Yet, at the same time, their collective experience with collaborative planning generally yielded less than satisfactory results. Analysis and coding of the transcripts
revealed two closely related themes that were tied to the perceived success or failure of collaborative planning within the group. Those themes were the role of the administration and control of the agenda as pertains to collaborative planning.

**Role of Administration**

Regarding the role of the administration in collaborative planning, the experienced members of the group were able to offer comments based on previous years at CMS. Ernie felt that the weekly curriculum meetings too often “seemed like it is administration talking, talking, talking, when it is supposed to be our planning time” (August 12, 2016). Traci echoed this sentiment when she said that “too much time is taken up with admin…a lot of admin things” (August 22, 2016). Similarly, Bobby, the department chair, acknowledged that specific issues driven by the administration often took up a lot of time. He said, “The agenda from the administration leaves you with, like 25 minutes…a lot of our planning time is taken away” (August 11, 2016). Concerns about the agenda for the curriculum meetings were consistent across all the pre-interviews. The participants felt that the focus of the meetings too often took them away from tasks, such as planning, that they would prefer to see as a priority.

**Control of the Agenda**

Three participants wondered about the agenda for the weekly meetings (August 12, 2016; August 22, 2016, August 19, 2016). The question arose then, “who controls the agenda for the weekly meeting?” According to Bobby, the responsibility is shared between him and the administrator responsible for social studies. He focuses on preparing the portion of the agenda that is curriculum focused and the administrator brings or adds topics that she needs to share (August 11, 2016). At a recent weekly meeting, for example, the administrator needed to share the transportation plan for a series of eighth grade field trips what will occur over a one-week
period. The preparation for the trip was intensive and the administrator wanted to ensure that everyone understood the plan.

The findings showed incongruity between what actually happens at the Tuesday meeting and what the teachers would prefer to happen at the Tuesday meeting. Traci went so far as to declare that “the agenda actually keeps us from planning…the structure actually hinders planning” (August 22, 2016). Her point was that by the time other issues are discussed, there is little or no time to plan. Oscar, explained that what he had hoped to see at the meetings were discussions about “standards, both state and county and assessments.” He believed these would provide him “a box” to work within. He also hoped to see us “dividing up tasks and people working to their strengths” when planning together (August 19, 2016). As of the pre-interview, he did not think that he was seeing any of these things happen. In other words, the weekly curriculum meeting was not helping him plan. Finally, Ernie wished that we could “Get rid of the news of the day from the AP and stuff. There is too much of the admin” (August 12, 2016). The recurrence of participants questioning the agenda was ubiquitous and notably impacted their attitudes toward attempting the process of collaborative planning.

Each pre-interview included a request for the participant to talk about how they felt about collaborative planning. Interestingly enough, every participant had something positive to say about the process. Comments such as “I love it,” “it helps identify best practices,” and “very beneficial to plan with others” seemed to indicate that the participants had each encountered positive experiences during collaborative planning (August 12, 2016; August 19, 2016; August 22, 2016). However, these sentiments were countered with statements such as we “could do a better job,” and it “is quite often unproductive” (August 11, 2016; August 22, 2016). These basic statements of the advantages and disadvantages of collaborative planning revealed a desire, or at
least a hope, for the outcome of collaborative planning meetings. However, when the
participants were asked to describe their experiences and training regarding collaborative
planning, strong deficiencies were quickly articulated.

None of the teachers could recall any deliberate or specific training for participating in
collaborative planning. The newest teacher in the group, Oscar, noted that the closest experience
he had during his pre-service education was when he conducted planning with his mentor
teacher. In those cases, Oscar noted that it was especially helpful for him, as a novice, to have
someone to share ideas and discuss the nuances of teaching specific topics and content. As a
new teacher, Oscar expressed his concerns over his lack of experience in the content and
envisioning how long particular activities might take (August 19, 2016). Traci, whose earliest
teaching experience was at the high school level in a small private school setting lamented that
she never had collaborative planning opportunities at her previous school. She stated that
teachers in that setting were always on their own to plan and prepare for lessons (August 22,
2016).

As a very experienced member of the group, with 18 years of service in special education
settings, Ginger’s story was forceful. Virtually every year of teaching prior to this year, Ginger
was assigned to EBD classroom settings. In this environment, she was often required to teach
multiple curriculum areas during each day and, due to the unique needs of her students, she was
unable to attend regularly scheduled curriculum meetings (August 22, 2016). I learned that
although Ginger had taught at CMS for 7 years, she had essentially worked in isolation from
others nearly all that time. At the same time, Ginger expressed some of the greatest hope for the
results of collaboration when she said, “it is very beneficial to plan with others,” and “I pull on
my peers because I want to be a better teacher” (August 22, 2016). Despite her lack of training
and experience with collaborative planning, Ginger was hoping for “beautiful things” to come out of our sessions (August 22, 2016). She was clearly influenced and professionally challenged by the collaborative planning and those results are discussed in the post-interview segment.

Just as expressions of the advantages and disadvantages of collaborative planning and participant experience and training were somewhat closely connected, the remaining major themes of the pre-interview sessions were also closely related. Control of the agenda for the curriculum meetings and concerns about the role of the administration at the meetings compiled the bulk of the pre-interview sessions.

Based on analysis of the pre-interviews, a tension emerged between the desires and guidance of the administrative team at CMS and the hopes and needs that teachers have with regard to the weekly curriculum meetings. The data results showed a strong pattern that the teachers in eighth grade social studies did not believe the weekly curriculum meeting time was well spent. According to Bobby, “as far as actually sitting down and planning together, I do not feel like we have done that” (August 11, 2016). Traci lamented that the meetings are “quite often, unproductive” (August 22, 2016). In addition, Ernie hoped to “get more into ‘our’ time and look at stuff” (August 12, 2016). Given that Oscar and Ginger were new to the curriculum group this year, they had no context within which to comment on how the curriculum meetings had previously proceeded. However, their thoughts on expectations for the meetings were stated earlier. All the teacher participants expressed hope that the curriculum meetings would be productive or more productive.

Even the newest members, Ginger and Oscar, shared similar expectations regarding collaborative planning (August 22, 2016; August 19, 2016). Given this finding, the perspective of the veteran members of the group on the role of administration in setting the weekly agenda.
were most insightful. Bobby, who also serves as the chair, lamented that once agenda issues driven by the administration are addressed, “you are left with like twenty-five minutes” and “a lot of our planning time is taken away” (August 11, 2016) Traci expressed concern that a lot of time was taken up by the administration (August 22, 2016). Ernie reflected that it seems, “the administration is talking, talking, talking when it is supposed to be our planning time” (August 12, 2016). It was notable to the researcher that although this weekly meeting is not labeled as a planning meeting, these veterans of the group expected it to yield valuable planning experiences. This was a very introspective moment for the researcher as he tried to separate himself from the group while serving primarily as an observer in the interview setting and realized that, indeed, the meeting time was regularly used for work not relevant to planning.

Summary of Pre-Interviews

Several themes emerged from these interviews, including the unanimous belief that collaborative planning is advantageous to teachers and they expected that collaboration will make their lesson planning better. As much as they hoped that collaboration might improve their craft, they were also unanimous that attempts at CMS to engage in collaborative planning during the weekly curriculum meeting were not productive (August, 11, 2016; August 12, 2016; August 22, 2016). According to the interviews, the lack of effective collaborative planning was a combination of the administration taking much of the time for other agenda items, while leaving little time to work on lesson planning or collaboration. The participants shared high hopes and expectations for collaborative planning opportunities. The most common belief was that by planning together, each hoped to be a better teacher in the end and deliver better lessons for their students. Unfortunately for the veterans of the group, their expressed hopes for the weekly curriculum meetings, the only formal opportunity to conduct collaborative planning, appeared
jaded by past experience. The conflict between demands of sharing administrative information and addressing administrative goals such as data analysis from previous assessments often conflicted with the teachers’ ideals of what they hoped the meetings would offer. In general, the experienced teachers expressed little hope of being able to take more teacher control of the agenda and move the administrative related tasks and announcements to some other venue. Time constraints are a real and present challenge to any organization, and the dynamics of any given day within a public school make little room for significant adjustments to the schedule.

The analysis of the pre-interviews provided the researcher with a valuable preliminary understanding from which to assess how the eventual application of CRISPA would impact the participants’ views on collaborative planning. After all interviews were complete, the next step in the research was to conduct a professional development session on the perceptual lesson planning model.

**Professional Development**

The purpose of the professional development was to introduce the participants to the perceptual lesson planning process and the elements of CRISPA. This was necessary in order to provide the participants an overview of CRISPA and allow them to explore lessons that modeled the application of perceptual planning. Prior to this session, the participants had no exposure to these concepts.

The design of the professional development session included several elements. First, participants were provided a copy of Uhrmacher and Moroye’s (2009) article that described how one elementary science teacher re-envisioned her space unit by applying CRISPA principles. Participants were given approximately one week to read the article. The initial segment of the professional development involved a researcher-led discussion on the article. During this
discussion, the participants explored concrete examples of applying CRISPA within the science unit lesson described in the article. The final segment of the professional development involved the teachers participating in a model social studies lesson incorporating perceptual planning principles. In each phase of the professional development, participant understanding was checked through oral feedback and the participants’ written indicators of application and understanding.

The initial professional development session occurred during the weekly curriculum meeting, “the Tuesday meeting” held at CMS. The meeting is regularly held in a conference room measuring approximately four hundred square feet. The same room is specifically reserved for all social studies curriculum groups. The room features a white board and a bulletin board. Other resources include a desktop computer with printer, overhead projection capability, conference table, and work tables. The researcher prepared posters with the definition each CRISPA element and placed them on the walls around the room. The posters were provided to allow participants to record their comments and reflections during the professional development. This feedback was important to confirm their engagement as well as to reveal their interpretations and understanding of CRISPA. The posters also served as artifacts for data collection. The agenda for the meeting was set by the department chair with approval by administration. The key item for the meeting was a professional development session regarding CRISPA led by the researcher.

