

Removing Barriers, Expanding Learning

**Seattle Children's Theatre's One&Five Program Impact Assessment
2024-2026**

Prepared by
Matt Omasta, Ph.D.
Miami University

Commissioned by Seattle Children's Theatre

Final Report

Table of Contents

Contents

Acknowledgements	2
Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction and Evaluation Purpose	5
2. Program Background and Operating Model	6
3. Productions Included in the Assessment	7
4. Evaluation Design and Methodology	8
5. Educator Respondent Profile and Starting Perspectives	10
6. Educator Assessment of Performances and Student Learning.....	11
7. Access as a Foundational Program Outcome	13
8. Dramatic Connections Workshops	15
9. Direct Student Findings: <i>Young Dragon</i>	16
10. Direct Student Findings: Robin Hood.....	18
11. Integrated Qualitative Findings About Student Learning	20
12. Areas for Program Refinement	24
13. Study Limitations	25
14. Conclusions	26
15. Recommendations for Program	27
16. Recommendations for Future Evaluation	28
References.....	32
Appendix A. Detailed Educator Findings.....	33
Appendix B. Detailed Student Findings	36
Appendix C. Qualitative Coding Summaries	38
Appendix D. Evaluation Administration and Interpretation Notes	40

Acknowledgements

This impact evaluation was commissioned by Seattle Children's Theatre (SCT). I am grateful to the educators and students who contributed their time and perspectives, to the school and theatre personnel who supported data collection, and to the SCT staff members who provided program information and logistical assistance. Their participation made it possible to examine not only whether educators and students valued the One&Five experience, but also how the program's combination of performance access, transportation, and optional Dramatic Connections workshops shaped that experience.

I am also grateful to Research Assistants Abbie Herbold and Caroline Martin who provided invaluable assistance with data collection and analysis.

The findings and interpretations in this report are those of the researchers. Seattle Children's Theatre funded the evaluation and provided information about the program's history and operation. Impact conclusions are based solely on the educator and student data collected for this assessment.

Executive Summary

Seattle Children's Theatre created One&Five to address two closely connected goals: removing financial and transportation barriers that prevent elementary students from attending professional theatre and supporting student learning through live performance. During the 2024-25 and 2025-26 seasons, participating first- and fifth-grade Seattle Public Schools classrooms received performance tickets, the full cost of transportation to the theatre, and an optional production-connected Dramatic Connections workshop without charge. Workshops were generally delivered after the performance, although timing varied according to classroom and program needs.

This final independent evaluation draws on three sources of evidence. First, 84 educators completed post-experience surveys one to two weeks after attending one of nine assessed productions. Second, matched pre- and post-surveys were completed by 65 students who attended *Young Dragon: A Bruce Lee Story* and 78 students who attended *Robin Hood*. Third, open-ended teacher responses were analyzed through an inductive coding process: 65 substantive responses addressed the most valuable aspects of the program, 59 addressed less valuable aspects or opportunities for improvement, and 57 described teacher-observed student impacts. The student comparisons used paired-samples t-tests and report Cohen's d when available. The study was approved by the Miami University Institutional Review Board and the Seattle Public Schools Office of Research & Evaluation.

Principal conclusions

One&Five's strongest and clearest impact is access. Teachers repeatedly described the field trip as a first or rare professional theatre experience for their students. At least 10 educators explicitly stated that some or most students had never attended live theatre or had few opportunities to do so outside school. The cost-scenario findings reinforce the importance of the program's fully subsidized model. When both the production and transportation were free, 92.3% of educators said they would be likely or very likely to bring students to a future SCT production. That proportion fell to 66.2% when the production remained free but transportation was not provided, to 57.5% when tickets cost \$6-\$16 but transportation was provided, and to 40.3% when both ticket and transportation costs were introduced. Transportation funding is therefore not a secondary convenience; it is part of the access intervention itself.

Educators viewed the performances as high-quality, engaging, and educationally valuable. Across productions, 98.8% of educators were satisfied or very satisfied with the performance they attended, and 97.6% were likely or very likely to recommend the program to a colleague. On a seven-point agreement scale, 89.2% selected "true" or "very true" in response to the statement that they liked the One&Five play, with an additional 4.8% selecting "slightly true." Similarly, 85.3% selected "true" or "very true" that students learned something, with an additional 11.0% selecting "slightly true." These ratings were supported by detailed teacher descriptions of professional production quality, sustained student engagement, developmentally appropriate humor and storytelling, and meaningful connections to literacy, science, history, cultural heritage, community, perseverance, and identity.

The educational value described by teachers came from a combination of elements rather than from performance attendance alone. Educators most frequently cited production quality and craft (n = 23), student engagement (n = 21), access to live theatre (n = 18), and curricular learning (n = 16). They also emphasized active participation and workshops (n = 13), cultural or historical learning and perspective-taking (n = 11), music and movement (n = 11), developmental appropriateness (n = 10), creativity and confidence (n = 10), representation and inclusion (n = 6), and the social experience of participating in a shared audience. Teachers described theatre as a vivid, multimodal form of learning in which students encountered ideas through character, story, dialogue, music, movement, visual design, and interaction with professional artists.

Dramatic Connections workshops were valued; their effectiveness depended on design and facilitation. Among teachers who rated a workshop, 95.9% were satisfied or very satisfied. Positive comments emphasized movement, imagination, acting, dance, collaboration, risk-taking, and the opportunity for students to demonstrate abilities that might not be visible in conventional classroom activities. The cost

results again underscored the importance of free access: 91.2% of educators said they were likely or very likely to book a future workshop when it was free, compared with 20.0% when priced at \$230-\$270. At the same time, some teachers recommended shorter and more active formats for younger students, less waiting while individuals took turns, clearer modeling, sufficient staffing, and more explicit connections between activities and intended learning outcomes.

Direct student findings were promising in specific areas and mixed overall. Students generally reported enjoying *Young Dragon*: the mean enjoyment rating was 4.05 on a five-point scale, and 78.5% agreed or strongly agreed that they liked the play. The mean learning rating was 3.78, with 63.0% agreeing or strongly agreeing that they learned something new. The clearest positive pre/post result was a rise in agreement that “plays are for people like me,” from 3.08 to 3.38 ($p = .015$, $d = .31$). This represents a small positive change in students’ sense of identification or belonging with theatre over the study period. Most other *Young Dragon* pre/post measures did not change significantly, which is not unsurprising for a single intervention.

Students’ immediate responses to *Robin Hood* were more mixed. The mean enjoyment rating was 3.62, with 60.0% agreeing or strongly agreeing that they liked the play. The mean learning rating was 2.88; 26.0% agreed or strongly agreed that they learned something new, 42.0% were neutral or unsure, and 32.0% disagreed or strongly disagreed. General theatre attitudes and the standardized empathy, tolerance, and future-orientation measures did not change significantly.

Qualitative evidence documented immediate learning, discussion, and participation more clearly than lasting personal change, due in part to the non-longitudinal nature of the study. Teachers most often described empathy and perspective-taking ($n = 18$), classroom discussion and curricular connections ($n = 14$), cultural understanding ($n = 9$), social behavior and teamwork ($n = 9$), engagement ($n = 9$), identity connections ($n = 8$), confidence and leadership ($n = 8$), and perseverance or self-belief ($n = 8$). The strongest examples involved observable actions: hesitant students joining activities, students taking leadership roles, classmates collaborating with peers outside their usual friendship groups, students expressing concern for characters, or classes continuing to discuss cultural rights, discrimination, identity, and belonging after returning to school. Twelve teachers also stated that it was too soon or otherwise difficult to determine whether the experience produced lasting change. Their caution is consistent with the evaluation design.

Implications for leadership and funding

The evidence supports continued investment in a fully subsidized program model. Funding tickets without transportation would address only part of the access problem. Charging for workshops would likely reduce participation sharply. The program’s value also depends on maintaining high artistic quality, offering stories and casts that provide both representation and exposure to unfamiliar perspectives, supporting teachers in connecting productions to classroom learning, and designing workshops that are active and developmentally responsive.

The strongest funding case is not that a single theatre visit reliably changes broad psychological traits. The stronger and more defensible case is that One&Five removes concrete barriers to a high-quality cultural and educational experience; reaches students who might otherwise have little or no access to professional theatre; creates immediate opportunities for learning, reflection, participation, and community; and gives educators material they can continue developing in the classroom. The program provides an equitable foundation on which those educational experiences can occur.

1. Introduction and Evaluation Purpose

Seattle Children’s Theatre’s One&Five program is built around a straightforward but consequential premise: students cannot benefit from a professional theatre experience if the practical costs of participation place that experience beyond their reach. For a school field trip, the price of admission is only one component of access. Transportation, scheduling, staffing, and the educational preparation required to make a field trip meaningful can be equally important. One&Five therefore combines complimentary performance tickets with fully funded transportation and optional Dramatic Connections workshops for participating first- and fifth-grade Seattle Public Schools classrooms.

SCT introduced One&Five during the 2021-22 season with free field-trip tickets. In August 2024, the organization announced that the program would expand for the 2024-25 season to include free bus transportation and no-cost, production-specific Dramatic Connections workshops. SCT described the initiative as a response to inequities and financial barriers that restricted young people’s access to theatre. The workshops were described as one-hour experiences led by SCT Teaching Artists and designed to deepen students’ knowledge of the characters, settings, and themes of the associated production (Seattle Children’s Theatre, 2024a).

This evaluation examined the first two seasons of that expanded program model. It was commissioned by SCT and conducted as an independent external assessment. The report is intended primarily for organizational leadership, the Board of Trustees, and current or prospective funders. It has three connected purposes: to provide an evidence-based account of program implementation and participant experience; to identify the clearest strengths and limitations of the program; and to support informed decisions about continued investment, refinement, and future evaluation.

This assessment sought to assess the One & Five’s impact in terms of its ability to:

1. **Remove financial and transportation barriers** that might otherwise prevent first- and fifth-grade Seattle Public Schools students from attending SCT productions.
2. **Support student learning through theatre**, including learning associated with the productions, classroom curricula, cultures and communities, participation, and the experience of live performance.

These outcomes require different forms of evidence. Barrier removal can be examined through the program’s actual cost structure, teacher descriptions of students’ prior access, and teachers’ stated likelihood of future participation under different cost scenarios. Student learning is more complex. It can include immediate knowledge, engagement, discussion, reflection, theatre literacy, cultural understanding, confidence, and social participation. Some aspects can be measured directly through student surveys; others are most visible to classroom teachers through student behavior and conversation.

Accordingly, the evaluation used a mixed evidence base. Educator surveys documented satisfaction, perceived student learning, willingness to recommend the program, cost sensitivity, and open-ended observations. Matched student surveys for two productions examined immediate reactions and pre/post changes in theatre attitudes, empathy, tolerance, future orientation, and production-specific concepts. The qualitative analysis provided examples of how teachers understood the program’s value, where they believed it could improve, and what changes or responses they observed among students.

The report deliberately distinguishes between evidence of access and participation, educator perceptions, students’ self-reports, and measured pre/post change. These forms of evidence answer different questions and have different limitations. A high satisfaction rating demonstrates that an educator valued the experience; it does not necessarily independently establish a change in student learning. A teacher’s description of a sustained class discussion provides meaningful evidence of engagement and curricular use; it does not establish that every student experienced the same outcome. A statistically significant pre/post change indicates that average scores differed across the observed period; without a comparison group, it does not demonstrate that the production caused the difference.

This distinction is particularly important for a report designed to inform funding. A compelling impact narrative should not depend on overstating what the research can support. The strongest case for One&Five

emerges when the different evidence streams are aligned: the program removed costs; teachers described reaching students with limited prior theatre access; educators rated the experiences highly; cost scenarios showed that participation would likely fall if subsidies were removed; and teacher and student responses documented immediate learning, engagement, belonging, and discussion. At the same time, the direct student pre/post evidence was mixed, and the report treats those findings transparently.

The evaluation was guided by four questions:

1. How did participating educators assess the quality, educational value, and relevance of the productions and workshops?
2. What does the evidence indicate about the role of free tickets, transportation, and workshops in supporting access and future participation?
3. What immediate reactions and pre/post changes were observed among students surveyed for *Young Dragon* and *Robin Hood*?
4. What program and evaluation refinements are suggested by the combined quantitative and qualitative findings?

The sections that follow describe the program and productions, explain the evaluation methods, present findings from educators and students, integrate the qualitative and quantitative evidence, and offer recommendations for SCT's leadership and funders.

2. Program Background and Operating Model

One&Five serves students at two transition points in elementary education: first grade, when children are entering the routines and shared experiences of formal schooling, and fifth grade, when they are approaching the transition to middle school. SCT's public description frames the program as an effort to ensure that Seattle Public Schools students can experience live theatre at important points in their elementary education. The current program materials describe a package that links a field-trip performance with a Dramatic Connections workshop intended to extend learning beyond the stage (Seattle Children's Theatre, n.d.-a).

During the period assessed in this report, the program's access model was fully subsidized. Participating classrooms received tickets without charge, and the full cost of transportation was covered. Teachers could also request a Dramatic Connections workshop at no cost. All classrooms that requested a workshop received one, although not every teacher opted into that component. Workshops typically occurred after the production, allowing students to draw on their own experience of the show, but some were scheduled before the performance or at another time. The performance, workshop where applicable, pre-survey, and post-survey generally occurred within approximately one month for the student study classrooms.

The three program components served distinct but complementary functions.

Performance tickets created the opportunity to enter the theatre. For some students, the field trip was their first professional production and, in some cases, their first exposure to theatre as an art form. Teachers described students who expected a film rather than a live event, students who had never been inside a theatre, and students who needed to learn when and why an audience applauds. The ticket subsidy directly addressed the admission cost that might otherwise limit school participation.

Transportation funding made the opportunity usable. A free ticket is not functionally free to a school if bus costs must be absorbed by a constrained classroom or school budget. The teacher comments and cost-scenario results demonstrate that transportation is a central part of the program's equity strategy. One educator stated simply, "The 1st and 5th program is so helpful in covering transportation for my school!" The importance of this support is quantified later in the report: the proportion of educators likely to attend a future free production declined by more than 26 percentage points when transportation was no longer provided.

Dramatic Connections workshops created an optional bridge between viewing and doing. SCT described the production-specific workshops as experiences led by Teaching Artists to foster curiosity and deepen knowledge of the production's characters, setting, and themes (Seattle Children's Theatre, 2024a). Teachers described workshops that asked students to move, act, dance, collaborate, imagine, listen, and experiment

with different forms of expression. In the strongest examples, the workshop did not simply repeat the story. It gave students another way to process it and offered a participatory setting in which students could take risks or display abilities that were less visible in the classroom.

Together, these components form a plausible program logic. Removing the direct and logistical costs makes attendance possible. A high-quality, developmentally appropriate production creates an engaging shared experience. Interaction, classroom preparation or follow-up, and an optional workshop may then deepen the experience by helping students connect the story to academic content, cultures and communities, relationships, and their own creative capacities. Teachers can continue using the performance as a reference point after the field trip.

This logic should not be treated as a claim that each component always produces each outcome. Teachers varied in whether they requested workshops, how they integrated productions into instruction, and how closely a particular show matched their students' interests and developmental needs. The student study could not link workshop participation to individual survey records. The program is therefore best understood as a set of conditions and opportunities: One&Five makes participation possible and provides multiple pathways through which learning may occur.

The expanded One&Five model also sits within SCT's broader role as a producer of professional theatre for young audiences and a provider of theatre education. The productions assessed across the two seasons ranged from adaptations of familiar picture books to culturally specific stories, historical narratives, science-focused musical theatre, and reimagined traditional tales. That range matters because educators did not describe one universal mechanism of value. A familiar book could reinforce literacy and comparison skills; a local historical story could introduce students to a Seattle community; a culturally specific performance could offer representation or perspective-taking; an interactive musical could support participation and memory; and a workshop could allow students to embody a theme through movement.

For leadership and funders, the most important feature of the operating model is that equity and learning are not separate program tracks. The access supports enable students to participate in the learning experience, while the artistic and educational design determines the value of the opportunity made accessible. Sustaining impact therefore requires attention to both: adequate resources to remove barriers and consistent quality in the productions, workshops, logistics, and teacher supports.

3. Productions Included in the Assessment

The evaluation covered nine productions across SCT's 2024-25 and 2025-26 seasons. The 2024-25 season was SCT's 50th anniversary season and included six productions in total; two were represented in this assessment: *The Hula-Hoopin' Queen* and *The Pa'akai We Bring*. The 2025-26 season consisted of seven productions, all of which were included in the educator data: *Chicka Chicka Boom Boom: The Musical*, *Fancy Dancer*, *The Pigeon Gets a Big Time Holiday Extravaganza!*, *Ada Twist*, *Scientist and Friends*, *Young Dragon: A Bruce Lee Story*, *Robin Hood*, and *Billy Goats Gruff and Other Tales*.

The productions varied substantially in form, subject, and intended audience. *The Hula-Hoopin' Queen* used an energetic community story adapted from a picture book. *The Pa'akai We Bring* drew on Native Hawaiian stories and traditions through hula, music, song, and audience participation. The 2025-26 season included an alphabet-based musical for young audiences; a story of self-expression and identity; a holiday comedy built around familiar characters; a science and friendship musical; a world premiere focused on Bruce Lee, courage, identity, and belonging; a reimagining of *Robin Hood*; and a collection of classic tales presented with fresh theatrical energy.

This variety is important when interpreting production-level ratings. A response may reflect the fit between one production and a particular grade, classroom, or curricular context as much as a general judgment about SCT. Production samples were also uneven and, in several cases, small. Educator response counts ranged from three for *Chicka Chicka Boom Boom* to 18 for *Ada Twist*, *Scientist and Friends*. Percentages based on a small number of respondents can shift substantially with a single response. Production-level findings are

therefore reported to preserve the study’s structure, but the aggregate patterns and qualitative themes provide the more stable basis for broad program conclusions.

Table 1. Educator respondents by production

Production	Season	Educator respondents
<i>The Hula-Hoopin’ Queen</i>	2024-25	7
<i>The Pa’akai We Bring</i>	2024-25	12
<i>Chicka Chicka Boom Boom: The Musical</i>	2025-26	3
<i>Fancy Dancer</i>	2025-26	6
<i>The Pigeon Gets a Big Time Holiday Extravaganza!</i>	2025-26	7
<i>Ada Twist, Scientist and Friends</i>	2025-26	18
<i>Young Dragon: A Bruce Lee Story</i>	2025-26	9
<i>Robin Hood</i>	2025-26	11
<i>Billy Goats Gruff and Other Tales</i>	2025-26	11
Total		84

Educator surveys were administered for all nine productions. Direct student surveys were administered only for *Young Dragon* and *Robin Hood*. The distinction matters throughout this report. Educator data provide broad coverage across the seasons and insight into classroom context, but much of the student-learning evidence is based on teacher perception and observation. The student data provide direct self-report and pre/post comparisons, but only for two fifth-grade productions.

The qualitative analysis also combined responses across productions and then identified themes that recurred in different contexts. The integrated findings sections draw on the combined evidence while noting production-specific examples when they illuminate how a theme operated.

4. Evaluation Design and Methodology

4.1 Overall design

The evaluation used a mixed-method, quasi-experimental design. It combined post-experience educator surveys, matched student pre/post surveys for two productions, and qualitative analysis of open-ended educator responses. The design was well suited to documenting participant experience, access, satisfaction, perceived learning, immediate student reactions, and changes over the observed period.

The evaluation was reviewed and approved by the Miami University Institutional Review Board as well as the Seattle Public Schools Department of Research & Evaluation. Participation in the study was separate from participation in the One&Five program. SCT commissioned and funded the evaluation, while the analysis and report were prepared by Matt Omasta as an independent external evaluator.

4.2 Educator surveys

A total of 84 educators completed surveys. Surveys were generally administered one to two weeks after the production. This timing allowed teachers to reflect on the field trip and, in many cases, classroom discussion or a Dramatic Connections workshop, while remaining close enough to the experience for detailed recall. Because workshops did not always occur at the same point relative to the performance or survey, some teachers may have completed portions of the survey before a workshop or before extensive classroom debriefing.

The educator instrument used seven-point and four-point response scales. Seven-point items assessed perspectives on theatre and agreement with statements about enjoying the One&Five production and

believing students learned something. Four-point items assessed satisfaction with the performance and workshop, likelihood of recommending the program, and likelihood of future participation under different cost conditions. The cost questions presented hypothetical scenarios involving ticket prices, transportation support, and workshop fees.

The survey also included demographic and background questions. These documented grade taught, gender, race, age, direct involvement with theatre, annual theatre attendance, and parent or caregiver connections to elementary-aged children and children's theatre involvement. The background data helped assess whether the educator group consisted primarily of theatre specialists or highly frequent theatre participants.

Open-ended questions asked teachers to identify the most valuable and least valuable aspects of the program and to provide examples of impacts on one or more students. Those responses became the qualitative datasets described below.

4.3 Student surveys

Direct student surveys were completed for *Young Dragon* and *Robin Hood*. The *Young Dragon* analysis included 65 students, and the *Robin Hood* analysis included 78. Only students who completed both the pre- and post-surveys were included in the matched analysis. When an included student skipped an individual question, the missing response was excluded from the analysis for that item.

Student surveys used five-point scales. Post-experience items asked students whether they liked watching the production and whether they learned something new. Pre- and post-survey measures examined four general perspectives on theatre as well as four themes specific to each production. Both surveys also included standardized or previously used measures of affective empathy, cognitive empathy, tolerance, and future orientation. Affective and cognitive empathy were based on the child empathy measure developed by Garton and Gringart (2005). The tolerance measure was drawn from prior live-theatre field-trip research (Greene et al., 2015). Future orientation was based on work by Lindstrom Johnson, Pas, and Bradshaw (2016). Production-specific items assessed concepts aligned with the stories and anticipated learning themes.

Matched pre/post comparisons used paired-samples t-tests. Cohen's d was reported for statistically significant findings. The report uses $p < .05$ as the conventional threshold for statistical significance. Statistical significance is not treated as equivalent to educational importance, and nonsignificant results are not interpreted as proof that no individual student changed.

The timing of pre-survey, performance, workshop where applicable, and post-survey varied by classroom, but the full sequence typically occurred within approximately one month. Individual student workshop participation was not available in the analytic dataset. As a result, the student outcomes cannot be attributed specifically to the performance, workshop, or their combination.

4.4 Qualitative analysis

The analyzed teacher responses were coded inductively for all relevant ideas. A single teacher could be included in multiple thematic categories when a response addressed more than one concept. Within a category, a teacher was counted only once regardless of how often the same idea appeared in the response. This approach captured the breadth of teacher perspectives without treating the categories as mutually exclusive.

Three open-ended datasets were analyzed:

- 65 substantive responses to the question about the most valuable aspects of the show and/or workshop;
- 59 responses concerning the least valuable aspects or reasons that a component was less valuable;
- 57 responses providing examples of teacher-observed student impacts.

The analysis combined theme counts with close examination of teacher explanations and examples. Counts indicate how often an idea was identified in the analyzed responses, not the percentage of all participating teachers who held that view. Because teachers could be coded into multiple categories, category totals exceed the number of responses.