**Review of Professional Article applying CRISPA**

At the start of the professional development session, the researcher led a discussion about the science unit and drew out key points such as how the science teacher had modified her existing lesson opener to account for CRISPA principles (Uhrmacher & Moroye, 2009). For
example, she had previously opened the space unit with a simple PowerPoint display of various pictures of space taken from the Hubble telescope. When she re-envisioned that lesson through the lens of CRISPA, she included an element of imagination by telling the students that on the day of the unit opener, they would be taking a field trip. That field trip turned out to be a walk down to the media center. Once at the media center, she instructed the students to express their thoughts while they looked at the Hubble telescope pictures from space, which inserts the element of active engagement. Finally, she played a piano while the slide show was presented and thereby enhanced the introduction to include sensory element of sound in addition to visual stimulation. The teacher in this study had the advantage of attending the Aesthetic Education Institute of Colorado (AEIC) prior to planning the lessons that were observed and reported on by Uhrmacher and Moroye (2007). The stated goal of AEIC is to “awaken educators’ artistic sensibilities as a tool for enhancing creativity and meaning making” (Uhrmacher & Moroye, 2007, p. 55). While teachers who attend AEIC receive several days of training and practice in order to consider the principles of applying CRISPA within lesson planning, the teachers within this study had a much more limited time to consider the aesthetic approach before they were asked to collaboratively plan lessons using the model.

While leading the professional development, the researcher summarized key points to include the field trip, music, and another part of the unit where the students actually constructed models of planets with paper mache. The paper mache modeling incorporated the CRISPA elements of making connections, sensory, and active engagement. The participants acknowledged that they recalled these key elements of the teacher’s lessons (August 30, 2016). For example, they discussed the teacher playing the piano during her unit introduction with the powerpoint slides of Hubble photographs. They indicated that the combination of the visual and
audio impact of the introduction seemed to be more impactful for the students. Oscar pointed out that that while the teacher took some risk in having the students make the paper mache models without explaining the context of the task, he believed there was also risk-taking on behalf of the students because they could not see where the lesson was heading (August 30, 2016). After some discussion about the article, the researcher asked the participants to walk around the conference room and indicate on the posters where they saw the teacher’s application of the CRISPA principles.

The purpose of this component of the professional development was to allow time for the participants to express and demonstrate how they interpreted the teacher’s actions within the context of the CRISPA principles. This was the first step in their demonstration of learning and allowed for individual expression. Bobby noted that the students in the science class “were making connections to prior knowledge” within other curriculum areas when they made the models of planets (August 30, 2016). Oscar noted that the students were “making connections to other curriculum areas” when they referred to math principles while they built planetary models (August 30, 2016). Although the teacher did not inform the students they were making planetary models, as the students worked and observed other groups at work, they eventually guessed that they were making planets. This demonstrated making connections to prior knowledge.

In order to monitor the participant’s understanding, the researcher provided posters for written responses during the professional development. An example of one of the posters is shown below at Figure 2, Active Engagement Poster. This chart was for the CRISPA principle of active engagement, and the definition of the principle is also visible. The figure shows where the participants wrote their interpretations of the CRISPA principles during the professional development. The use of the posters was actually an implementation of active engagement
within the professional development. Writing on the posters allowed each participant the space to consider their thoughts about CRISPA and what they discerned from the article.

Figure 2 Active Engagement Poster

For this chart, the teachers noted four instances of active engagement for the elementary science class article on the left of the chart. The entries on the right side of the chart followed the portion of the professional development that modeled a social studies lesson. The chart is transcribed at Table 4, Transcript of Professional Development Comments. Table 3, Summary of Participant Identification of CRISPA Principles during PD, shows the total number of times that the participants identified the application of each CRISPA principle during the review of the article as well as during the follow up portion of the professional development.
Table 3

Summary of Participant Identification of CRISPA Principles during PD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRISPA principle</th>
<th>Science article</th>
<th>Museum Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connections</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagination</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptivity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Engagement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modeling CRISPA within the Social Studies

The next phase of the professional development was intended to demonstrate how the CRISPA principles might work in a social studies setting with material specific to eighth grade content. For this portion of the professional development, the researcher prepared a separate unused classroom ahead of time. The room was intended to mimic a museum setting where students might explore artifacts from local early Native American tribal groups. Several tables were arranged around the room each with replica artifacts that were constructed by students from the researcher’s classes. Prior to leaving the original meeting area, the researcher told the teachers that he wanted them to join him on a field trip to a museum.

Upon arrival at the museum, the teachers were given clipboards with artifact analysis worksheets. The participants were instructed to individually view each of the various artifacts, and then choose one which they would focus on for completion of the artifact analysis worksheet. The teachers were told not to discuss their choices or analysis with one another so
that their individual insights would not affect the others. After about 20 minutes, the researcher called the group together to discuss the process so far and to talk about where they saw the CRISPA principles within this particular model lesson.

Following that debriefing, the group moved back to the original meeting location. At that time, the researcher asked each participant to go back to the CRISPA charts and, this time, write on the right side of the chart comments about where they saw that principles in play for the museum class. As displayed in chapter two, the CRISPA principles are:

- **Connections**: connect to the subject (connect through senses, emotions, knowledge, and people)
- **Risk-taking**: try something outside of your comfort zone
- **Imagination**: imagine possibilities – real and fantasy
- **Sensory experience**: explore with your senses – taste, touch, smell, sound, see
- **Perceptivity**: the more you look the more you see and know
- **Active engagement**: participate and enjoy the experience (Moroye & Uhrmacher, 2009, p. 86)

A sample of the final charts is below at Table 4, Partial Transcript of Professional Development Comments.

Table 4

*Partial Transcript of Professional Development Posters*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Science article example</th>
<th>Social Studies museum example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connections</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Connect to the subject (connect through senses, emotions, knowledge, people)</td>
<td>- Connect to prior knowledge of playing in dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Connect to learning in other classes</td>
<td>- Go to a museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Senses – she used sight and sound in the preview. Taste with the ice cream. Feel with creating the planets. Music also connects in an emotional level</td>
<td>- Excitement to go on a field trip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The complete transcript of the posters is located at Appendix E, Full Transcript of Professional Development Posters.

Identifying CRISPA

While reviewing the transcripts and charts during analysis, the researcher identified a few points where the participants struggled to come to grip with the CRISPA model. In one instance Traci discussed how she was “struggling to classify the artifact as a sensory or connections” experience (August 30, 2016). A similar example is demonstrated on the left side of the chart where participants listed the music played during the teacher’s PowerPoint introduction as both sensory and imagination. Categorization is subjective so teachers may have difficulty sometimes deciding how to categorize certain aspects of a lesson. For example, if a teacher is considering the analysis of artifacts for a lesson, that could be categorized as either an aesthetic element or active engagement. Oscar needed clarification on the principle of risk taking when he asked, “Is the risk taking on the kid’s side or the teacher’s?” (August 30, 2016). The answer to Oscar’s question was that the risk-taking is intended for the teacher as they consider the perceptual planning model. Oscar’s question was important, not only to confirm the application of the model, but it also confirmed that the teachers were engaged and thinking about the process. The CRISPA model would allow or accept that individual teachers should be able to categorize items in any manner they wish. After more practice with the model, categorization would become easier and more intuitive.

Similar to the pre-interviews, the issue of time constraints was raised by Traci (August 30, 2016). While discussing her previous use of art as a key component of her approach to teaching history in high school, she discussed her concerns about the different learning styles of middle school students. Whereas the high school students tended to be more mature and able to
handle tasks with less supervision, Traci was worried that she could not rely on her students to stay on task and ensure they were actually learning. She expressed concern about using the artifact class, because the students might not complete the analysis sheet and, therefore, not be able to engage in any meaningful discussion afterward. Traci saw this as a matter of risk taking and stated that she would constantly wonder if “they are learning when they are up and moving around” (August 30, 2016). While Traci opted not to utilize the artifact class, her comments demonstrate how CRISPA helped her consider a different lesson. As demonstrated in her post-interview, she did choose to modify her classes as a result of applying the model. Other participants also showed how considering the museum model impacted their decision making.

While discussing the article, Ernie also mentioned his concerns about taking students to the computer lab, as an example, and how he was always concerned about them remaining on task. According to Ernie, “Going to the computer lab is always a risk” (August 30, 2016). His concern was centered on whether students really improved learning during lessons in the lab as opposed to doing other tasks while working on the computers. While he mentioned taking his students to the computer lab as risk taking in a flippant manner, the researcher acknowledged and showed value for his concerns. If the true vision for CRISPA is to regularly apply the various aspects in classroom planning, then any concerns shown by participating teachers ought to be brought into the open and discussed dispassionately.

Ginger showed tremendous reflection after the group returned upstairs and completed the charts. Once we gathered at the conference table again, she discussed how she viewed her teaching style as “very old school” (August 30, 2016). By this, she meant that she felt set in her traditional teaching routines and had never really been willing to vary from those strategies that she believed worked best with her students. In her own words, she was all about “that drill and
kill” (August 30, 2016). However, as a function of this professional development and her burgeoning exposure to regular meetings with her curriculum group (as opposed to her previous isolated setting), she said that she was really being exposed to something outside her box and seemed willing to try new things. The results of her efforts are discussed in the post-interview section of this chapter. The researcher observed that this discussion and admission from Ginger was a perceptual experience in itself. That is, now that she was taking a regular part in curriculum meetings and had reflected on the article and the day’s professional development, she seemed ready to challenge herself in new ways.

**Summary of Professional Development Session**

The goals of the professional development session were to introduce the CRISPA model to the participating teachers, and to provide opportunities for them to discuss and demonstrate their understanding of perceptual planning. By reading Moroye and Uhrmacher (2009) before the meeting, the teachers acquired some exposure to how the model was successfully applied in one classroom setting. This particular example also demonstrated that their existing lesson plans probably contained the seeds of aesthetic application although they had not previously referred to them as such. The discussion led by the researcher highlighted key points where CRISPA was utilized and allowed confirmation that the teachers were recognizing how the model was used. The process of labeling the charts with the various CRISPA facets provided another opportunity for reflection on the application of the model as shown in Table 4.

**Summary of Professional Development**

When the teachers went on their simulated field trip to the artifact museum, they were experiencing an application of CRISPA within the context of their own content area. Through discussion and debriefing, the teachers were able to share their thoughts with each other and
discuss CRISPA as a curriculum group. Finally, when they individually labeled the charts following the artifact class, the researcher was able to check for individual understanding of the principles of the strategy. Although less intensive than the several day workshops through the AEIC experience, the professional development was intentionally and purposefully designed to leverage the components of the aesthetic experience despite time constraints. At the end of the session, teachers were already demonstrating personal reflection on many of their own lessons and how CRISPA might apply or, with minor changes, be applied to their future lessons. The discussion immediately turned to how the group might focus on applying the model in a collaborative planning environment. Without suggestion from the researcher, the group decided to commit their semi-annual all-day planning session to a specific unit with an eye toward including CRISPA in the planning process. This session is a very unique opportunity for the curriculum group to work together, although the past agenda had not always afforded lesson planning opportunities.

**Collaborative Planning Experience**

One day per semester, the administration at CMS provides every grade level curriculum group with substitute teachers for an entire day. This represents a significant commitment of time and monetary resources on behalf of the administration to support the teachers in their collaborative planning process. The planning day was coincidentally scheduled to occur approximately three weeks after the professional development day. The department chair and the administrator for social studies were fully supportive of the effort, and the group decided to focus the day’s effort work on planning for the American Revolution unit including the utilization of CRISPA principles.
On the planning day, the group convened in the designated conference room and began work at approximately 8:30 a.m., and with the exception of a 45 minute break for lunch and small personal breaks, the group planned until approximately 3:30 p.m. on the all-day planning session. All members of the curriculum group were present the entire day and the administrative team did not visit the room until approximately 30 minutes before the end of the session. In short, the group was given control of the agenda and the agenda included only collaborative lesson planning. This was a notable exception to previous all-day planning sessions where the focus was on data analysis, test construction and review, or other administration directed tasks. As the post-interviews indicated, having control of the agenda was important during the all-day planning session, particularly with the experienced members of the group. Teacher control of the agenda was also one of the key issues highlighted in pre-interview sessions. The transcription and coding for the collaborative planning session is described in the next section.

**Transcribing and Coding the Collaborative Planning**

The transcription for the collaborative planning session was done in a partial format (Glesne, 2016). Segments of the recordings that only focused on discussing details or disagreements on content matters, such as the actions of the Sons of Liberty at the Boston Tea Party were not transcribed. These discussions themselves did not involve critiques of various strategies or CRISPA elements. The transcription resumed when the recorded discussion returned to lesson strategies or decisions on specific lessons. Whenever the transcription was stopped, the researcher noted the time on the recording so that these segments could be easily located for future reference.

Coding for the collaborative planning session began with a focus on descriptive coding where the researcher sought direct usage and evidence of discussion of the CRISPA principles.
In Vivo coding was also used to identify other themes throughout the nearly six hours of audio recordings obtained during the planning day. Finally, charts were also used on the day of the collaborative planning to help classify various planning strategies within the context of CRISPA. Table 5, Instances of CRISPA Discussed during Collaborative Planning, shows the number of times CRISPA appeared within the transcripts using the descriptive coding approach.

Table 5

Instances of CRISPA Discussed during Collaborative Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bobby</th>
<th>Traci</th>
<th>Ginger</th>
<th>Oscar</th>
<th>Ernie</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connections</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptivity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Engagement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of displaying the instances of CRISPA in Table 5 is to allow for a compressed view of how often the various CRISPA elements were specifically mentioned during the session. Recalling Ginger’s teaching experience provides valuable context to this chart. In her pre-interview, Ginger expressed her lack of formal education in social studies content and her admitted preference for science. Although she did not comment on CRISPA during the planning session, she did provide other valuable input and her post interview revealed how she was actually driven to re-envision some of her teaching practices and sought to challenge herself.
to try some new strategies in her classroom. Similarly, Oscar’s relatively low frequency of mentioning CRISPA themes (a total of 11), was also reflective of his first-year teaching status and exposure to unfamiliar content relative to his peers. Their stance as listeners may also be attributed to their status as newcomers to the group in general. The following section describes the structure of the planning day.

**The Collaborative Planning Day**

The basic structure of the planning day consisted of a review of a portion of the state and district standards for the American Revolution. After reviewing a specific segment (e.g., causes leading to the Revolution), the teachers would discuss the standard and confirm what they believed were the critical content items to teach within it. For newer members of the group, such as Oscar and Ginger, these discussions were helpful to orient them to the specific issues they would need to teach. For other members, the review served to position the discussion and allow for a simultaneous review of the common summative assessment for the unit.

Next, the teachers would engage in a discussion about the various lessons that had been used in the past. In a way, repeating this process for each item within the standard was a form of perceptivity in itself. As the teachers reviewed the standard, they discussed what they needed to teach, how it had been taught before, and the summative assessment. The whole group was engaged in a review for each component of the curriculum standard. As different lesson ideas were suggested, teachers would ask about time and effect on the students. For example, there was a lengthy discussion about using a map for teaching the Proclamation Line of 1763 and its impact on the colonies after the war. When and how to use the map were discussed as experienced teachers shared the strategies they had used and how long they took to teach them.
After different chunks of the standard were reviewed and discussed in this manner, the group would then contemplate which CRISPA principles were reflected in the various strategies. When considering the use of a map, the teachers classified it as perceptivity and active engagement. The participants suggested that using map activities, including drawing on maps, would give the students more opportunity to explore and evaluate the maps, which is essentially the idea behind perceptivity. Further, by designing activities to have the students interact with the map, they would practice active engagement, and not just look at the map and move on to the next task (September 13, 2016). Just as Traci had trouble during the professional development deciding how to categorize the artifact lesson and choose one category to place it, there were instances where teachers categorized the same lesson strategy in different ways, using justifiable evidence, during the planning day. Some of those are highlighted later in this chapter.

Another example of CRISPA occurred when the participants discussed using higher-order thinking questions during the lessons. Traci viewed those questions as active engagement and risk taking while Bobby viewed them as examples of risk-taking with the idea that all students might not fully commit to the task. After some consideration, Traci also suggested they might be listed under imagination, as the questions were concerning “what if’s” about adoption of the Declaration of Independence. Examples of the “what if?” questions were, “what if only nine states ratified the Constitution? and “what if only five states ratified the Constitution?”

These discussions between the participants as they grappled with the elements of CRISPA and how to classify them were a poignant moment in the research process. In effect, the researcher was watching the evolution of the teachers within their own perceptual experience. That is, as they reviewed the standards in detail and discussed various options for teaching those standards, they were growing in their individual understanding of the content, as well as
exploring new idea for specific lessons. The collaborative planning process in itself was, therefore, a growth experience for these teachers. This observation is aligned with Uhrmacher and Moroye’s (2009) findings as they observed the science teacher’s process as well.

The best example of the teachers’ engaging in discussion of CRISPA occurred about four hours into the planning session. At that point, the routine was well established and they had already completed several standards and discussed CRISPA a few times. The discussion occurred after the group reviewed a rap song about the Declaration of Independence on YouTube. The video was prepared and posted by a group of high school U.S. History students. Oscar initially suggested the rap and looked up the video on YouTube. Watching the video visibly energized the group and when considering use of the strategy, it was labeled as risk taking by Traci and Bobby (August 30, 2016). Ernie and Bobby also believed that if their students make rap videos they would be actively engaged (August 30, 2016). Bobby moreover believed that making the video would be a sensory experience for his students. After more discussion, Oscar weighed in and suggested that imagination was a part of making the video and Ernie agreed (August 30, 2016). Ernie also said he believed that making the video would require the students to make connections with the material throughout the unit. In effect, every one of the CRISPA facets was encapsulated within this single classroom strategy. This discussion led the group to consider strategies with multiple CRISPA elements as being particularly valuable for student engagement, thus learning.

**Teasing out CRISPA – Addressing the Counter Argument**

As the analysis of the post-interviews will demonstrate, the participants viewed the all-day planning as a success. As opposed to their pre-interview comments which characterized the planning as a waste of the reserved meeting time and not giving them time to effectively plan,
they believed the all-day planning was very helpful and provided evidence of how it influenced their delivery of lessons.

The analysis of the collaborative planning transcript was much like solving the riddle of which came first, the chicken or the egg? In this case, was the planning day effective because of the introduction of CRISPA, or was it effective because the administration granted the teachers control over their meeting and they chose to plan? A difficult question remains, and perhaps it is unanswerable with the data available. That is, had the curriculum group just asked for permission to set their own agenda, would they have been granted the latitude to do so? Or, did the administrator’s observation of the professional development demonstrate that the teachers could lead an effective all-day effort without guidance? The department chair, Bobby, confirmed that he was allowed to set the agenda for the planning day whereas the responsibility to set the schedule on the normal Tuesday meetings is a shared responsibility between him and the administrator (October 17, 2016). This experience of allowing the teachers to control their agenda for planning stands in contrast to examples of teacher control noted in the literature review such as Darling-Hammond et al. (2010) and Ravitch (2010).

However, several facts point to CRISPA as providing the key to a successful planning day. First, the participants wanted to use the model after it was introduced at the professional development. They asked to do so during the upcoming all day planning session. The department chair used the momentum from the professional development to gain administrative support of an agenda for the entire day and, finally, the post interviews provided relevant examples of the application of CRISPA in the participants’ classrooms. Compared to experiences described of preceding all day planning sessions, this meeting produced usable
lessons, whereas the previous days experience. Together these pieces of information indicate that CRISPA changed the dynamics of this planning process.

**Influencers on the Planning Process**

Some examples of the overt influencers on the planning process included the following. First, there was a time constraint on the planning of the American Revolution unit. The district office provides a yearly planning/pacing calendar that directs when each unit should be taught and, in effect, establishes “no-later-than” dates when the standards should be taught. For the unit that was planned, teachers were expected to complete their teaching before the end of the first nine weeks of school. Thus, teachers are required to prepare their students for the 9-week or interim test that is facilitated by the district and administered to all eighth graders at the end of the first quarter. Specific skills and concepts within the American Revolution are driven by state standards and subsequently those standards are re-published by the school district, sometimes with minor changes, for each teacher to follow. CMS administration directs that all teachers use a common assessment for tests and quizzes and these assessments form another mode of constraint. So, the planning day had to account for standards, time, and assessments outside of teacher’s control that would determine the student’s level of learning. It is important to note that these district, state, and test-driven components were nevertheless compatible with the CRISPA model and did not directly interfere with the creative process.

**Summary of the Collaborative Planning**

By their own accounts, the all-day planning was a success, especially for the veterans of the group. Traci felt that “for the first time, we actually came up with something that was useful” (October 20, 2016). Ernie confirmed that when compared to his previous experience in past years, he felt like, “...hey, I can use this and be successful...in years past, I never had that”
As mentioned in this chapter, what is difficult to positively identify is whether CRISPA led to good collaborative planning or whether the teachers taking control of the agenda was the key to success. The evidence seems to suggest that it was a combination of both of these elements. The administration, having seen positive effects of the professional development on CRISPA was willing to allow the chair to set the agenda for the all-day planning. When the all-day planning happened, CRISPA was part of the process and helped to drive some introspective discussion among the teachers. More than simply sharing ideas for lessons, they critiqued and questioned each other, debated pedagogical choices and truly seemed to be thinking about how to improve their teaching, and thus the experience and content knowledge of their students. For example, Traci said that she needed to look for more visual tools, particularly to help her ESOL students. Ernie remembered and shared a strategy that utilized pictures of key revolutionary personalities to help students make connections (September 12, 2016). Ultimately, the feedback from the post-interviews, provided next, solidify this claim.