The qualitative data serve two functions in this report. First, they explain why educators gave high or low ratings. Second, they identify forms of learning and participation that may not be captured by broad student scales. A teacher’s observation that a hesitant student joined a workshop, for example, is not a standardized measure of confidence, but it is direct evidence of behavior in that setting. Conversely, a broad comment that a show “built empathy” is an interpretation rather than an independent measurement of empathy. The report gives the greatest weight to examples tied to observable actions, student statements, or sustained classroom discussion.

4.5 Interpretation framework

Four principles guide the interpretation of findings.

First, the evidence is strongest when multiple sources converge. The access conclusion, for example, is supported by the program’s fully subsidized design, teacher descriptions of students’ limited prior exposure, and the steep decline in intended future participation when costs are introduced.

Second, educator perceptions and student measures answer different questions. Teachers can observe curricular connections, public behavior, classroom conversation, and changes in participation that students may not self-report. Students provide direct information about their own enjoyment, learning perceptions, attitudes, and responses to survey items. Neither source replaces the other.

Third, statistical results require context. A change may reach statistical significance but remain small, may arise among many tests, or may be difficult to interpret because the baseline score was already high. A nonsignificant result may reflect stability, limited statistical power, measurement mismatch, or heterogeneous student responses. The report presents all findings but gives greater narrative emphasis to clear descriptive patterns, statistically significant results, and well-supported qualitative themes.

Fourth, causal language is avoided. Without a comparison group, the evaluation cannot determine what would have happened to the same students over the same period without the One&Five experience. Statements such as “teachers observed,” “students reported,” “scores increased,” and “the evidence suggests” are used instead of claims that the program caused a change.

5. Educator Respondent Profile and Starting Perspectives

The educator sample was composed primarily of classroom teachers rather than theatre specialists. Fifty-seven percent taught first grade, 40% taught fifth grade, and 3% taught another grade. Seventeen percent reported direct involvement with theatre, 82% reported no direct involvement, and 1% were unsure. Sixteen percent reported attending no theatre productions in a typical year, 32% attended one, and 53% attended two or more. These data indicate that the group included educators with varied exposure to theatre and that most did not participate directly in theatre as artists or practitioners.

The sample was 80% female and 20% male. Reported racial identities included White (69%), two or more races (11%), Asian (9%), Black or African American (4%), and American Indian or Alaska Native (2%). Age was distributed across adulthood: 16% were ages 18-29, 15% were 30-39, 30% were 40-49, 33% were 50-59, and 6% were 60 or older. Fifty-three percent were current or former parents of an elementary student. Among those parents, 51% said their children were involved with theatre, 42% said they were not, and 7% were unsure. Percentages in some categories do not total exactly 100 because of rounding.

Although most educators were not directly involved in theatre and nearly half attended one or no productions annually, their baseline attitudes toward theatre were strongly positive. On the seven-point scale, mean ratings ranged from 6.37 to 6.67 across six statements:

- I like watching plays: 6.45
- Plays are important for learning about the world: 6.57
- Theatre is for people like me: 6.37
- Theatre is for people like my students: 6.37

- Theatre productions can influence audience members' perspectives: 6.57
- I am interested in seeing plays in the future: 6.67

This profile should be interpreted carefully. The respondents were not predominantly theatre professionals or unusually frequent attendees, but neither were they neutral about theatre. They entered the program with a strong belief in theatre's relevance and educational potential. This positive orientation may have influenced satisfaction ratings and willingness to participate in the evaluation. At the same time, it is meaningful that educators who were not generally theatre practitioners viewed theatre as appropriate for themselves and their students.

For leadership, the starting perspectives help frame the educator findings. The high ratings do not represent a conversion from negative attitudes toward theatre. Instead, they show that One&Five largely met the expectations of educators who already believed theatre could be valuable but who varied in their own attendance and involvement. The cost findings also show that positive beliefs alone are not sufficient to ensure future participation. Even among this theatre-positive group, willingness to return fell sharply when transportation or ticket costs were introduced.

6. Educator Assessment of Performances and Student Learning

6.1 Enjoyment of the productions

Educators responded positively to the statement, "I liked watching the One&Five play I saw." Across all productions, 49.4% selected "very true," 39.8% selected "true," and 4.8% selected "slightly true." Another 4.8% selected neutral, 1.2% selected slightly untrue, and no respondents selected untrue or very untrue. Thus, 89.2% selected one of the two strongest positive options, and 94.0% selected a positive option at any level.

Positive ratings were observed across the nine productions, although the distribution varied. All respondents for *Chicka Chicka Boom Boom* selected "very true," but that result represents only three educators. *Young Dragon* had one of the strongest distributions among the larger production samples, with 77.8% selecting "very true" and 22.2% selecting "true." *The Pa'akai We Bring* generated more neutral responses than most productions but still had 81.9% selecting "true" or "very true." These differences are descriptive and should not be used to rank productions because the samples were small and the classroom contexts differed.

Teacher comments provide a richer account of what the ratings represented. Production quality and theatrical craft were the most frequently identified valuable elements ($n = 23$). Teachers praised performers, characters, storytelling, music, sets, scenery, props, and creative staging. They were particularly impressed when a small ensemble or limited set of objects created a complete theatrical world. One teacher wrote that "4 performers making the stage come to life was very impressive to students." Another valued "the displays, the different stories being mashed together, and the live action."

Student engagement was nearly as prominent ($n = 21$). Teachers described students as captivated, excited, entertained, and emotionally involved. Humor, recognizable characters, music, movement, and interactive moments were repeatedly mentioned as reasons students sustained attention. In one memorable example, a teacher reported that students were still singing music from the play a week later. Such observations show that the performances remained present in students' daily lives beyond the immediate field trip, even though the evaluation did not measure long-term retention systematically.

Developmental appropriateness was another recurring strength ($n = 10$). Educators valued shows that were relatable, humorous, familiar, and well matched to students' age. Familiar books or characters provided an entry point for younger students, while theatrical adaptation made the material new. One teacher described a show as valuable because of "how very relatable and grade appropriate it was." Another explained that first graders especially appreciated "the scenery and when anything is silly."

The combined evidence indicates that high satisfaction was not simply a general endorsement of arts education. Teachers identified concrete artistic features that supported enjoyment and attention. For funders, this matters because access to a weak or poorly matched experience would not fulfill the program's

educational purpose. One&Five's access strategy was paired, in most teachers' accounts, with professional artistic quality and age-responsive storytelling.

6.2 Satisfaction with the performance experience

When asked how satisfied they were with the performance attended with students, 80.5% selected "very satisfied," 18.3% selected "satisfied," 1.2% selected "dissatisfied," and none selected "very dissatisfied." The combined satisfaction rate was therefore 98.8%.

Performance satisfaction was high across productions. All respondents for *Chicka Chicka Boom Boom* were very satisfied. Very satisfied responses were also especially common for *Ada Twist, Scientist and Friends* (94.4%), *The Hula-Hoopin' Queen* (85.7%), *Fancy Dancer* (83.3%), *Robin Hood* (81.8%), and *Billy Goats Gruff and Other Tales* (81.8%). The only dissatisfied performance rating appeared in the *Pa'akai We Bring* sample, where one of 12 educators selected dissatisfied. Because of small samples, these percentages should be viewed as descriptions of respondent experience rather than comparative quality scores.

The qualitative improvement comments reinforce the overall satisfaction finding. Fifteen of the 59 responses explicitly stated that all aspects were valuable, the experience was excellent, or no least-valuable component came to mind. Eight additional responses were "N/A," "not sure," or too limited to identify a concern. Critical feedback therefore represented targeted suggestions within a broadly positive experience rather than widespread dissatisfaction.

6.3 Perceived student learning

Educators also responded positively to the statement, "I believe my students learned something by seeing the One&Five play they saw." Overall, 46.3% selected "very true," 39.0% selected "true," and 11.0% selected "slightly true." Only 2.4% were neutral and 1.2% selected slightly untrue; no one selected untrue or very untrue. The combined proportion choosing "true" or "very true" was 85.3%, and the proportion choosing any positive response was 96.3%.

The production distributions varied more for perceived learning than for satisfaction. For *Young Dragon* and *Chicka Chicka Boom Boom*, 66.7% selected "very true" and 33.3% selected "true." For *The Pa'akai We Bring*, 60.0% selected "very true," 20.0% selected "true," 10.0% were neutral, and 10.0% selected slightly untrue. For *Billy Goats Gruff and Other Tales*, 18.2% selected "very true," 54.5% selected "true," and 27.3% selected "slightly true." These patterns suggest that teachers could be highly satisfied with a production while differing in how strongly they identified explicit learning.

Teacher explanations show that "learning" was not limited to factual recall. Sixteen teachers connected the program to academic or curricular learning, especially literacy. They described students comparing books with stage adaptations, examining characters and details, learning vocabulary, practicing sustained attention to narrative, and seeing written stories embodied through performance. One teacher wrote, "Seeing a book come to life helped reinforce literacy comprehension skills." Another said that comparing the book and play helped students think more deeply about story details and characters.

Teachers also described connections to science, engineering, history, cultural heritage, and planned classroom units. Productions introduced topics such as invention, perseverance, Bruce Lee's life, Asian American history, Seattle's International District, Native Hawaiian culture and rights, community, race relations, and socioeconomic struggle. In these accounts, theatre did not compete with academic instruction. It offered another mode of encountering and remembering academic content.

Eleven teachers specifically highlighted cultural, historical, or perspective-taking learning. Students learned through words, song, dance, character, and story. Six teachers emphasized representation and inclusion. One stated, "My students could see themselves in the diverse cast." Other teachers noted that students saw actors and dancers as people they might become, expanding their sense of participation and possibility.

The educator findings therefore support a broad interpretation of student learning: knowledge and curriculum, cultural and historical understanding, theatre literacy, social reflection, and creative participation. Direct student measures provide a more constrained test of selected outcomes and are

examined later. The two sources should not be collapsed. Teacher perceptions show how educators recognized and used learning; student pre/post data show whether average scores changed on the specific scales administered.

6.4 Willingness to recommend

Educators were highly willing to recommend the SCT program to colleagues. Overall, 86.6% selected “very likely” and 11.0% selected “likely,” producing a combined recommendation rate of 97.6%. One educator selected unlikely and one selected very unlikely.

The recommendation rate is a strong indicator of perceived program quality because teachers were evaluating whether they would place their professional credibility behind the experience. It also suggests that the program has substantial potential for peer-to-peer advocacy within schools. However, recommendation should not be interpreted as equivalent to future participation. The cost scenarios demonstrate that educators may strongly recommend a program while still being unable to attend when financial supports are removed.

7. Access as a Foundational Program Outcome

7.1 Exposure to live theatre

Access and exposure to live theatre were among the clearest qualitative outcomes ($n = 18$). Teachers did not describe the field trip as merely a less expensive version of an experience students were already receiving. They described it as an introduction to an art form that was unfamiliar or unavailable to many students. At least 10 explicitly stated that some or most of their students had never attended a live production or had few opportunities to attend outside school.

One teacher valued “exposure to theater and having the experience of seeing a professional performance,” explaining that students “don’t all get that opportunity outside of school.” Another wrote, “Just the experience of watching a play—many students had never even heard of this art medium.” Teachers also described students who initially believed they were going to watch a movie, then learned how live performance, audiences, and interaction with performers function.

These comments support a central equity claim: One&Five does not simply reduce the cost of participation for students who would otherwise attend. It appears to extend professional theatre access to students for whom attendance could not be assumed. The evaluation did not collect household income or compare participants with all eligible Seattle Public Schools students, so it cannot quantify the exact proportion who would otherwise have been excluded. It can, however, document teachers’ repeated reports of first and rare experiences.

The shared nature of the field trip also mattered. Students attended with classmates and other schools, practiced focusing on a story that was not presented on a screen, and learned how to participate in a public cultural setting. Teachers described audience behavior and community membership as educational outcomes in their own right. Access therefore included entry into a cultural institution and participation in the social practices surrounding live performance.