**Post Interviews**

The previous three components of data collection, pre-interviews, professional development, and collaborative planning were vital preliminary processes ultimately leading to the post-interviews. The post-interviews provided data for the researcher to explore the answer to the research question: how the application of the perceptual planning process impacted teachers’ attitudes toward collaborative planning.

Five post-interviews were fully transcribed by the researcher who then applied the coding protocols used in the pre-interviews. While the questioning during the pre-interviews was much more open ended, with the researcher seeking to explore general attitudes and experiences with collaborative planning, the questions during the post interviews were focused on what had
occurred during data collection in the earlier phases described above. For example, each participant was asked to specifically discuss the all-day planning day and their reactions to CRISPA. Participant responses were, therefore narrower and generally remained limited to their descriptions of what they had experienced during the professional development and collaborative planning session. Table 6, Coding for Post-Interviews, shows the first and second cycle coding for post-interview transcripts.

Table 6

*Coding for Post-Interviews*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Cycle Codes (Major Themes)</th>
<th>Second Cycle Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Response to Prof. Dev.</td>
<td>-Pros/ Cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Response to Collab. Planning</td>
<td>-Role of Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Response to CRISPA</td>
<td>-Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Using CRISPA</td>
<td>-Experience/Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Weekly Tue. Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Hidden Admin. Agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notably, the second cycle coding themes for pre and post-interviews were similar. The pre-interviews also included a second cycle code of pros and cons. While the post-interviews did include participant comments on the pros and cons of applying CRISPA, the researcher opted to include those underneath the heading of experience and training as the post-interview focused on participant application of CRISPA within the collaborative planning setting.

**Experience and Professional Development**

The professional development session described earlier took place about three weeks prior to the full day of planning. Given time and schedule constraints, the researcher was unable to get feedback on the professional development until the post-interviews. The post-interviews
began with the researcher asking for participant feedback on the professional development including the review of the article and the field trip to the “museum.”

Traci described the training as enjoyable and as a nice opportunity for her to reflect on her teaching. In the process of the training, she realized that she used to rely heavily on artwork when she taught at the high school level. The sensory aspect of CRISPA really resonated with her and she had applied the use of art in her classroom since the training (October 20, 2016). Her use of CRISPA is discussed near the end of this chapter. She remembered that using artwork was a departure from the mundane and provided opportunities for lessons that students really enjoyed. For Ginger, there were two major outcomes from the professional development. First, she noted that the idea of being creative with her lessons was challenging for her and the aspect of allowing the students the opportunity for self-discovery was a risk taking issue for her. She was concerned that after committing time for such an activity, the students would not learn the required material (August 22, 2016). The element of self-discovery was reflected in the science teacher’s experience when the children crafted the paper mache planets. They were not told what they were making, only that they were making various sized orbs. During that process, the students gradually determined that they were making planets and that idea stuck with Ginger (October 19, 2016). Like Traci, she utilized the professional development as an opportunity to reflect on her mode of lesson planning and her attitudes as a teacher to change some lessons to incorporate the aesthetic. Those changes are also discussed at the end of this chapter. Ernie described the use of CRISPA as a road-map for planning and a way to keep teachers motivated (October 12, 2016).

Oscar, the first-year teacher among the participants, saw value in CRISPA but was also very honest when he described how difficult lesson planning was becoming for him in general.
As a new teacher, he was struggling to meet all the demands of any given day, no less plan what he considered meaningful lessons (October 13, 2016). In a recent conversation, he lamented the amount of work he was doing on the weekends and how his wife was discouraged at how many hours he was working outside of the school day. He confided that he was telling her it would be much better next year, but only sounded like he hoped his workload might get easier. Oscar confirmed that he was not deliberately placing CRISPA at the front of his lesson planning, but “the exposure to the process has affected the way that I plan” (October 13, 2016). In this respect, Oscar’s experience is the same as other inservice teachers reflected in existing literature such as Uhrmacher and Moroye (2009), and Conrad et al. (2015).

Based on the post-interviews, there was a clear divide between the experienced teachers and Oscar. Whereas the experienced teachers were able to consider CRISPA within the context of having taught the material for multiple years, Oscar was facing the classic new teacher dilemma of simply surviving in an almost day-to-day experience. Like Oscar, Ginger was in her first year teaching eighth grade social studies. She has more years of teaching experience to place CRISPA within her planning schema and make use of the concepts as well as being skilled at time management. However, the interviews demonstrated that every teacher, even Oscar, had applied CRISPA in at least one lesson after the collaborative planning day. Specific examples of these changes are noted in the next section.

Positive Aspects of CRISPA

Across the board, the participants lauded the CRISPA concepts and the perceptual planning model. Bobby confirmed his preference for the connections, sensory and active engagement aspects of the model. While he had pushed the group to identify other goals for the American Revolution unit such as increased reading and higher order questions, he believed that
“if we use it [CRISPA] with those other goals that we set at the beginning of the unit, then we can sit down and build better units and better lessons” (October 12, 2016). He also re-iterated one of his key points from the professional development that CRISPA confirmed his belief that sensory experiences, such as analyzing the artifacts, leave a lasting impression on students and lead to lessons they are not as likely to forget.

Ginger was quite animated as she discussed the professional development experience. She described how she felt when the teachers analyze the artifacts. When she saw the other teachers actually picking up the artifacts and handling them, she was surprised and amazed. She reflected on how you act when you go to a museum, “You do not touch artifacts at a museum” (October 19, 2016). Although she was tempted to pick up an artifact herself, she could not bring herself to do so. She discussed how her lessons in the past were admittedly “old school and drill and kill” (October 19, 2016). Watching the other teachers handling the artifacts was an action that she could not bring herself to do. However, she reflected on how differently her students might respond to a class where they were able to handle an artifact for themselves instead of just looking at one or a picture of one. Without identifying it as such, she was simply acknowledging the value of a sensory experience. From the researcher’s perspective, as Ginger relayed these feelings, she was also describing a perceptual experience with regard to her professional practice and her lesson planning. It was as though she was looking at lesson planning in a very new light in spite of her 18 years of experience.

Ernie saw value in the use of the CRISPA model but expressed concerns about taking risks in his lesson planning. “It is hard for me and the risk-taking,” he said. “We don’t like facing our fears” (October 12, 2016). The context of his comments aligned with concerns that were expressed earlier by Traci. The matter of risk-taking seemed to come down to trying to
strike a balance between the willingness to try something new and the constraints of the amount of material the teachers had to teach and the time they were given to do so. In effect, the excitement of even trying something new is tempered with the reality of limited time.

The participants’ concerns about time were reflected in the literature review such as when Dorolovomo et al. (2010) described lesson planning as a list of activities, rather than a professional development experience. In the participant’s case, for example, during a five day work week, they have about one hour per day, or five hours per week set aside as planning time. The hour on Tuesday is routinely taken by the curriculum meeting. If, during the remainder of the week, the planning time is uninterrupted, then the teachers have four hours to plan lessons, grade papers and prepare assessments as a course of routine work. That allows the teacher four hours to plan what is routinely just over twenty hours of instruction time in a five day week. However, parent meetings, phone calls, and other duties often interrupt at least some of those four hours. The situation is brought into clearer focus when compared to other countries such as New Zealand and Singapore, where teachers are routinely allotted 15-25 hours per week to plan (Demir et al., 2013). Neither this researcher nor anyone else in education ought to be surprised when our young teachers are leaving the profession in such significant numbers concerned with the daily workload and responsibilities.

Oscar also weighed in on this topic when he discussed his excitement with the planning day and all the ideas he got but then left the meeting and looked at his calendar and realized he had a few precious days to teach the entire unit (October 13, 2016). At that point, he was forced to choose simple lessons that were focused on relaying information, with one exception described below. The time and curricular constraints on Oscar and the other teachers were very real and his decision was one which was not his preferred means of planning and delivering
lessons, rather, he simply had to deal with the time constraints of the profession as defined by a finite number of minutes to teach each week, the district pacing calendar, and the state standards that all the participants are required to teach.

**Application of CRISPA**

Although it was not a goal of this research project to follow the teachers and their lessons into their classrooms, during the post-interviews, each one of the participants revealed how the planning day and CRISPA had impacted their teaching following the all-day planning session. The revelation of these decisions was a welcomed surprise for the researcher and offered tangible evidence of how CRISPA affected them as well as their students.

Bobby described how he modified an existing lesson. In his modified lesson, students prepared a newspaper headline and article where either a Tory or Patriot was interviewed and they discussed their views about American Revolution topics. After considering the aspects of active engagement and connections encapsulated in CRISPA, Bobby modified the lesson (October 12, 2016). Instead of assigning a small group of students to develop the headline and article together, he assigned each member of the group a specific task. For example one student was designated as the Tory and another as the interviewer. Once they were assigned their roles, they had to do more intensive research on the topic for their interviews (e.g., the Stamp Act). Bobby’s feedback after the lesson was that the students seemed more engaged and obtained deeper meaning of the lesson material (October 17, 2016). Requiring the students to do more intensive preparation for the interviews is an example of perceptivity and at the same time contributed to the facet of active student engagement while preparing for the interview task.

Despite feeling time pressure, Oscar conducted a class on compromise by taking his students outside and giving them an assortment of odd objects, such as a white-board eraser and
a traffic cone. Teams of students were then tasked with developing a game that included the use of every object. By introducing a few twists of instructions, Oscar was able to induce deep thinking about the concept of compromise and how compromise is obtained between parties that disagree. The follow up to this class was a lesson on the Constitutional Convention where small and large, northern and southern states had to reach agreement on key topics in order to forge the U. S. Constitution.

Ernie took ideas from lesson plans that were discussed on the all-day planning session and differentiated them to meet the unique needs of his students. As revealed earlier, Traci reintroduced artwork into her lessons by including pictures and other visual items in her daily warm up activities. Bobby also discussed how he worked with Ernie and Ginger after the all-day planning session to adjust a particular reading strategy for their classrooms. Ernie and Ginger took the activity that Bobby had originally developed and then modified it for their students, thus they gained a deeper understanding of the context of the lesson, such as its design and purpose. This process led to individual teacher ownership of the lesson and exceeded the previous routine of simply having teacher share their lessons without context and intent.

Perhaps it was Ginger who offered the most poignant description of how the entire process had influenced her lesson planning and decision making. In her previously limited collaborative experiences, Ginger felt that the regular education teachers came to the meetings with their minds made up about what to do, and that was simply how they would teach (August 22, 2016). There was no meaningful sharing. In contrast, Ginger presented a reading assignment during the post-interview that she developed for her class in coordination with Bobby (October 19, 2016). This was the modified work that Bobby had described at the all-day planning session. Ginger described how she had stepped “out of the box” in preparing this
lesson for her students. In the past, her “old school” approach would have been to prepare the reading, prepare some questions, and prepare what she considered to be the right answers. For her, approaching the reading lesson as if there were multiple correct answers was a risk-taking exercise. However, in designing the lesson, Bobby deliberately built the questions so that students could have multiple correct answers as long as they could defend them based on the reading. Thus, these teachers integrated higher order thinking, which was not something that Ginger had previously attempted.

On the day that she was delivering instruction, the administrator conducted her annual 30 minute observation. When the administrator appeared in her room, Ginger’s reported thinking, “I am doing something new. Why are you here?” As she discussed the text and the students responded to the questions, one of her students, who requires the most assistance with reading, spoke up and said, “Well, Ms. G., what if we look at it this way?” And, according to Ginger, he successfully offered a way to answer and then defend that answer (October 19, 2016). Ginger also reported that her observation was favorable. After relaying this story, Ginger referred back to how picking up the artifacts had made her nervous and she would not do it. She correlated her willingness to try this new classroom strategy to her unwillingness to pick up the artifact. She always thinks about connections, but she wondered, “Maybe if they picked up the artifact, maybe that would be something to help them connect” (October 19, 2016).

Every participant offered relevant examples of how they reflected and applied perceptual lesson planning after the all-day planning session. In each of these cases, the teachers felt that they had delivered a more effective and engaging lesson for their students. These comments epitomize the hope of CRISPA to challenge teachers and ultimately change the classroom experience for their students.
Agenda

Other themes that emerged during the post-interviews were the issues of time and control of the agenda. While Ginger appreciated the productivity of the all-day planning and what followed in her own lessons, she was disappointed that there was no follow up. Any follow up for the planning day would reasonably have occurred during the weekly Tuesday curriculum meeting (October 19, 2016). From the researcher’s perspective, Ginger’s observation showed great professional reflection and provided further confirmation to the value of the planning day and the desire all the teacher’s had for other collaborative planning opportunities. However, as noted before, the Tuesday meeting is titled “curriculum” and not “planning.” As such, the agenda is often crowded with issues that are, at best, indirectly related to planning.

For example, during one recent Tuesday meeting, Bobby hoped to continue work on an upcoming unit and review standards, and some lesson ideas if possible. Before he could open the meeting, the administrator passed out the results of a recent analysis on one of the common unit assessments. Apparently, a few months earlier, CMS was required to provide copies of one common assessment from each curriculum area to the district assessment office for their analysis. The group spent almost 30 minutes, over half of the usable time, reviewing comments from the district and discussing what they meant. The immediate result was that planning time was lost and there was really no action to address the district comments. In fact, in order to address those comments, the group would probably have to spend at least three Tuesday sessions only updating questions and formatting issues the district pointed out as problematic in their review. While one may argue that common assessments are part of the overall planning process, the fact that this single instance of administrative activity took so much time is not an isolated instance impacting the Tuesday meetings.
When asked about the control of the Tuesday agenda, Bobby indicated that he felt he had about 80% of the control (October 12, 2016). Bobby, Traci and Ernie all lamented that in the previous school year they had regularly met on Thursday mornings in an ad hoc fashion just to make sure they were doing some planning together. They began this school year with the same intention, but the meetings so far had been much less often and in fact, Ernie had not attended them at all (October 20, 2016). The fact that these teachers were even trying to meet at a time and place designated by them is a strong indicator of the desire and recognized need for teachers to support one another in collaborative planning. In Traci’s words, planning together helps her feel like she “is not alone,” and she is “able to have better lessons than I would have created just on my own” (October 20, 2016).

The information above provides insight into how the teachers perceive the administration’s role in their ability to plan. Too often, the weekly Tuesday meeting contains administrative tasks that consume precious time. In one participant’s words, “the meetings are more about procedural stuff, procedural and administrative.” Another teacher lamented that at the time of the post-interview, “we are in our next unit, and there is no time to plan.” A recent email from Bobby solicited ideas from the curriculum group about “how to make collaborative planning a success” (October 29, 2016). Clearly, the participants feel that the Tuesday agenda is too often overwhelmed by administrative issues leaving no time for meaningful planning. By the time the group arrives at the meeting location and settles in, there are usually only 45-50 minutes to work before they have to leave to prepare for afternoon duty during bus call. As demonstrated in the pre-interviews, the agenda for this meeting is often impeded upon by various administrative tasks that do not contribute to effective planning.
The information provided in this chapter so far has addressed the process of professional development and introduction of the CRISPA model as well as its application during the all-day planning meeting. One final element of this study was to explore the possibility that using perceptual lesson planning might enable or enhance the application of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson Billings, 1995a) as well.

**Culturally Relevant Pedagogy**

In addition to exploring the impact of perceptual lesson planning within this group of teachers, the researcher examined how the CRISPA model could enable inclusion of CRP within the planning process as described in chapter 2 (Ladson Billings, 1995a). The design of this portion of the research, involved allowing participants the opportunity to learn and practice CRISPA first. Once they understood and practiced perceptual planning, the researcher would then investigate how the two pedagogical models might be combined. During the course of discussions with the participants, the researcher discovered that only one participant, Oscar, had any prior knowledge of CRP. Oscar’s familiarity with CRP stemmed from his recent initial teacher preparation experience which emphasized the pedagogical approach (Ladson Billings, 1995a).

The lack of participant knowledge of CRP posed a challenging circumstance for the researcher. As a member of the curriculum group, the researcher was professionally obligated to participate in the all day planning session and provide input as a fellow teacher during data collection. However, as indicated in the summary of the collaborative planning session, the researcher sought to place an emphasis on the observer role of his observer-participant position. The concern was that anytime he spoke about CRISPA or made a value or judgment statement about participant input, the group would automatically gravitate toward that same position. They
would view the researcher as the subject matter expert and defer to his judgment. If this happened, the participants would simply be echoing the researcher’s positions and preferences regarding CRISPA. The same situation presented itself when the lack of CRP knowledge became apparent.

After some consideration about how to go about the CRP discussion, the researcher discussed the situation with Oscar. Given his familiarity with CRP, the researcher sought to leverage Oscar’s knowledge and one classroom application of CRP as a model for discussion (Ladson Billings, 1995a). This situation somewhat mirrored the introduction of the science teacher’s space class with CRISPA (Uhrmacher & Moroye, 2009). In this way, the researcher was not the spokesman for CRP, rather an observer to the discussion that followed from Oscar’s example.

After discovering their lack of familiarity with CRP, the researcher scheduled additional meeting time with participants in order to provide an overview of CRP and a specific social studies class model that used the tenets of Ladson-Billings’ approach (1995a). Those key points included a pedagogy that is widely considered to be effective at facilitating knowledge with learners as well as making teaching decisions that honor and leverage the students’ cultural backgrounds in the classroom. Finally, CRP as envisioned by Ladson-Billings, includes an element of inspiring students to think critically about their environment and choosing to challenge the status quo (Ladson-Billings, 1995a). During this meeting, the researcher briefly summarized CRP and Oscar gave the example of his application of CRP. He shared how he encouraged his students to discuss issues of social justice as they related to the era of reconstruction after the U.S. Civil War. Oscar described how the country needed to simultaneously address the human toll of the war with regard to deaths and destruction of
property as well as the social injustices that were part of the nation’s slave experience. He used the themes of justice and healing as overarching discussion points for his class (January 26, 2017).

He completed his description of implementing CRP by describing how his students were making connections between the reconstruction era and their own lives and families (Ladson Billings, 1995a). Notably, the presidential election cycle was underway around the time of these lessons, and students made connections to current campaign issues. As Oscar described it, “they were bringing these points and being able on their own to connect the dots from a hundred and sixty years ago to today” (January 26, 2017).

Oscar’s example allowed the participants to explore a concrete lesson for discussion, similar to using the museum artifact class which was to model the application of CRISPA. Prior to the CRP discussion, the researcher coordinated with Oscar to gain his support to aid with the discussion. At the meeting, Oscar described how he applied CRP during his Civil War reconstruction unit. Oscar explained how he used the themes of justice and healing as overarching ideas for the lesson on reconstruction. His intent was to provide a pathway for his students to explore reconstruction and help them seek meaning in a modern context with a social justice orientation. While teaching his students about the challenges facing the United States during that era, he encouraged them to make connections to their world today. According to Oscar, his students raised current events issues such as topics in the news, the rise of the Ku Klux Klan, and racially motivated violence that had recently happened in cities and towns across the United States (January 26, 2017). After providing a description of his lesson, the group discussed Oscar’s class and explored how the tenets of CRP were evident.
Despite their limited knowledge and lack of personal experience with using CRP, the group had an engaging discussion. While Oscar was describing his experience, Ernie actually looked up information about CRP on his computer. After Oscar finished, Ernie asked if “CRP is basically where the winner has always written the book, so now we are looking at the other sides and the other people that were also involved?” (January, 26, 2017). This questioning showed that Ernie was considering how the inclusion of CRP can seek to explore history topics from marginalized viewpoints and multiple perspectives. Ernie described how he liked to “play Devil’s advocate a lot with (his) students and destroy their beliefs in what society has taught them.” For example, he stated that he always ensures his students know that several of the founding fathers were slave owners. In his telling, many of his students were routinely unaware of this fact and this was an example of his challenging their beliefs. While Ernie’s example did, arguably, approach some of the purposes of CRP, he did not offer an instance of leading students toward taking an active part in changing the status quo and seek systemic change through activism, a key component of CRP. Other members of the group also believed that they were already making lesson decisions that seemed to tentatively incorporate elements of CRP.

Traci stated that because she taught ESOL for many years, she often put a focus on “helping students bring their background and interests…into the room.” Although she did not offer a specific example of her practice, she expressed that the process was familiar and using the term CRP was simply “putting a name on something that is already out there.” Further, she also stated that she believed most teachers made some attempts to include these processes in their classrooms. However, Traci also expressed her concern that taking the opportunity to approach a topic such as reconstruction in the manner described by Oscar was very time consuming. In the end, she was not convinced the time would be used for her students to “learn something they are
going to see on a standardized test that we all are going to be judged on.” These comments were reminiscent of major coding themes from pre and post interviews that focused on the value of a teacher’s time and the demands of teaching voluminous state standards with high stakes consequences.