7.2 The independent contribution of transportation

The cost-scenario data provide some of the evaluation’s strongest evidence for program design. Educators were asked how likely they would be to bring students to a future SCT production under four conditions.

Table 2. Likelihood of future production attendance under cost scenarios

Scenario	Very unlikely	Unlikely	Likely	Very likely	Likely or very likely
Production free; transportation provided	7.7%	0.0%	9.0%	83.3%	92.3%
Production free; transportation not provided	18.9%	14.9%	25.7%	40.5%	66.2%

Scenario	Very unlikely	Unlikely	Likely	Very likely	Likely or very likely
Tickets \$6-\$16; transportation provided	27.4%	15.1%	30.1%	27.4%	57.5%
Tickets \$6-\$16; transportation not provided	40.3%	19.4%	25.0%	15.3%	40.3%

When the production and transportation were both free, more than nine in ten educators anticipated future participation. Removing transportation support while keeping tickets free reduced that proportion by 26.1 percentage points. Providing transportation while charging a modest ticket price produced a somewhat lower likelihood of participation, 57.5%. Introducing both costs reduced the likely/very likely group to 40.3%, fewer than half of educators.

These are hypothetical intentions rather than observed bookings. Actual future participation will also depend on production fit, schedules, administrative approval, staffing, and other school conditions. Nevertheless, the pattern is internally consistent and large enough to carry practical significance. Both tickets and transportation matter. Covering one cost while leaving the other to schools would substantially weaken the program's reach.

The findings also suggest that transportation may function as an especially visible constraint for free field trips. Even when admission remained free, one-third of educators were unlikely or very unlikely to return without transportation support. This is consistent with the teacher who specifically described bus funding as essential to the school's participation. It also reflects a broader reality of school arts access: an opportunity located off campus requires a viable means of reaching it.

For leadership and funders, Table 2 can be interpreted as a program sustainability result. Continued investment in transportation is likely to preserve a much larger pool of participating classrooms than ticket subsidy alone. Funding requests should therefore present transportation as an educational access cost, not merely an administrative expense.

7.3 Workshop affordability

Educators were also asked how likely they would be to book a future Dramatic Connections workshop under two price conditions. When the workshop was free, 76.5% were very likely and 14.7% were likely to book, for a combined 91.2%. When the workshop was priced at \$230-\$270, only 3.1% were very likely and 16.9% were likely, for a combined 20.0%. Nearly half were very unlikely and 30.8% were unlikely under the priced scenario.

Table 3. Likelihood of booking a future Dramatic Connections workshop

Scenario	Very unlikely	Unlikely	Likely	Very likely	Likely or very likely
Free of charge	4.4%	4.4%	14.7%	76.5%	91.2%
Priced at \$230-\$270	49.2%	30.8%	16.9%	3.1%	20.0%

The 71.2-point difference indicates that workshop participation is highly price sensitive. As with the production scenarios, stated likelihood is not the same as actual demand. Teachers may also have interpreted the fee as a classroom, school, or program cost in different ways. Even with those limitations, the result strongly suggests that charging market-level workshop fees would transform the workshop from a broadly accessible component into an option available to a small minority of interested teachers.

The access results reveal an important feature of One&Five: the program reduces multiple costs simultaneously. This comprehensive approach is likely a primary reason educators can treat the experience as an educational choice rather than a budget tradeoff. It also creates a funding challenge because tickets, transportation, and teaching-artist time all require sustained resources. The evidence supports making that full cost visible in fundraising rather than representing the program primarily as a ticket giveaway.

8. Dramatic Connections Workshops

8.1 Satisfaction and role within the program

Not every teacher opted into a Dramatic Connections workshop, but all classes that requested one received it without charge. Among teachers who rated the workshop, 67.3% were very satisfied, 28.6% were satisfied, 4.1% were dissatisfied, and none were very dissatisfied. The combined satisfaction rate was 95.9%.

Workshop satisfaction was high across most production groups, but production-level percentages were based on differing and sometimes very small numbers of workshop participants. All responding workshop teachers associated with *Chicka Chicka Boom Boom*, *Fancy Dancer*, and *The Pigeon Gets a Big Time Holiday Extravaganza!* were very satisfied. For *The Pa'akai We Bring*, 40% were very satisfied, 40% satisfied, and 20% dissatisfied. For *Billy Goats Gruff and Other Tales*, 44.4% were very satisfied and 55.6% satisfied. These patterns should be used to identify questions for program reflection rather than to rank workshops.

The qualitative responses help define the workshops' intended contribution. Thirteen teachers identified active participation as a central program strength. They valued opportunities for students to move, act, dance, collaborate, use their imaginations, and explore how theatre is made. One teacher summarized the value as "hands on—moving around the room" and "showing different ways they can get into acting." Another described how a workshop helped students who were initially uninterested in dance connect with the production and recognize multiple ways of dancing.

Teachers also saw workshops as a setting in which students could display different strengths. Conventional classroom activities often privilege verbal or written responses; theatre activities invite physical, relational, spatial, and imaginative forms of participation. Several teachers observed hesitant students joining over time, students taking leadership, or students working successfully with peers outside their usual groups. These examples suggest that the workshop can broaden the ways students are seen by teachers and classmates.

The workshop's educational value was strongest when teachers perceived a clear connection to the performance. Production-specific movement, role-play, or creative exercises allowed students to revisit themes through action rather than simply discuss them. This is consistent with the program logic: performance creates a shared reference point, and workshop participation offers an embodied way to process it.

8.2 Confidence, collaboration, and risk-taking

Teachers described workshop impacts related to confidence, participation, and leadership ($n = 8$). One estimated that approximately one-third of the class initially held back but that every student was involved by the end of the workshop. Another observed a student assume a leadership role not previously seen in class. Students took risks by speaking, moving, asking questions, and trying unfamiliar activities while classmates watched and responded.

The workshops also created social-learning opportunities. Teachers described students listening to partners, respecting different comfort levels, working with classmates they would not normally choose, and considering others' physical space and safety. One teacher explained that students had opportunities to use their voices and listen to others, find their own way to participate, and allow peers to participate in ways that felt comfortable. Such observations show how workshop structure can support social and emotional skills through practice rather than through abstract discussion alone.

These are immediate, context-specific observations. The evaluation did not determine whether workshop confidence transferred to later classroom behavior or persisted over time. The evidence nevertheless supports the workshop as a setting that can make participation, cooperation, and creative risk-taking visible.

8.3 Opportunities for refinement

Six teachers identified concerns about workshop structure or facilitation. The most common issues were length, repetition, and waiting while other students took turns. These concerns were particularly relevant for

first graders and large classes. One teacher recommended “a shorter experience for little kids and more whole group,” with “more movement, less listening or waiting.”

Some teachers reported that students became silly, lost focus, or made unsafe choices during an activity. These responses did not necessarily indicate that active theatre work was inappropriate; rather, they suggested that a particular structure may not have matched the group’s age, size, or behavioral needs. Whole-group activities, faster transitions, clearer boundaries, and fewer periods of passive observation may improve participation.

Facilitation quality also mattered. One teacher felt that a single facilitator was insufficient and that activities were not clearly explained or modeled for first-grade students. Another praised the workshop and instructors but did not perceive a clear connection between the activities and empathy, if empathy was the intended learning goal. These comments support two refinements: match staffing to group size and needs, and state the purpose of each activity in language that teachers and students can recognize.

Workshop sequencing should also be considered as part of the total field-trip experience. SCT should continue allowing scheduling flexibility while offering guidance on when a class is most likely to benefit from the workshop.

The workshop findings support continued funding and refinement. Teachers should retain the ability to opt in, since classroom schedules and needs differ. The central goal should be to ensure that any class choosing a workshop receives a developmentally responsive, active, clearly connected experience.

9. Direct Student Findings: *Young Dragon*

9.1 Respondent profile

The *Young Dragon* matched sample included 65 students. Ages were 10 (41.5%) and 11 (58.5%). Sixty percent identified as female, 36.9% as male, and 3.1% as non-binary. Reported racial identities included White (40.3%), Asian (33.9%), two or more races (16.1%), Black or African American (4.8%), and Hispanic or Latino/a (3.2%). Totals may vary slightly because of rounding or missing responses.

Prior theatre exposure was not uniform. Three percent reported seeing no plays previously, 35.4% had seen one or two, and 61.5% had seen three or more. Nearly half (47.7%) reported having been in a play as an actor or backstage participant, 44.6% said no, and 7.7% were unsure. About one-third (32.8%) had taken a theatre or drama class, 62.5% had not, and 4.7% were unsure. The sample therefore included both experienced and less experienced students.

9.2 Immediate enjoyment and perceived learning

Student responses to *Young Dragon* were generally positive. The mean rating for “I liked watching the play *Young Dragon*” was 4.05, with a median and mode of 4. Strongly agree was selected by 35.4%, agree by 43.1%, neutral or not sure by 13.8%, disagree by 6.2%, and strongly disagree by 1.5%. The combined agree/strongly agree proportion was 78.5%.

The mean rating for “I learned something new by seeing *Young Dragon*” was 3.78, with a median and mode of 4. Strongly agree was selected by 21.5%, agree by 41.5%, neutral or not sure by 32.3%, disagree by 3.1%, and strongly disagree by 1.5%. The combined positive proportion was 63.0%.

The difference between enjoyment and learning is informative. Most students liked the production, while a smaller majority explicitly recognized new learning. Nearly one-third were neutral or unsure about learning. Some students may have learned information or developed questions without labeling the experience as “learning something new.” Others may already have known aspects of Bruce Lee’s story or the production’s themes. The survey item was broad and did not identify what kind of learning students should consider.

Teacher comments provide more specific examples. Educators reported discussions of Bruce Lee’s life, discrimination, mixed heritage, Asian American history, Seattle’s International District, bravery, belonging, and perseverance. One class connected the production to an upcoming unit and a visit to the Wing Luke

Museum. Another teacher described students' strong connection to a character who did not feel fully accepted in either of two worlds, noting that many students in the class were themselves of mixed ethnicities. These examples suggest forms of learning that may be meaningful even when a student does not select a strong agreement response to a general learning item.

9.3 Perspectives on theatre

Four general theatre attitudes were compared before and after the experience.

Table 4. Young Dragon pre/post theatre perspectives

Measure	Pre	Post	p	Interpretation
Overall, I like watching plays	3.98	3.94	.594	No significant change
Plays are important for learning about the world	3.52	3.59	.488	No significant change
I want to see more plays in the future	4.23	4.12	.342	No significant change
Plays are for people like me	3.08	3.38	.015	Significant increase; $d = .31$

Three attitudes remained statistically stable. Students already reported relatively high enjoyment of plays and interest in future attendance before the production, leaving limited room for upward movement. The statement that plays are important for learning about the world increased slightly but not significantly. Interest in future play attendance declined slightly but not significantly.

The significant increase in “plays are for people like me” is the clearest positive student outcome in the evaluation. The mean rose by 0.30 on a five-point scale, with a reported Cohen’s d of .31. Under conventional benchmarks, this is a small effect. Its practical meaning may nevertheless be important because belonging and identification can be distinct from simple enjoyment. A student can enjoy a play while still viewing theatre as an activity intended for other kinds of people. The increase suggests that, over the measured period, students were more likely to locate themselves within the imagined audience or community of theatre.

Several aspects of *Young Dragon* may be relevant to this result, but the evaluation cannot determine the mechanism. The production presented a culturally and locally connected story, and teachers emphasized representation, identity, mixed heritage, and students seeing artists and characters with whom they could identify. The professional field trip and possible workshop participation may also have made theatre feel more familiar. It is plausible that there is a relationship between (A) the relatively diverse composition of the body of students who completed surveys about this show (~60% students of color), (B) a production storyline that explored and celebrated characters of color, and (C) this finding. While further research would be required to definitely assess this possibility, it may be that introducing students to plays featuring characters similar to themselves is related to increasing students’ perception that theatre is “for them.”

9.4 Standardized measures

Table 5. Young Dragon standardized pre/post measures

Measure	Pre	Post	p	Interpretation
Affective empathy	3.72	3.69	.640	No significant change
Cognitive empathy	3.48	3.42	.330	No significant change
Tolerance	4.03	3.98	.320	No significant change
Future orientation	4.16	4.04	.016	Significant decrease; reported $d = .307$

Affective empathy, cognitive empathy, and tolerance did not change significantly. This does not contradict teachers’ reports of empathy-related discussion or behavior. The measures assessed broad dispositions, while teacher examples often concerned immediate responses to particular characters, partners, and situations. A single production may provide opportunities to practice perspective-taking without shifting a generalized self-report scale over a short period.

Future orientation decreased significantly by 0.12 points, with small impact factor ($d = .307$). The result should be acknowledged rather than minimized, but should not be attributed to the production.

Several considerations may be relevant. The baseline mean of 4.16 was high, creating limited upward range and the possibility of regression toward a more typical response. The measure was developed in broader research on adolescents and school climate, and its sensitivity to a single arts experience among 10- and 11-year-olds may be limited. Students completed the surveys amid other school and personal experiences that could influence future-oriented thinking. Multiple outcomes were tested, which increases the chance that at least one will meet a .05 significance threshold by chance. Finally, seeing a story that presents obstacles and identity conflict could temporarily influence reflection about the future, although the evaluation provides no evidence that this occurred. These are possible considerations, not explanations established by the data.

9.5 Production-specific concepts

Four *Young Dragon* concept items were assessed. None changed significantly:

- “Most people are the way that they are and will never change much”: 2.51 to 2.46, $p = .635$.
- “When I do an activity, it is important that I be the best at it”: 2.86 to 3.03, $p = .347$.
- “Some activities are only for certain types of people, and others should not be allowed to participate”: 1.75 to 1.78, $p = .766$.
- “If I am not doing something perfectly, then I am not doing it well enough”: 2.52 to 2.70, $p = .247$.

The stability of these measures suggests that the experience did not produce detectable average change on the selected beliefs during the observation period. The items may also have been relatively indirect representations of the production’s themes. Future evaluations could supplement broad attitudinal items with brief knowledge questions or scenario-based items more closely tied to the production and workshop activities.

9.6 Overall interpretation of Young Dragon

The *Young Dragon* evidence supports three measured conclusions. First, most students enjoyed the production. Second, a majority reported learning something new, and teachers identified specific cultural, historical, identity, and curricular learning. Third, students’ sense that theatre was “for people like me” increased modestly and significantly.

The evidence does not show broad short-term growth in empathy, tolerance, future interest in theatre, or the production-specific beliefs assessed. One significant change, future orientation, moved in an unfavorable direction and should be considered exploratory in the context of multiple outcomes and a nonexperimental design. The most defensible impact narrative is therefore focused on engagement, reported learning, theatre belonging, and teacher-observed discussion, rather than broad transformation of psychological traits.

10. Direct Student Findings: Robin Hood

10.1 Respondent profile

The *Robin Hood* matched sample included 78 students. Most were 11 years old (74.4%), with 24.4% age 10 and 1.3% age 12. The sample was 53.2% male and 46.8% female. Reported racial identities included White (52.2%), Asian (19.4%), Black or African American (14.9%), two or more races (10.4%), and Hispanic or Latino/a (3.0%).

In terms of prior exposure to theatre, 2.8% had seen no plays, 23.9% one or two, and 73.2% three or more; 61.8% had participated in a play, 26.3% had not, and 11.8% were unsure; 32.8% had taken a theatre or drama class, 62.5% had not, and 4.7% were unsure. 37.2% reported having taken a theatre or drama class, 53.8% had not, and 9% were not sure.

10.2 Immediate enjoyment and perceived learning

The mean rating for “I liked watching the play *Robin Hood*” was 3.62, with a median and mode of 4. Strongly agree was selected by 19%, agree by 41%, neutral or not sure by 27%, disagree by 8%, and strongly disagree by 5%. The combined positive proportion was 60%.

The mean rating for “I learned something new by seeing *Robin Hood*” was 2.88, with a median and mode of 3. Strongly agree was selected by 9%, agree by 17%, neutral or not sure by 42%, disagree by 18%, and strongly disagree by 14%. The combined positive proportion was 26%, while 32% selected a negative response.

These findings indicate a more mixed student response than for *Young Dragon*. A majority enjoyed *Robin Hood*, but a number of students were neutral or negative about learning something new. This does not mean the production lacked value; enjoyment, exposure, and participation may still be meaningful, and teachers may have observed learning that students did not label as new. The result nevertheless warrants attention because it is direct student feedback.

Several possible interpretations can inform program reflection without being treated as conclusions. The story or themes may have been familiar to some students, reducing perceptions of novelty. The general learning item may not have prompted students to consider perspective-taking or interpretive learning. Developmental fit, pacing, and classroom preparation may also have varied. Production-specific qualitative comments should be reviewed alongside these survey results when planning future adaptations or learning materials.

10.3 Perspectives on theatre

Table 6. *Robin Hood* pre/post theatre perspectives

Measure	Pre	Post	p	Interpretation
Overall, I like watching plays	3.65	3.62	.667	No significant change
Plays are important for learning about the world	3.19	3.35	.109	No significant change
I want to see more plays in the future	3.72	3.72	1.000	No change
Plays are for people like me	3.05	3.17	.307	No significant change

None of the general theatre attitudes changed significantly. The mean for plays as important for learning about the world increased by 0.16, and the mean for plays being for people like the respondent increased by 0.12, but neither reached statistical significance. Enjoyment of plays remained stable, as did interest in future attendance.

These stable attitudes should be interpreted in relation to the immediate reactions. Students’ average enjoyment of *Robin Hood* was lower than their general liking for plays, but their overall theatre attitudes did not decline significantly. The production therefore appears not to have altered students’ broader relationship with theatre over the short study period.

10.4 Standardized measures

Table 7. *Robin Hood* standardized pre/post measures

Measure	Pre	Post	p	Interpretation
Affective empathy	3.73	3.66	.197	No significant change
Cognitive empathy	3.25	3.19	.335	No significant change
Tolerance	4.03	3.99	.358	No significant change
Future orientation	4.22	4.22	.875	No significant change

No significant changes were observed. As with *Young Dragon*, these are broad measures that may be unlikely to shift after a single production. The high baseline levels for tolerance and future orientation also limited room for upward movement.

Teacher-observed impacts across the full program included empathy, cooperation, and perspective-taking, but those findings should not be used to claim that *Robin Hood* changed the standardized scales. The appropriate conclusion is that the student survey detected no reliable average change on these broad constructs during the measured period.

10.5 Production-specific concepts

Table 8. *Robin Hood* production-specific pre/post measures

Measure	Pre	Post	p	Interpretation
Community offers strength, belonging, and power to stand together for what is right	4.29	4.15	.304	No significant change
Even when it is difficult or frightening, I should use my voice to stand up against injustice	4.29	4.00	<.01	Significant decrease
I should challenge systems that prey on vulnerable people	4.06	3.85	.182	No significant change
Everyone has the power to be a hero	4.50	4.17	.076	No significant change

All four items had high baseline means. Three declined descriptively but did not reach statistical significance. Agreement with using one's voice against injustice declined significantly by 0.29. The effect size was small ($d = .304$)

The direction of the finding is unexpected given the intended theme. It should be interpreted cautiously. High starting scores can create ceiling effects and can make small downward movements more likely than upward ones. A complex narrative may also lead students to reconsider an initially simple moral statement, distinguishing between the principle of speaking up and the risks or consequences involved. Alternatively, the difference may reflect unrelated experiences, changes in survey attention, or chance among multiple statistical tests. The data do not identify which, if any, of these possibilities applies.

The absence of a comparison group means the change it cannot be causally attributed to *Robin Hood*. Replication with a more focused item set and qualitative follow-up would be necessary before drawing a program conclusion.

10.6 Overall interpretation of *Robin Hood*

The *Robin Hood* student evidence is mixed. Most students reported liking the production, but immediate learning ratings were modest. No significant changes occurred in general theatre attitudes or standardized measures. One production-specific attitude declined significantly, while the other three were statistically stable.

For program improvement, the immediate learning result may be the most actionable finding. SCT could examine whether teacher preparation, post-show reflection, or workshop activities made the production's learning goals explicit and developmentally meaningful. Future evaluation might ask more specific questions about what students understood, remembered, questioned, or connected to their own lives rather than relying primarily on broad attitudinal statements.

11. Integrated Qualitative Findings About Student Learning

The qualitative analysis expands the definition of learning beyond the outcomes directly measured in the two student studies. Across nine productions and two grade levels, teachers identified a set of interconnected processes: students were engaged by high-quality artistic work; they connected stories to classroom content

and personal experience; they encountered cultures, histories, and perspectives; they practiced being audience and community members; and, when workshops were included, they participated physically and collaboratively.

11.1 Curricular and academic learning

Sixteen teachers explicitly connected One&Five to academic or curricular learning. Literacy was the most prominent connection. Students saw books become performances, compared written and staged versions, considered changes in plot or character, practiced vocabulary, and sustained attention to a story. The live format offered an alternative to both text and screen, requiring students to follow actors, dialogue, movement, design, and music in real time.

These experiences can support comprehension without resembling a conventional lesson. A set change can clarify setting; an actor's choices can reveal a character's motivation; music can reinforce a pattern or emotional turn; and an adaptation can prompt students to ask why a story was changed. Teachers used the performances as shared texts that could be discussed after returning to school.

Curricular connections extended beyond literacy. Teachers linked productions to science, engineering, invention, history, cultural heritage, race, community, and planned field trips. *Ada Twist, Scientist and Friends* and related stories created connections to scientific curiosity and design. *Young Dragon* provided historical and cultural context for Asian American experiences in Seattle and Bruce Lee's life. *The Pa'akai We Bring* prompted discussion of Native Hawaiian culture and rights. Teachers described the theatre experience as background knowledge for later units and as a vivid example that could be revisited.

Fourteen teachers described meaningful classroom reflection or curricular discussion after the experience. One class continued discussing the rights of Indigenous Hawaiians for days. Another used *Young Dragon* to discuss belonging in two worlds and the formation of individual identity. Productions became reference points for conversations about empathy, bravery, heroism, discrimination, perseverance, science, writing, and community.

This continuation is important. A field trip is brief, but a teacher can extend its educational life by returning to the characters and questions. One&Five's impact may therefore depend partly on the classroom context into which the experience is received. Teachers who have relevant units, preparation materials, or discussion time can use the performance as a shared learning resource. Future program materials should support this continuation without overburdening educators.

11.2 Cultural understanding, identity, and representation

Teachers described cultural, historical, or perspective-taking learning in 11 responses about program value and in nine impact responses. They valued opportunities for students to learn about Hawaiian culture, Native Hawaiian rights, Asian American history, immigration, mixed heritage, discrimination, and Seattle communities. Cultural learning was often embedded in theatrical form—through words, song, dance, movement, costume, and storytelling—rather than presented as a list of facts.

The familiar “mirrors and windows” metaphor describes two functions of culturally specific stories. For some students, the performance reflected identities, families, histories, or struggles they recognized. For others, it provided access to a perspective different from their own. A teacher wrote that students “were able to experience a little bit of someone else's culture and experiences.” Another described learning about cultural heritage through words, song, and dance as “incredibly powerful.”

Representation was identified by six teachers as a particular value. Diverse casts and stories allowed students to see people like themselves on stage and exposed them to artists and communities historically underrepresented in mainstream narratives. One teacher stated, “My students could see themselves in the diverse cast.” Another emphasized that seeing an underrepresented dancer's history was important for children.