Ernie and Bobby both demonstrated an awareness of the cultural background of their students when they commented on how the 8th grade state social studies standards largely ignore the Latinx population. Ernie recognized this fact when he stated, “I get asked every day, where are the Hispanics?” He acknowledged that as the standards currently exist, “in order to make our state’s history culturally relevant, per se, to them, they are not there.” By this, he implied that few Hispanics resided in the area prior to the late 20th Century. Bobby believed that the ability to include an in-depth version of CRP pedagogy also depended on the required content of the particular class. He shared that “it is great to tie in students’ cultural perspective and their background, especially if you are teaching world history or talking about different religions.” But within his content of state studies, he claimed there were fewer options to do so. Although CMS has a relatively small Latinx population, it was notable that the participants thought about different cultural groups during the discussion. Significantly, the current state standards do include prominent African Americans in nearly every phase of the curriculum excepting early European contact with Native Americans. Notably, several prominent Native Americans are also included in the state standards. Engagement with CRP via the CRISPA model may provide avenues to teach these standards in highly relevant ways to promote student involvement and learning (Ladson-Billings, 1995a).

Bobby placed a major emphasis on the critical thinking aspect of CRP. While reflecting on Oscar’s class, Bobby was certain that CRP called for critical thinking as it required the
students to “apply information and make meaning for you.” Both the researcher and Oscar assured Bobby that he was right in his belief that critical thinking was part of what Oscar had accomplished, but he was not making the connection to the larger CRP goal of challenging the status quo.

After quite a bit of discussion, Ginger, spoke about what she was hearing. She said that when Oscar was providing his example, “a little light bulb went off.” She emphasized that her students, who are primarily African-American, “could benefit from that.” While she was referring to the specific example of the reconstruction unit that Oscar used, the conditions he set in his class allowed his students to make connections far beyond the reconstruction era. Ginger was acknowledging the value of what she heard from Oscar and she expressed support for making similar connections. Ultimately, she “hoped that it would trigger something in my student’s heads...to awaken them.” The researcher believed that these comments by Ginger were the strongest expression of support and appreciation for the goals of CRP during the meeting.

However, Ginger later used her own experience as a young student to contrast the work of teachers teaching today. She expressed a belief that her primary and secondary teachers “had much more control over the curriculum and their calendar” (October 19, 2016). She stated that they were not “teaching to a test and that we (their students) were actually being educated.” In this instance, Ginger was agreeing with Traci’s earlier concern about the risk of taking valuable class time to teach in a way that might not ultimately be reflected on a testing regime.

Within the context of actually applying CRP within education, Conrad (2012) suggested that teachers’ actions within their classrooms are driven by their intentions and beliefs. Simply put, the way teachers view the world shapes their positionality and this leads to decisions about how to teach and what things to place value upon. Although written before CRP was introduced,
this thinking is closely aligned with Thornton’s (1989) description of the social studies teacher as a gate keeper for the curriculum. In both instances of their research, it is clear that the teacher has tremendous responsibility. Despite the constraints of time or the number of standards that must be taught, it is the individual teacher that decides what happens in their classroom on a daily basis. As comments from the participants demonstrated within this CRP discussion, they were willing to at least consider its application in their practice.

In summary, this discussion amounted to an initial introduction and small sample of CRP and its usage in the classroom. The participants were receptive to the tenets of CRP and some felt that they were already using parts of this pedagogy. However, the focus on critical thinking, particularly by Bobby, was not penetrating the depth or goals of CRP. As far as setting CRP in relation to the CRISPA tenets, a couple of examples emerged from the findings. First, the teachers spoke of their concerns about Oscar’s lesson straying away from state standards. They saw risk taking in the utilization of class time to try and lead students toward learning objectives that they might not even reach. The second CRISPA element that was discussed was that of making connections. Oscar was directly asking his students to link reconstruction events to their modern lives. Beyond the aesthetic concepts espoused by Dewey, one of his primary urgings to the education community of his era was to make student learning relevant to their environments. In this sense, CRP could easily couple with CRISPA.

**Chapter Summary**

This chapter summarized the collection of data over the course of the research. Discussions of key themes that were identified during each phase of the project were identified and explained. The pre-interviews demonstrated a consistent expectation that by working collaboratively, individual teachers would become better classroom practitioners. However, an
exploration of each participant’s specific experience and professional development for collaborative planning showed that most often, the results of collaboration were disappointing. Each participant also highlighted what they saw as conflicts between their desire to plan together and conflicting tasks placed on the weekly curriculum meeting by the administration. Additionally, the semi-annual all-day planning activity was often hindered by the inclusion of various tasks that were not directly related to lesson planning. The professional development to introduce CRISPA was well received by the participants and they subsequently expressed a desire to ensure the next scheduled all-day planning session agenda was controlled by the teachers’ and that the focus would be oriented toward planning one specific unit of study.

The department chair was able to coordinate with CMS administration in order to ensure the all-day planning agenda was focused on lesson planning, and as a result, the entire day was spent on the American Revolution unit with CRISPA taking a prominent place in the lesson design. Following the all-day planning session, the researcher conducted post-interviews to gauge how the inclusion of CRISPA had impacting their beliefs about collaborative planning. Importantly, the post-interviews revealed that each participant had applied some aspect of CRISPA within the lessons they delivered during the unit. Finally, a discussion regarding CRP was undertaken to gauge how CRISPA could enhance the application of that pedagogy. The next chapter will summarize the entire research project with an emphasis on how these findings enhance the existing body of research on CRISPA and may also inform future studies.
Chapter 5

Summary of the Study

This qualitative case study explored how the introduction of a planning model based on Deweyian aesthetic ideals might influence collaborative lesson planning among a group of eighth grade middle school social studies teachers (Dewey, 1934). The perceptual lesson planning model is based on modern research that evolved from observing inservice teachers interacting with artists of various disciplines to explore lesson planning through an aesthetic perspective. The model utilizes six elements: making Connections, Risk-taking, Imagination, Sensory, Perceptivity, and Active engagement (CRISPA) as a lens through which educators are encouraged to re-examine their planning with an aesthetic grounding (Uhrmacher, Conrad, & Lindquist, 2010; Moroye & Uhrmacher, 2007, 2009). This chapter contains theoretical and methodological summaries as well as the key findings and a contextual placement of this study within existing research.

Context of the Study

This study was inspired by the inservice experiences of the researcher. After nine years of teaching in middle school social studies classrooms, the realities of the daily workload placed on modern public school teachers were brought into clear focus (Brown, 2006; Popham, 2004; Ravitch, 2010). Between teaching, counseling, mentoring, and other duties, the daily schedule facing teachers today can be simply overwhelming. In addition, the trickle-down effect of federal education policies such as No Child Left Behind and more recently, the Every Child Succeeds Act, have resulted in an increased emphasis on quantitative measures of teacher effectiveness and student learning within the classroom (Brown, 2006; Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 2001; Popham, 2004; United States Department of Education, 2015).
Existing research supports the theme of too many topics to teach and too little time to do so well (Canaday & Rottig, 1995; Glatthorn, 1993; Ravitch, 2010). In short, federal, state, and local education policies place great tension on teachers as they try to balance a range of demands (Brown, 2006; Darling-Hammond, Wei, & Andree, 2010; Popham, 2004). An example of the local policies affecting this curriculum group lies within the curriculum pacing calendar issued by the district. This calendar specifies which state standards must be taught during each academic quarter. This policy is enforced, in effect, by interim assessments given at the middle and end of each semester. If a teacher has not taught the required standards by the time of these district assessments, their students will not fare well.

Within this educational environment, the researcher considered how teachers might maintain a focus on lesson planning as one of their most important core tasks. Many research studies validate the importance of lesson planning and demonstrate how good planning can improve lesson delivery and ultimately increase student learning (Anfara & Caskey, 2010; Darling-Hammond, et al., 2010; Mertens et al., 2010; Swick et al., 1976). Unfortunately, given the plethora of daily duties, too many teachers are prone to view lesson planning as a waste of time (Canaday & Rottig, 1995; Glatthorn, 1987; Lederman & Niess, 2000; Trimble, 2015). Thus the researcher pondered if improving lesson planning through collaboration might save time as well as improve teachers’ professional relationships.

The value of the teacher within the role of lesson planning and the process for that planning is supported by Thornton (1989). Thornton suggested that the social studies teacher serves as a curriculum gate keeper by making daily decisions to deliver the “operational curriculum – the curriculum that is actually provided” (p. 4). This research on collaborative planning fits into that schema by providing another means to aid the teacher in that decision
making. As detailed in the findings below, this group of participants had a strong desire to work together to improve their individual craft.

**Purpose Statement and Research Question**

The dilemma of trying to accomplish so many activities simultaneously, and doing them all at a high level of performance, provides the context for the problem addressed in this research. That is, given the teachers’ environment of multiple tasks, a recognized need to conduct lesson planning in order to provide quality lessons, and the idea that too many teachers view the planning task as mundane and wasteful, how might the lesson planning process be improved? Within this context, the researcher learned about the perceptual lesson planning model (Moroye & Uhrmacher, 2009). Drawing on aesthetic themes outlined by Dewey (1934), Moroye and Uhrmacher (2009) developed the perceptual lesson planning model with the aim of “engaging teachers and students’ senses and creativity; as an artistic endeavor that is joyful in and of itself” (2009, p. 2). The research question for this study directly connects with Moroye and Uhrmacher’s extension of aesthetics for lesson planning as follows:

How do teachers in a collaborative planning setting respond to the implementation of perceptual lesson planning?

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical perspective underpinning this research stems from John Dewey (1934). Among his prolific writings on education theory, he suggested that “no intellectual activity is an experience unless it is rounded out with [this] aesthetic quality” (p. 40). According to Dewey, humans are exposed to a myriad of aesthetic experiences every day and it makes sense that teachers ought to seek to include an aesthetic element within their lessons. A range of researchers have conducted classroom studies with aesthetics as a focal point, but these are primarily found
in the science curriculum (Girod & Wong, 2002; Jakobson & Wickman, 2008; Pugh, 2002; Pugh & Girod, 2007). Building on Dewey’s ideas, Uhrmacher and Moroye (2009) devised a specific framework for inclusion of aesthetic elements during lesson planning.

Uhrmacher and Moroye (2007) sought to apply Dewey’s aesthetic approach by exploring interactions between classroom teachers and artists from a variety of specialties. The Aesthetic Educational Institute of Colorado (AEIC), held annually in Denver, Colorado, brings together these two groups to allow the teachers’ time to explore, consider, and practice aesthetic applications in their lesson planning. Through their work with AEIC, Uhrmacher and Moroye (2007) identified CRISPA as a set of guiding principles for those educators who are interested in applying aesthetics in their lessons (Conrad et al., 2015; Conrad & Moroye, 2013). The next section provides a review of the methodology and data collection procedures for the study.