Representation also affected students' sense of artistic possibility. Teachers described students recognizing actors, dancers, and theatre artists as people they might become. One response valued students “seeing

themselves and a person who can be an actor/member of a theater group.” This qualitative theme aligns with the *Young Dragon* increase in “plays are for people like me.” The data do not establish that representation caused the measured change, but the convergence is noteworthy: teachers described recognition and possibility, and student theatre belonging increased over the same study period.

Culturally specific stories also supported connection across difference. Teachers reported that students connected to themes of family, struggle, belonging, food insecurity, and community even when they did not share a character’s cultural identity. This suggests that specificity and universality need not be opposites. A story grounded in a particular community can invite both recognition and empathy when presented with artistic and educational care.

11.3 Empathy and perspective-taking

Empathy and perspective-taking were the most frequently identified teacher-observed impacts (n = 18). Teachers described students considering characters’ feelings, responding emotionally to moments of injury or exclusion, discussing discrimination, and thinking about experiences outside their own. Some students expressed concern during a hospital scene; another class reflected on how characters checked on and helped someone who fell.

Workshops offered opportunities to practice perspective-taking with classmates. Students listened to partners, adjusted to different comfort levels, respected space, and allowed peers to participate in different ways. These examples are narrower than a change in generalized empathy, but they are also more concrete. They show students enacting attentive and supportive behavior in a specific setting.

The standardized empathy measures did not change significantly for either student production. The difference between the qualitative and quantitative findings should not be resolved by privileging one source and dismissing the other. They assessed different levels of outcome. Teacher examples documented immediate responses and behavior; the standardized scales assessed broad self-reported tendencies. One theatre experience may generate an empathic conversation or action without changing a student’s overall score.

This distinction has implications for program claims. SCT can reasonably state that teachers observed opportunities for empathy, perspective-taking, and supportive interaction, but evidence does not support the assertion that the program definitively led to broad increases in student empathy. Future research could bridge the evidence sources through production-specific scenarios, teacher ratings collected at standardized intervals, or observations of workshop participation.

11.4 Social behavior, teamwork, and community participation

Nine teachers described impacts on social behavior, self-regulation, teamwork, or peer relationships. Attending a live production required students to listen, wait, manage excitement, respond appropriately, and share a public space with other audiences. For students with limited prior exposure, learning to be part of an audience was itself a meaningful form of cultural and social participation.

Teachers valued “the need to follow and focus on a story (not a screen)” and the opportunity to practice being “good audience members and community members.” These comments connect access to cultural fluency. Students were not only admitted to the theatre; they learned how the social environment works and saw themselves as participants within it.

Workshop activities created additional opportunities for cooperation. Teachers observed students working with unfamiliar partners, being mindful of others’ physical safety, responding kindly to unexpected ideas, and practicing patience. One teacher described students exchanging imaginary gifts in a “Magic Clay” activity and learning about one another through a group game. These are modest examples, but they illustrate the relational learning embedded in theatre processes.

The community dimension also appeared in the content of productions. Teachers identified messages about collective support, belonging, standing together, and the relationship between individual perseverance and

community encouragement. The program therefore provided social learning through both form and content: students participated in a community of audience members and encountered stories about community.

11.5 Confidence, creativity, perseverance, and self-belief

Ten teachers identified creativity, confidence, or students' identification with the arts as a valuable program feature. Eight described observed impacts related to confidence, risk-taking, leadership, or participation, and eight identified perseverance, bravery, growth mindset, or belief in oneself.

The strongest evidence involved visible behavior. Hesitant students joined activities. A student took on a leadership role. Students asked questions of performers, moved outside their comfort zones, and watched classmates take risks. Teachers saw students experiment with acting, dance, movement, invention, and storytelling. The workshop provided a relatively low-stakes setting in which trying mattered more than technical mastery.

Productions also offered narrative examples of persistence. Students discussed characters who continued after setbacks, pursued goals, or resisted limiting judgments. One concise student takeaway reported by a teacher was, "Rosie wanted to quit and kept trying!" Another teacher described a message about believing in oneself while having a supportive community. This combination of personal effort and relational support appeared repeatedly.

The evaluation does not establish lasting growth in confidence or perseverance. It does show that theatre created situations in which those qualities could be discussed and enacted. For program design, the implication is to preserve opportunities for students to participate rather than positioning them only as observers.

11.6 Engagement and appreciation of theatre

Nine teachers described visible engagement, enjoyment, or sustained interest, and six identified theatre literacy, arts appreciation, or career awareness. Students' faces were described as "alight with wonder and delight." Some continued talking about characters or performers later in the day. Others called out to characters because they were emotionally invested in the story.

Students learned that theatre is made by real people in real time. They encountered actors, sets, props, music, and staging as parts of an artistic process. Some discussed artistic careers and came to see "following the arts" as a viable and obtainable path. Exposure to professional artists thus expanded both knowledge of the art form and possible future identities.

This outcome is particularly relevant to One&Five's grade-based model. A first encounter in early elementary school can establish basic familiarity and comfort; a later encounter in fifth grade can deepen understanding and belonging. The current evaluation did not track individual students across those grade points, but the program structure creates that possibility.

11.7 Caution about duration and attribution

Twelve teachers stated that it was too soon or otherwise difficult to assess impact. Some had not yet completed a workshop or classroom debrief. Others emphasized that empathy and social-emotional development are shaped by many experiences and cannot be confidently attributed to one production. One teacher wrote that experiences may plant "seeds of empathy" even when benefits cannot yet be known. Another said students enjoyed the show and offered thoughtful ideas but that it was too soon to determine whether it produced real individual change.

This caution strengthens the credibility of the qualitative findings. Teachers were not uniformly making expansive claims. They distinguished immediate engagement and discussion from durable change. The report adopts the same distinction. One&Five clearly created opportunities for learning and participation; the persistence and broader developmental effect of those opportunities remain questions for future study.

12. Areas for Program Refinement

The teacher feedback was highly positive overall, but it also identified practical ways to strengthen the experience. Most concerns focused on developmental responsiveness and logistics rather than on the fundamental value of theatre access.

12.1 Length, pacing, and cumulative demands

The most consistent concern was the amount of time students were expected to sit, listen, or wait. Five teachers said a production or total experience was too long or would have benefited from an intermission. The concern was especially pronounced for younger students. One teacher described first graders “vibrating in their seats” because of the length.

Three teachers raised similar concerns about post-show question-and-answer sessions. The Q&A could be valuable, but it extended sitting time after the performance, and questions were sometimes difficult to hear. Teachers suggested taking fewer questions or finding a more active or efficient format.

The relevant unit of design is the full experience: travel, early arrival, waiting, seating, performance, Q&A, dismissal, and so forth. A 60- or 70-minute show may be appropriate in isolation but challenging after a long bus trip or extended wait. SCT may wish to review the cumulative timeline for first-grade and fifth-grade groups separately and identify where movement, shorter transitions, or clearer scheduling can reduce fatigue.

12.2 Developmental and grade-level fit

Four teachers reported that dialogue, vocabulary, themes, or story structure were too complex for some students. Challenges included lengthy dialogue, multiple stories combined into one production, difficult themes, and unclear conclusions. Conversely, three teachers felt a production was too simple or aimed at younger students.

The mixed direction of the feedback suggests that no single adjustment will solve developmental fit. The better response is clear guidance. Teachers need concise information about story complexity, dialogue density, potentially challenging themes, level of abstraction, audience participation, running time, and performance style. Such guidance can help teachers select productions that fit their students and prepare students for unfamiliar forms.

SCT already provides content and age guidance in its public materials. For One&Five, the guidance could be tailored more explicitly to first- and fifth-grade classrooms and include practical prompts: what students should know in advance, what may be confusing, and what questions can help them process the experience afterward.

12.3 Workshop design and facilitation

The workshop concerns described earlier point toward a consistent design principle: maximize active, simultaneous participation and minimize passive waiting. Short activities with clear instructions, demonstration, and rapid transitions are likely to work better for younger or larger groups than structures that require students to wait for individual turns.

SCT should also consider staffing ratios and classroom needs. A single Teaching Artist may be sufficient for some classes but not for groups requiring more behavioral, language, or accessibility support. A brief teacher intake question about class size, movement needs, sensory needs, and participation preferences could help staff adapt.

Learning goals should be made visible. When a workshop is intended to support empathy, collaboration, or understanding of a production theme, the activity and closing reflection should help participants recognize that connection. This does not require turning the workshop into a lecture. A simple prompt can connect embodied activity to the story and to classroom language.

12.4 Logistics, waiting, and scheduling

Five teachers mentioned late starts, early arrival, or extended waiting before a show or workshop. Waiting was especially difficult for first graders and could reduce later engagement. Two teachers noted disruptions to lunch schedules. These concerns may be relatively infrequent, but they affect the experience disproportionately when they occur.

SCT should continue strengthening arrival communication, realistic timing, and coordination across schools. A “Know Before You Go” format can include expected arrival windows, likely waiting time, lunch considerations, audience procedures, and contingency plans. Schools should also know how interactive moments will work so teachers can prepare students for appropriate participation.

12.5 Accessibility and participation

Two teachers stated that “just watching the show is not helpful for my students,” suggesting that some groups require more active or multisensory engagement. One reported that parts of a production were too loud, and another questioned the usefulness of written flyers for young children who could not read them.

These isolated comments should not be generalized, but they identify useful review questions. Are sensory conditions communicated in advance? Are printed materials age and language appropriate? Are there participation options for students who benefit from movement, visuals, or repeated explanation? Can teachers request accommodations easily? An accessibility review should consider the full field-trip pathway, including transportation, arrival, seating, sound, materials, workshop activities, and dismissal.

13. Study Limitations

This evaluation offers a substantial evidence base, but its conclusions should be understood within the design’s limitations.

No comparison group. Student pre/post scores were compared within the same students, but there was no comparable group that did not attend the production. Changes may reflect the program, ordinary development, classroom instruction, current events, family experiences, survey familiarity, or other factors. Causal attribution is therefore not possible.

Student surveys covered only two productions. Direct student evidence came from *Young Dragon* and *Robin Hood*, both serving upper-elementary students. The findings cannot be assumed to represent first-grade experiences or the other seven productions.

Uneven and small production-level educator samples. The educator sample totaled 84, but some production groups were very small. Percentages for *Chicka Chicka Boom Boom* represented three educators; a single response would change the result by 33 percentage points. Production comparisons should therefore be treated as descriptive.

Workshop participation was not linked to individual student records. The evaluation cannot determine which surveyed students received a workshop or whether workshop timing or participation was associated with outcomes. Student findings represent the broader program experience available to their classrooms, not a controlled test of the workshop.

Timing varied. The sequence and interval among pre-survey, production, workshop, classroom discussion, and post-survey varied, although typically all occurred within about one month. Differences in timing may influence what students remembered and how much classroom processing occurred before the post-survey.

Self-report and teacher-report measures. Students reported their own attitudes and learning perceptions. Teachers reported satisfaction and observed impact. Both sources are valuable but can be influenced by social desirability, expectations, recall, and interpretation.

Positive educator starting attitudes and possible response selection. Educators held strongly positive baseline views of theatre. Teachers who completed surveys may also have been more engaged with the

program than nonrespondents. The evaluation cannot determine whether respondents represent all participating educators.

High baseline scores and ceiling effects. Several student measures began above 4 on a five-point scale. High starting scores reduce the possibility of detecting improvement and make small declines more likely than comparable increases.

Measurement fit. Broad constructs such as empathy, tolerance, and future orientation may be relatively stable and may not be expected to shift after one production. Some measures were developed for different contexts or age ranges. Production-specific items may not have captured the most salient learning for each show.

Short-term follow-up. The evaluation primarily captured immediate or near-term responses. It did not assess whether engagement, knowledge, belonging, or behavior persisted over a semester or school year.

Qualitative prevalence. Theme counts show how often ideas appeared among substantive responses, not the proportion of all participating teachers or students who experienced an outcome. Responses were not mutually exclusive, and more detailed respondents had more opportunities to be coded into multiple categories.

These limitations do not negate the findings. They define the level at which claims are appropriate. The evaluation provides strong evidence about access, educator satisfaction, perceived value, cost sensitivity, and immediate experiences. It provides suggestive but more limited evidence about student attitudinal change and long-term impact.

14. Conclusions

One&Five was designed to remove financial and transportation barriers and support student learning through theatre. The combined evidence indicates that the program is succeeding most clearly in creating equitable access to a highly valued educational and cultural experience.

The access finding is unusually direct. During the assessment period, tickets and transportation were fully funded, and optional workshops were also free. Teachers described students who had never attended a live production or who were unfamiliar with theatre as an art form. When asked about future participation, educators' willingness was highest when both tickets and transportation remained free and fell substantially when either cost was introduced. Workshop participation was even more price sensitive. These results support the program's comprehensive subsidy model and show why transportation and teaching-artist funding must be included in the impact and funding narrative.

Educators assessed the program very positively. Nearly all were satisfied with performances and likely to recommend the experience. They believed students learned something, and they described the mechanisms in detail: high-quality production, engagement, familiar and developmentally appropriate material, curricular connections, cultural specificity, representation, music, movement, interaction, and participation. The theatre experience became a shared text and a shared community event that teachers could revisit in class.

The qualitative findings document immediate student responses across a wide range of domains. Teachers observed students discussing identity, culture, discrimination, community, science, literacy, empathy, perseverance, and artistic careers. They saw students collaborate, take creative risks, practice audience behavior, and participate in workshops. The strongest examples were tied to concrete behavior and continued discussion.

The direct student evidence requires a more differentiated conclusion. *Young Dragon* was well received, and students reported learning. The increase in "plays are for people like me" is a promising result that aligns with teacher observations about representation and belonging. Most broad measures did not change, and future orientation declined significantly. *Robin Hood* produced moderate enjoyment and lower learning ratings, with no significant general or standardized changes and one significant decline on a production-specific item.

These mixed findings do not invalidate the program, but they show that broad attitudinal transformation should not be the primary impact claim.

The most defensible conclusion is that One&Five creates access and educational opportunity. It removes barriers that would otherwise reduce participation, places students in contact with professional artists and stories, and creates immediate conditions for engagement, discussion, reflection, cultural learning, and creative participation. The program's long-term influence will depend on repeated exposure, classroom continuation, production and workshop fit, and the accumulation of experiences over time.

For leadership and funders, this is a compelling impact narrative precisely because it is grounded. The program is not valuable only when a broad psychological scale changes after one performance. It is valuable because students who may have had no access can enter a professional theatre, see their own and others' communities represented, learn how live performance works, connect stories to school and life, participate with peers, and carry a shared experience back to the classroom. Fully funding that opportunity is the essential first step.

15. Recommendations for Program

15.1 Preserve the fully subsidized access model

SCT should continue treating free tickets and full transportation funding as inseparable core components of One&Five. The cost scenarios show that ticket-only support would leave a substantial participation barrier. Funding proposals and budgets should present transportation as a direct program service required for equitable access.

15.2 Continue no-cost, optional Dramatic Connections workshops

Workshop satisfaction and cost sensitivity support continued free access. Teachers should retain the ability to opt in rather than being required to participate. Optional delivery respects classroom schedules, student needs, and teacher judgment while ensuring that cost does not determine access.

15.3 Strengthen grade-level and developmental guidance

For each production, SCT should provide a concise first-grade and fifth-grade profile addressing running time, dialogue density, story complexity, unfamiliar cultural or historical context, sensory features, audience interaction, and potential points of confusion. The goal is not to discourage attendance but to help teachers select and prepare effectively.

15.4 Review the full duration and pacing of the experience

SCT should map the typical field-trip journey from school departure through return. Particular attention should be given to waiting, seating, Q&A length, lunch disruption, and workshop sequencing. Shorter Q&As, movement opportunities, faster transitions, or differentiated schedules may improve the experience for younger students.

15.5 Design workshops for active, inclusive participation

Workshops should emphasize short, clearly modeled activities in which many students can participate simultaneously. Individual-turn structures should be limited when they create extended waiting. Teaching Artists should have adaptable versions for different ages, class sizes, behavioral needs, language needs, and mobility or sensory access requirements.

15.6 Clarify workshop learning goals and production connections

Each workshop should have a small number of explicit objectives connected to the production. Activities can remain playful and open-ended while concluding with a brief reflection that names the connection. Teachers should receive a one-paragraph explanation of what the workshop is designed to explore.

15.7 Provide concise preparation and follow-up resources

Teachers repeatedly described using productions in later classroom discussion. SCT should support this practice with materials that are short enough to use: a one-page pre-show orientation, a small set of post-show questions, key vocabulary or context, and one optional activity. Resources should distinguish first-grade and fifth-grade use.

15.8 Continue prioritizing representation and cultural specificity

Teachers valued diverse casts, culturally specific stories, local history, and opportunities for students to see themselves and learn about others. SCT should continue investing in productions and community partnerships that provide both mirrors and windows. Cultural guidance should be developed with relevant artists and communities rather than treating representation as a general theme detached from specificity.

15.9 Strengthen audience preparation and participation expectations

Teachers and students should know in advance whether a production includes call-and-response, singing, movement, or other interaction and what appropriate participation looks like. Clear preparation can reduce confusion and help multiple school groups share the audience space successfully.

15.10 Conduct an accessibility review of the entire program pathway

Review transportation procedures, arrival, waiting, seating, sound levels, written materials, sensory information, workshop movement, and communication channels. Teachers should have a simple way to communicate accommodation needs and receive confirmation before the field trip.

15.11 Build a structured educator feedback loop

After each production, SCT should review both ratings and open-ended comments with artistic, education, front-of-house, and operations staff. A short internal response memo can identify which issues are production-specific, which recur across seasons, and which actions will be tested. Closing the feedback loop will make evaluation part of program improvement rather than a periodic external exercise.

16. Recommendations for Future Evaluation

Future research should build on the strongest evidence in this report while addressing the limits of the current design. Priorities should include direct evidence from first-grade students, clearer information about the contributions of performances and workshops, and follow-up beyond the immediate experience. Because these additions require reliable access to students and classrooms, the research partnership and school-access plan should be established before the study design and program calendar are finalized.

16.1 Plan the SPS partnership and access process in advance

SCT and the evaluator should begin formal planning with Seattle Public Schools (SPS), particularly the Office of Research & Evaluation, well before productions or classrooms are recruited. Early consultation should confirm current SPS requirements for district review, school participation, family permission, student assent, data privacy, approved data collectors, and direct contact with students. Requirements should be confirmed for each study rather than inferred from the approval process used for this evaluation.

A shared planning calendar should identify review deadlines, instrument-development dates, school recruitment windows, family communication, data-collection dates, and make-up dates. SCT, SPS, and the evaluator should each designate a primary liaison so that teachers are not required to coordinate among multiple parties. The protocol should also clarify which methods require principal approval, teacher agreement, family permission, or additional safeguards, and whether school personnel must be present during student activities.

Once approved, research logistics should be incorporated into One&Five recruitment and scheduling. Teachers should receive a concise description of the activities, time commitment, dates, and responsibilities

before agreeing to research participation. SPS-approved family materials, teacher scripts, and student assent language should be prepared centrally.

16.2 Include first-grade students through verbal surveys

Future research would benefit from inclusion of first-grade students so that both groups served by One&Five are represented. Because many first graders are still developing reading fluency and familiarity with written rating scales, brief verbal surveys administered individually or in very small groups would be more developmentally appropriate than a conventional self-administered questionnaire. While the time required for such assessment will add to the cost of evaluation, the benefits from data collection of this nature potentially exceed that cost.

The instrument should use concrete language, few questions, and visual supports such as faces or symbols. Questions could address enjoyment, recall, perceived learning, understanding of live theatre, belonging, memorable moments, and the workshop experience. Open-ended prompts such as “Tell me something you remember,” “What did the play make you think about?” and “Was anything confusing?” may identify learning that broad agreement items miss. The instrument should be piloted with children of the same age to test comprehension and pacing.

This method requires direct student access and should therefore be explicitly included in the SPS submission. The protocol should specify who will conduct the survey, where and when it will occur, how long it will take, how responses will be recorded, and how identifying information will be minimized. Data collectors should be trained in child assent, neutral prompting, accessibility, and stopping whenever a student does not wish to continue. Reserving a short approved data-collection block for each classroom, with a make-up option, would reduce disruption and improve participation.

16.3 Add student focus groups and other qualitative methods

Small, grade-specific student focus groups could help explain mixed survey findings and provide richer evidence about representation, belonging, cultural learning, confusion, and the relationship between the production and workshop. First-grade groups should be short and may use pictures, drawing, character cards, or story-sequencing prompts. Fifth-grade groups can support more extended discussion of themes, production choices, identity, and connections to school or community.

Focus ^{groups} would require advance SPS approval of recruitment, permission and assent, moderator questions, group size, location, recording or note-taking, and confidentiality procedures. Sampling should include students with varied levels of engagement and prior theatre experience rather than only students expected to respond positively. Other approved methods could include brief classroom or workshop observations, student drawings or reflections, and short teacher logs completed after the performance, workshop, and later classroom follow-up. Each method should be tied to a specific research question so that added access demands remain proportionate. As with general inclusion of first-grade students, the benefits of collecting this richer data may exceed the fiscal cost of the additional evaluative labor required.

16.4 Use measures closely aligned with the experience

The broad empathy, tolerance, and future-orientation measures in this study were largely stable and may not be sensitive to a single theatre experience. Future instruments should emphasize outcomes that One&Five is positioned to influence directly: production-specific knowledge and interpretation, theatre literacy, cultural or historical understanding, perceived relevance, belonging, participation, and connections to classroom learning.

Production-specific items should be developed collaboratively by the evaluator, SCT artistic and education staff, educators, and relevant cultural partners when appropriate. Brief recall questions, scenarios, and open-ended prompts may capture learning more effectively than abstract agreement statements. Workshop questions should correspond to clearly stated workshop activities and objectives.

16.5 Track program components, timing, and implementation

Future datasets should document, using privacy-protective classroom or student codes, which participants received a workshop, whether it occurred before or after the production, when surveys were administered, and what preparation or follow-up the teacher used. This would allow the evaluation to distinguish performance-only experiences from performance-plus-workshop experiences and examine whether timing is associated with engagement, recall, or learning.

A short classroom implementation record could capture production, grade, class size, workshop participation and date, survey dates, use of SCT resources, and major schedule changes. Teaching Artists could complete a brief note on activities delivered, participation, and adaptations for age, access, or time. Better implementation data would make results more interpretable without requiring sensitive student records.

16.6 Add longer-term follow-up and examine repeated exposure

The current evaluation primarily measured immediate or near-term response. A future study should add a follow-up several weeks or months later to examine what students remember, whether the production remains part of classroom discussion, and whether teachers used the experience in later instruction. The follow-up can be brief and need not be administered to every participating classroom.

One&Five's first- and fifth-grade structure also creates an opportunity to examine cumulative exposure. With SPS approval and appropriate privacy safeguards, a cohort study could assess whether students who participate at both grade levels show greater theatre familiarity, comfort, belonging, or interest than students with one recorded experience. This question is better aligned with the program model than expecting broad, durable change after one production.

16.7 Strengthen sampling and comparison where feasible

Future student studies should include more productions, both grades, and more classrooms. Recruitment should be planned to include schools and students with varied prior theatre access, demographic characteristics, language backgrounds, and support needs.