Review of the Methodology

Taking into consideration the research question, setting, and relevant data collection methodologies, a qualitative study was chosen for this research. One of the hallmarks of qualitative research is the process of making meaning from the spoken word of participants, and observed behaviors. The qualitative researcher seeks to evaluate the participants’ actions and reactions and place those into a coherent framework that tells a story about what happened (Creswell, 2013; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Merriam, 1998; Sherman & Webb, 1988; Yin, 2016). The research method utilized was a case study because five teacher participants formed the core of a single curriculum group at one school (Creswell, 2013; Lin, 2016). These participants represented a range from zero to 20 years of teaching experience. Within the school, they are assigned to regular education, ELL, and gifted settings, as well as self-contained and
collaborative special education classrooms. Using existing research on lesson planning as a model, the researcher developed a definition that fit the context of this particular study.

The definition of lesson planning for this research is a collaborative process among teachers of preparing a framework for guiding individual teacher action toward teaching a specific skill or standard (Clark & Elmore 1979; Lalik & Niles, 1990; Thousand, et al., 2006; Yinger, 1980). By soliciting participants from one grade level curriculum group at one school, this research is set apart within the CRISPA arena, as existing studies used single participants or groups of participants who were identified through the AEIC (Conrad et al., 2015; Moroye & Uhrmacher, 2009; Uhrmacher, Conrad, & Moroye, 2013).

Data collection took place in the fall of the 2016-2017 school year and consisted of four phases. The first step of data collection consisted of pre-interviews where the researcher sought to establish a base line for the teachers’ beliefs and attitudes toward collaborative lesson planning. Next, the researcher led a professional development session where participants were introduced to the CRISPA model. In the third phase of data collection, the curriculum group conducted collaborative planning while implementing the model. In the final phase of data collection, the researcher conducted post-interviews with an eye toward identifying how the application of the CRISPA model impacted the participants’ beliefs about collaborative planning. The collected data consisted of interviews and artifacts that were produced during the professional development and collaborative planning phases. The data yielded relevant findings detailed in the next section.

**Major Findings of this Study**

After intensive data analysis, four distinct findings emerged from this study. First, the participants highly valued the opportunity to plan collaboratively. Second, their ability to
conducted collaborative planning was often hindered by the intrusion of other tasks when they wanted planning time protected. Third, the application of CRISPA allowed for creative and meaningful collaborative planning experience and, in doing so, helped address the first two findings. Finally, there is evidence that the application of CRISPA may complement the usage of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy (CRP) (Ladson-Billings, 1995a). Each of these findings and their relation to the existing body of literature is discussed in the next section.

Findings in Relation to Existing Literature

The participants in this research expressed great expectations for their opportunities to plan collaboratively. Participant comments, such as “[it is] very beneficial to plan with others” and it allows for “identification of best practices,” are expressions of what the teachers hoped to gain from collaborative planning (August 11, 2016; August 22, 2016). Perhaps the highest level of expectation was offered by Ginger when she said, “I pull on my peers because I want to be a better teacher” (August 22, 2016). Existing research demonstrates the value of lesson planning and its impact on both student and teacher (Anfara & Caskey, 2010; Darling-Hammond, et al., 2010; John, 2006; Mertens et al., 2010; Swick et al., 1976). It is notable that all five participants expressed a similar belief during the pre-interviews that opportunities to plan collaboratively would not only help them become better as individual teachers, but at the same time, make the group stronger. The desire to work with other teachers, as demonstrated by these participants, also seems to reflect the idea that teaching can become a lonely and isolated field (Goddard & Goddard, 2007; Tschannen-Moran et al., 2000). While this claim may seem contrary due to the relative proximity to other teachers within their building, the demands on their time can prevent the development of relationships and routines that foster collaboration and team-building.
Common planning time and common daily schedules are shown to foster collaboration (Cook & Faulkner, 2010; Swick, et al., 1976). Due to grade-level scheduling routines, perhaps middle schools offer the best opportunity to establish conditions for collaboration to occur. However, this study demonstrated that the availability of regular meeting times does not guarantee collaborative planning will occur, and other tasks not related to planning frequently encroach on this important curricular time. Without commitment from teachers and administrators, the time set aside to plan may be viewed as simply another list of activities to accomplish (Dorovolomo, Phan, & Maubuta, 2010). Unfortunately, data from the pre-interviews indicated that all too often, time that the teachers felt was set aside for planning was intruded upon by requirements from administrators. The experienced members of the curriculum group felt that collaborative planning often “fell short” of what was hoped for and was “quite often unproductive” (August 11, 2016; August 22, 2016). These findings mirror existing research that demonstrates lesson planning is viewed as drudgery and a waste of time even though it can facilitate professional development and dialogue (Glatthorn, 1987; Lederman & Niess, 2000; Trimble, 2015).

In separate ways, the first two findings provide support and contextualize the third result from this research. That is, the application of the perceptual planning model by way of CRISPA, provided a focused and intense collaborative planning effort that was in stark contrast to the participants’ previous collaborative experiences as described in their pre-interviews. Conrad, Moroye, and Uhrmacher (2015) suggested that the focus on quantifiable classroom outcomes has led to teaching decisions that “center on assessable content learning rather than meaningful educational experiences for teachers and students alike” (p. 1). Their research with inservice teachers suggests several possible outcomes resulting from the inclusion of CRISPA. Among
these are an enlivened experience for teachers while planning lessons, and the potential for “transformative experiences for teachers that change the way they view themselves and their professional responsibilities” (p. 11).

While the pre-interviews of the experienced curriculum group participants were consistently negative in their views regarding previous collaborative experiences, the opposite position was universally taken during the post-interviews. In their own words, the participants described the collaborative planning conducted during data collection as, “one of the more productive meetings we’ve had,” and “for the first time, we came up with something useful” (October 17, 2016; October 20, 2016). Importantly, the success of the professional development that introduced the participants to CRISPA was key to setting the stage for the planning day. As a result, the department chair was able to leverage the opportunity to take complete control of the agenda for the planning day and allow a total focus on lesson planning.

Application of CRISPA Within Participant Classrooms

The data collected in this research supports Moroye and Uhrmacher’s (2013) belief that perceptual lesson planning can make the process more interesting and engaging. During post-interviews, the researcher discovered that every participant included some aspect of CRISPA within their American Revolution unit. Oscar, the first-year teacher, described how he implemented a lesson plan involving a game requiring the students to compromise. The game he used set the stage for discussing various compromises made during the constitutional convention. He reported that the students demonstrated the CRISPA facet of making connections as the game unfolded. Further, Oscar stated that this was the most enjoyable lesson he had taught to that point in the year (October 3, 2016).
Bobby reflected on a lesson he previously taught where groups of students were asked to develop newspaper headlines and stories based on various revolutionary topics. His earlier lesson instructions allowed the students to divide up the required tasks, such as who would be the reporter or the revolutionary character for an interview. Over time he noted that some students tended to let others do most of the work. When he reconsidered this lesson through the lens of CRISPA, he decided to assign every student in the group a specific role to play. This change forced every student to prepare for a specific task in order to contribute to the final product, because no student could rely on their peers to complete their portion of the assignment. By making this relatively minor change, Bobby improved on the CRISPA element of making connections within the class. Further, while he believed the lesson previously incorporated active engagement, his reconsideration of the lesson within the CRISPA frame further enhanced the value of the lesson for his students (October 17, 2016). The preceding examples of how the participants utilized CRISPA for lesson planning mirror the results found by Uhrmacher and Moroye (2009). These results also parallel Uhrmacher et al. (2013) assertion that the perceptual planning model might open opportunities for “surprise and student innovation” within the planning process (p. 16).

Critical observers may note that the sensory theme rarely appeared in the examples where teachers applied CRISPA in their classrooms. One noteworthy example from this study is Traci’s implementation of a strategy that included visual art. As described earlier, the CRISPA discussion reminded her of how she had previously used pictures of artwork on a regular basis when she taught high school and felt it was a very satisfying practice. After the collaborative planning session, she resurrected the practice in her classroom and began to use artwork for her daily warm-up activities (October 20, 2016).
Traci provided a concrete example of the sensory experience as did Oscar’s compromise game where students interacted individually and collectively with a variety of props (October 13, 2016; October 20, 2016). It seems reasonable that the aesthetic vision described by Dewey (1934) would most likely present itself through a sensory experience. However, it is also notable that the CRISPA model encapsulates various elements of lesson planning that, together, contribute to the aesthetic.

During post-interviews each participant acknowledged the value they saw in CRISPA and took the time to implement new lessons or change existing ones in order to explore the practice. Further, Conrad et al. (2015) found similar results when introducing CRISPA to new groups of teachers. Their findings show that perceptual planning “enliven(ed) the experience of teachers and enhancement of attention toward the student experience in the lesson” (p. 12). The findings presented in this study show how the collaborative planning session was improved over previous experiences and, perhaps more importantly, the participants took what they learned and implemented it in their classrooms with the goal of making better lessons for their students.

The last element of this study involved an exploration of whether the implementation of CRISPA might also enable the participants’ utilization of CRP (Ladson Billings, 1995a). As discussed in chapter four, most of the participants were unfamiliar with CRP when the study began. As a result, the researcher and the one teacher familiar with CRP guided a discussion to introduce the pedagogy and explore how it might be utilized in a social studies setting. Through the course of the conversation, the participants made connections between CRISPA and CRP by discussing the advantages of employing higher order and critical thinking skills (January 26, 2017). Notably, the depth of the dialogue regarding implementing CRP with students did not successfully reach the third goal of CRP or having students challenge social structures they
interpret as unfair (Ladson-Billings, 1995a). However, this was the very first explicit exposure to CRP for most of the participants. This preliminary finding is generally positive thus indicating that perhaps CRISPA may be a strong platform to continue efforts towards inclusion of CRP in daily lessons.

Evidence that the participants were grasping the basic ideals of CRP was confirmed when two teachers pointed out the lack of Latinx representation within their state social studies standards. These teachers were alert to the need, and indeed, the questioning of their own Latinx students as to where they fit within the state’s history (January 26, 2017). The limited data gathered regarding CRP for this study indicated that the participants were open to exploring the pedagogy further, as well as identifying several areas where they believed they were already using it. These examples of participant comment also reflect existing research that demonstrates teacher reflection is an important component of building CRP skills and application (Briggs, 2014; Howard, 2003).

The findings described in the preceding sections represent the distillation of the data collection and analysis for this study. They get to the heart of answering the research question. The next segment of this chapter will address the various means for confirming these research claims.

**The Case Supporting the Findings**

Several means of supporting the findings from this study are provided by Miles, Huberman and Saldaña (2014). The first suggestion offered by these researchers is to identify patterns or themes within the data. The consistency of answers during both pre and post-interviews with the participants satisfies this criteria. For example, during pre-interviews, the participants were consistent in their expectation that collaborative planning would help them
become better teachers. Further, the experienced members of this curriculum group were uniform in their assertions that previous collaborative planning sessions did not meet their expectations. Finally, the group was unanimous in their belief that the inclusion of CRISPA had aided both with gaining control of the agenda, but also in the work that was done during the all-day planning session.

Another method of supporting these findings is to explore rival explanations and test them against the data (Miles et al., 2015). An apparent rival explanation for the success of the all-day planning session could be that the department chair simply gained control of the agenda and thereby prevented other tasks from interfering with the planning time. Counter-arguments to this rival explanation include asking the question, “Why hadn’t the group simply taken control previously?” A plausible answer is that the group never had an issue like CRISPA to approach the setting of the agenda. Second, the post-interview responses unanimously supported the assertion that the participants believed the application of CRISPA made a difference during planning. Further, those interview results also confirmed that each participant applied some principle or principles of CRISPA during their lesson delivery of the revolution unit. Third, the findings match those of existing literature on CRISPA (Conrad, et al. (2015); Uhrmacher & Moroye, 2007, 2009). Teachers who participate in CRISPA report a renewed energy and vitality to their planning and the participants in this research had the same experience. Finally, the participants were asked to conduct member checks of chapters four and five. Only two participants provided comments, and they were related to grammar and citations. In summary, the pre-and post-interview findings appear to counter the rival explanation for the all-day planning success. In addition, the existing literature supports the findings and indicates a
successful analysis with multiple sources of data to support these findings with a high level of confidence.

**Implications for Further Research**

This study adds to the small pool of previous research that explored the application of the perceptual planning model for inservice teachers (Uhrmacher & Moroye, 2009). By design, this study did not follow the teachers into their classrooms as they applied what they learned about CRISPA during collaborative planning. To that end, the researcher suggests that it would be valuable to have more studies that examine teachers and groups of teachers who apply the model and perhaps seek to identify more ways to practice its application.

Another suggestion for further study could explore methods to introduce and train teachers on the CRISPA model other than attending the AEIC. Clearly, physical attendance at the conference is limited due to time, expense, and travel constraints. How might portable or online training modules be produced and shared or distributed? Exposing a wider teacher audience to CRISPA will require additional training options. A comparative study may explore how attendance or not at AEIC impacts practice.

Future research may also expand the literature through a longitudinal case study that seeks to follow one or more teachers as they implement CRISPA. Simultaneously, such studies might also benefit from monitoring the allocation of planning time versus the actual use of those opportunities as well as the various forces that act to influence its’ implementation.

A vital assessment for any classroom strategy or pedagogy is determining its value to the learning experience of the student. Unless the strategy is educationally effective or beneficial, then its application is dubious. Therefore, another useful study could examine the learning
outcomes between classes or teachers who use CRISPA and those that do not. In summary, there are many possible opportunities to enhance the nascent research literature on CRISPA.

One final suggestion for further research stems from the finding regarding the teachers’ desire to plan together and their hopes that the collaboration would increase their effectiveness. To an extent, this is contrary to Darling-Hammond et al. (2010) and Dorovolomo et al. (2010) who indicate that the process of planning is often viewed as wasteful and just another task to complete. The near future of public education will continue to include state driven teaching mandates and multiple required assessments. The teachers’ already limited time is going to continue to be encroached upon. Further studies of collaborative planning and the ways that these efforts may aid teachers in managing their time and striking a better balance would also be helpful.

Conclusion

This study of five middle school social studies teachers was developed to explore how the teachers would respond to the application of the perceptual lesson planning model in a collaborative setting. Based on the analysis of the data, the findings show a clear preference by the teachers for opportunities to plan together. The teachers expressed an expectation that those opportunities will ultimately produce better lessons as well as help them become better teachers. However, they shared frustration with their previous efforts and often felt that the time they could spend planning was truncated by administrative issues. When the perceptual model was introduced, it was received with enthusiasm and a willingness to consider how it might affect their planning. Ultimately, their participation in a lengthy collaborative planning session led each teacher to implement some aspect of the CRISPA model within their American Revolution unit.
These findings also support the vision of perceptual planning described by Uhrmacher, Conrad, and Moroye (2013) as intended to “engage teachers’ and students’ senses, creativity, and imagination” (p. 18). The participants allowed themselves to be challenged in their lesson planning and ask themselves the questions posed by CRISPA. Am I allowing my students to make connections? Am I willing to take a risk as I plan? How can I more actively engage my students in their learning? Their answers to these questions resulted in pointed and relevant changes to their lessons as well as a willingness to try new things. They took steps toward achieving Dewey’s (1934) challenge of including an aesthetic element for teaching their students. The results of this study demonstrate what can happen when teachers feel empowered and in control of critical professional proceedings. Their individual hopes and desires for a collaborative planning experience were realized when they were given the flexibility to chart their own path. Together their work was stronger and they influenced each other to expand their classroom repertoire.
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**APPENDICES**

*Appendix A*

Participant Time Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Estimated Time for Event</th>
<th>Estimated Cumulative Time Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Read and sign consent form</td>
<td>-15 Minutes</td>
<td>-15 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Pre-Interview</td>
<td>-30-60 Minutes</td>
<td>-45 Minutes – 1 Hr. 15 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Conducted during normal duty hours at CMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Read Moroye &amp; Uhrmacher (2009) article</td>
<td>-20 Minutes</td>
<td>-1 Hr. 5 Min. – 1 Hr. 35 Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Professional Development and Model Aesthetic Lesson</td>
<td>-45-60 Minutes</td>
<td>-1 hr. 50 Min. – 2 Hr. 35 Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Collaborative Planning/ Focus Group sessions (4-6 estimated)</td>
<td>-4 – 6 Hours</td>
<td>-5 hr. 50 Min. – 8 Hr. 35 Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Conducted during normal weekly curriculum meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Post-Interview</td>
<td>-30-60 Minutes</td>
<td>-6 hr. 20 Min. – 9 Hr. 35 Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Conducted during normal duty hours at CMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Generic Timeline for Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| August | - Teacher participant selection  
- Collect/confirm participant consent forms  
- Conduct initial individual teacher interviews (at least 2)  
- Distribute Moroye & Uhrmacher (2009) article for preview  
- Begin observations of collaborative planning (field notes and video)  
- Collect artifacts as needed  
- Focus group Interview  
- Transcribe field notes, video, focus group, and interviews |
| September | - Continue observations of collaborative planning  
- Collect artifacts as needed  
- Focus group interview  
- Conduct final individual teacher interviews (at least 2)  
- Transcribe field notes, video, focus group, and interviews |
| October | - Finalize all transcription  
- Begin coding of transcripts  
- Member checks of interview transcripts  
- Peer debriefing (to be determined) |
| November | - Complete coding of transcripts  
- Identify key themes of data analysis  
- Peer debriefing |
### Appendix C

Pre and Post Semi-Structured Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Pre Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are individual teacher attitudes toward collaborative lesson planning?</td>
<td>- Discuss how you feel about planning with other teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Describe your previous experience with collaborative planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Follow up/probing questions as needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are individual teacher attitudes toward lesson planning after the introduction and application of the perceptual lesson planning model?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D

**Detailed Plan for Professional Development and Focus Group Collaborative Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Intended data collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Conduct individual pre interviews</td>
<td>-Address specific research question&lt;br&gt;-Establish baseline for participant thoughts on collaborative planning</td>
<td>-Audio recording and field notes for transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Provide copies of Moroye &amp; Uhrmacher (2009) to each participant for read ahead</td>
<td>-Introduce CRISPA model&lt;br&gt;-Set the stage for researcher led professional development</td>
<td>-Sets conditions for gathering data during professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Researcher leads professional development on CRISPA model</td>
<td>-Validate participant understanding of Deweyian aesthetics and the CRISPA model&lt;br&gt;-Researcher models use of CRISPA in a Native American lesson</td>
<td>-Audio recording and field notes for transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Collaborative planning/focus group sessions (number of sessions is anticipated at 4 to 6)</td>
<td>-Participants conduct collaborative lesson planning using CRISPA model&lt;br&gt;-Researcher serves as participant-observer then as observer-participant</td>
<td>-Audio/video recordings for transcription&lt;br&gt;-Field notes from researcher&lt;br&gt;-Still/video photographs for evidence&lt;br&gt;-Collect artifacts produced during collaborative planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Conduct individual post interviews</td>
<td>-Address specific research question concerning impact of using the CRISPA model</td>
<td>-Audio recording and field notes for transcription&lt;br&gt;-Compare pre and post interview data for changes in teacher response to collaborative planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E
Full Transcript of Professional Development Posters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Science article example</th>
<th>Social Studies museum example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connections</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Connect to the subject (connect through senses, emotions, knowledge, people)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Connect to learning in other classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Senses – she used sight and sound in the preview. Taste with the ice cream. Feel with creating the planets. Music also connects in an emotional level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Connect to prior knowledge of playing in dirt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Go to a museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Excitement to go on a field trip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Taking</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Try something outside of your comfort zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “computer lab” - No lights to start project (always scary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not telling the students the point of making globes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The planet making w/math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If previewing, students have to guess why and who used the artifacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not being able to quickly re-focus students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imagination</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Imagine possibilities – real and fantasy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ooh and ahh at the video</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Video and music together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Figure out what they were creating with paper mache</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Imagining how the artifacts feel as well as thinking about what the artifact is made of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sensory Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Explore with your senses – taste, touch, smell, sound, see</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Playing music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Associating the sound of music with the characteristics of the planets (visual)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dancing/moving to the music “touching” the planets w/paper mache</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I was able to see, feel &amp; Smell my artifact which allowed me to connect with the object and thus the people who had created them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The more you look the more you see and know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Had students look at orange planets in a variety of different ways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Telling students to just look (sight) @ space pics and listen (hear) to music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Breadth of the unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To see the artifact up close touch/feel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The more I looked the more art elements I saw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students get to see/feel the objects they have already studied and looked at in photos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participate and enjoy the experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Math lesson: making planets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Figuring out they were making the planets and to make Pluto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students were asked just to “experience” the opener, which allowed them to enjoy the experience and engage with the environment she had created</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Making the planets and then creating the solar system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tangible items: draw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Allowing the students to have ownership in choosing which artifact they will analyze – allowing students to make sense of the activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- My first thought was “how would I make this?” at the artifact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- touch think about using</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>