When feasible and ethical, a comparison condition would strengthen interpretation. Options include staggered participation, comparable classrooms attending later in the season, or within-program comparisons of performance-only and performance-plus-workshop experiences. A comparison should not be created by withholding One&Five access from eligible students. Even without a formal comparison group, larger samples, consistent timing, and stronger implementation records would improve the evidence.

16.8 Plan for accessible and equitable research participation

The research process should continue reflect One&Five's equity goals. Participation should not depend on a student's reading level, disability status, home language, or ability to complete a standard written form. As with this study, instruments should be available in accessible formats and translated into the languages represented in participating classrooms. The study plan should identify how students who use communication supports, require sensory accommodations, or need additional processing time can participate meaningfully.

Access planning should occur with SPS and school staff before data collection, not be left to individual teachers on the day of the study. Teachers can describe classroom needs, but they should not be responsible for designing research accommodations or deciding which students are excluded. The evaluator should prepare approved alternatives, train data collectors to use them consistently, and document when an accommodation changes the mode of administration. Analyses should report major participation patterns and limitations so that findings do not inadvertently represent only the students for whom research procedures were easiest.

16.9 Use a tiered, sustainable evaluation model

SCT need not use every method with every classroom. A brief annual core evaluation can continue tracking access, satisfaction, cost sensitivity, workshop experience, and educator-observed learning. Each season could then include one deeper study with a smaller, pre-approved group of schools, such as first-grade verbal surveys, student focus groups, workshop contribution, representation and belonging, or longer-term retention.

A tiered model would protect school capacity while building stronger evidence over time. It would also allow SCT, SPS, and the evaluator to review findings annually and plan the next study before the following season. The central principle is to treat access to research participation with the same care One&Five gives to access to theatre: establish the partnership early, remove avoidable procedural burdens, use developmentally appropriate methods, and ensure that the time requested from schools is justified by the value of the evidence.

References

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Garton, A. F., & Gringart, E. (2005). The development of a scale to measure empathy in 8- and 9-year-old children. *Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology*, 5, 17-25.

<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworks/2829/>

Greene, J,. (2015). Methodological appendix for the live theatre experimental study. *Education Next*.

<https://www.educationnext.org/methodological-appendix-for-the-live-theater-experimental-study/>

Lindstrom Johnson, S., Pas, E., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2016). Understanding the association between school climate and future orientation. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 45(8), 1575-1586.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-015-0321-1>

Seattle Children's Theatre. (2024a, August 28). *Breaking barriers: Seattle Children's Theatre expands One&Five program to include free buses and workshops for Seattle Public School 1st and 5th grade classes* [Press release]. https://www.sct.org/app/uploads/2018/11/SCT_PRESS_1AND5_0827.pdf

Seattle Children's Theatre. (n.d.-a). *One&Five program*. Retrieved July 20, 2026, from

<https://www.sct.org/education-programs/oneandfive/>

Appendix A. Detailed Educator Findings

A1. Educator characteristics

Characteristic	Distribution
Grade taught	First grade 57%; fifth grade 40%; other 3%
Gender	Female 80%; male 20%
Race	American Indian/Alaska Native 2%; Asian 9%; Black/African American 4%; White 69%; two or more races 11%
Age	18-29 16%; 30-39 15%; 40-49 30%; 50-59 33%; 60+ 6%
Direct theatre involvement	Yes 17%; no 82%; unsure 1%
Annual theatre attendance	None 16%; one production 32%; two or more 53%
Current/former parent of elementary student	Yes 53%; no 47%
Child involved in theatre among parents	Yes 51%; no 42%; unsure 7%

A2. Educator starting perspectives

Statement	Mean (1-7)
I like watching plays	6.45
I think plays are important for learning about the world	6.57
Theatre is for people like me	6.37
Theatre is for people like my students	6.37
Theatre productions can influence audience members' perspectives	6.57
I am interested in going to see plays in the future	6.67

A3. Educator enjoyment by production

Small production samples should be interpreted cautiously.

Production	Slightly untrue	Neutral	Slightly true	True	Very true
The Hula-Hoopin' Queen	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	71.4%	14.3%
The Pa'akai We Bring	0.0%	18.2%	0.0%	36.4%	45.5%
Chicka Chicka Boom Boom	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Fancy Dancer	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
The Pigeon Gets a Big Time Holiday Extravaganza!	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	57.1%	28.6%
Ada Twist, Scientist and Friends	5.6%	0.0%	5.6%	38.9%	50.0%
Young Dragon: A Bruce Lee Story	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	77.8%
Robin Hood	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	36.4%	54.5%
Billy Goats Gruff and Other Tales	0.0%	9.1%	9.1%	36.4%	45.5%
Overall	1.2%	4.8%	4.8%	39.8%	49.4%

No respondents selected untrue or very untrue.

A4. Educator perceived student learning by production

Production	Slightly untrue	Neutral	Slightly true	True	Very true
The Hula-Hoopin' Queen	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	28.6%	42.9%
The Pa'akai We Bring	10.0%	10.0%	0.0%	20.0%	60.0%
Chicka Chicka Boom Boom	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%
Fancy Dancer	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%
The Pigeon Gets a Big Time Holiday Extravaganza!	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	57.1%	28.6%
Ada Twist, Scientist and Friends	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	38.9%	50.0%
Young Dragon: A Bruce Lee Story	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%
Robin Hood	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	45.5%	45.5%
Billy Goats Gruff and Other Tales	0.0%	0.0%	27.3%	54.5%	18.2%
Overall	1.2%	2.4%	11.0%	39.0%	46.3%

No respondents selected untrue or very untrue.

A5. Performance satisfaction by production

Production	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied
The Hula-Hoopin' Queen	0.0%	14.3%	85.7%
The Pa'akai We Bring	8.3%	16.7%	75.0%
Chicka Chicka Boom Boom	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Fancy Dancer	0.0%	16.7%	83.3%
The Pigeon Gets a Big Time Holiday Extravaganza!	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Ada Twist, Scientist and Friends	0.0%	5.6%	94.4%
Young Dragon: A Bruce Lee Story	0.0%	37.5%	62.5%
Robin Hood	0.0%	18.2%	81.8%
Billy Goats Gruff and Other Tales	0.0%	18.3%	81.8%
Overall	1.2%	18.3%	80.5%

No respondents selected very dissatisfied.

A6. Workshop satisfaction by production

Production	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied
The Hula-Hoopin' Queen	0.0%	14.3%	85.7%
The Pa'akai We Bring	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%
Chicka Chicka Boom Boom	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Fancy Dancer	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
The Pigeon Gets a Big Time Holiday Extravaganza!	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Ada Twist, Scientist and Friends	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%
Young Dragon: A Bruce Lee Story	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%

Production	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied
Robin Hood	0.0%	20.0%	80.0%
Billy Goats Gruff and Other Tales	0.0%	55.6%	44.4%
Overall	4.1%	28.6%	67.3%

No respondents selected very dissatisfied.

A7. Likelihood of recommending the program

Production	Very unlikely	Unlikely	Likely	Very likely
The Hula-Hoopin' Queen	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	85.7%
The Pa'akai We Bring	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%
Chicka Chicka Boom Boom	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Fancy Dancer	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	83.3%
The Pigeon Gets a Big Time Holiday Extravaganza!	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	85.7%
Ada Twist, Scientist and Friends	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	94.1%
Young Dragon: A Bruce Lee Story	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Robin Hood	9.1%	0.0%	27.3%	63.6%
Billy Goats Gruff and Other Tales	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Overall	1.2%	1.2%	11.0%	86.6%

Appendix B. Detailed Student Findings

B1. Young Dragon respondent profile

Characteristic	Distribution
N	65 matched respondents
Age	Age 10: 41.5%; age 11: 58.5%
Gender	Female 60.0%; male 36.9%; non-binary 3.1%
Race	Asian 33.9%; Black/African American 4.8%; Hispanic/Latino/a 3.2%; White 40.3%; two or more races 16.1%
Plays seen previously	None 3.1%; one or two 35.4%; three or more 61.5%
Participated in a play	Yes 47.7%; no 44.6%; unsure 7.7%
Taken theatre/drama class	Yes 32.8%; no 62.5%; unsure 4.7%

B2. Young Dragon immediate response distributions

Response	Liked the play	Learned something new
Strongly disagree	1.5%	1.5%
Disagree	6.2%	3.1%
Neutral/not sure	13.8%	32.3%
Agree	43.1%	41.5%
Strongly agree	35.4%	21.5%
Mean	4.05	3.78
Median	4	4
Mode	4	4

B3. Robin Hood respondent profile

Characteristic	Distribution
N	78 matched respondents
Age	Age 10: 24.4%; age 11: 74.4%; age 12: 1.3%
Gender	Female 46.8%; male 53.2%
Race	Asian 19.4%; Black/African American 14.9%; Hispanic/Latino/a 3.0%; White 52.2%; two or more races 10.4%
Plays seen previously	None 2.8%; one or two 23.9%; three or more 73.2%
Participated in a play	Yes 61.8%; no 26.3%; unsure 11.8%
Taken theatre/drama class	Yes 37.2%; no 53.8%; unsure 9%

B4. Robin Hood immediate response distributions

Response	Liked the play	Learned something new
Strongly disagree	5.0%	14.0%
Disagree	8.0%	18.0%
Neutral/not sure	27.0%	42.0%
Agree	41.0%	17.0%
Strongly agree	19.0%	9.0%
Mean	3.62	2.88
Median	4	3
Mode	4	3

Appendix C. Qualitative Coding Summaries

C1. Most valuable aspects (65 substantive responses)

Theme	Number of teachers coded
Production quality and craft	23
Student engagement	21
Access and exposure to live theatre	18
Academic or curricular learning	16
Active participation and workshops	13
Cultural/historical learning or perspective-taking	11
Music, song, dance, and movement	11
Developmental appropriateness	10
Creativity, confidence, or arts identification	10
Audience participation	8
Social/community experience	8
Messages and values	8
Representation and inclusion	6

Categories overlap; teachers could be coded into more than one theme.

C2. Areas for improvement (59 responses)

Theme	Number of teachers coded
All aspects valuable/no concern identified	15
N/A, unsure, or insufficient detail	8
Workshop structure or facilitation concerns	6
Performance/overall experience too long	5
Late start, early arrival, or waiting	5
Content too complex for some students	4
Q&A too long	3
Content too simple/young for some students	3
Lunch schedule disruption	2
Aesthetic pacing or structure concern	2
Need for more active/multisensory participation	2
Isolated accessibility/material concerns	2

C3. Teacher-observed student impacts (57 responses)

Theme	Number of teachers coded
Empathy and perspective-taking	18

Theme	Number of teachers coded
Classroom reflection or curricular connections	14
Too soon or difficult to assess lasting impact	12
Cultural understanding	9
Social behavior, teamwork, or relationships	9
Engagement or sustained interest	9
Identity-based or personal connection	8
Confidence, risk-taking, participation, or leadership	8
Perseverance, bravery, or self-belief	8
Theatre literacy, arts appreciation, or career awareness	6

Appendix D. Evaluation Administration and Interpretation Notes

- Educator survey total N = 84.
- Educator surveys were administered approximately one to two weeks after the production.
- Student surveys used five-point scales; educator surveys used seven-point and four-point scales.
- Student pre/post records were matched at the individual level.
- Students missing either the pre- or post-survey were excluded from the matched sample.
- Missing responses to individual items were excluded from the relevant item analysis.
- The typical pre-survey, production, workshop where applicable, and post-survey sequence occurred within approximately one month, but timing varied.
- Paired-samples t-tests were used for student pre/post comparisons.
- Reported effect sizes are Cohen's d.
- Workshop participation could not be linked to individual student respondents.
- The study was approved by the Miami University Institutional Review Board.
- The design supports conclusions about experience, perceptions, and change over time but does not support causal attribution.